

## Zitierhinweis

Santangelo, Federico: review of: Celia E. Schultz (ed.), A Commentary on Cicero, "De Divinatione I", Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014, in: Exemplaria Classica, 20 (2016), p. 309-314, DOI: 10.33776/ec.v20i0.2935, downloaded from Website

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

## copyright

Dieser Beitrag kann vom Nutzer zu eigenen nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken heruntergeladen und/oder ausgedruckt werden. Darüber hinausgehende Nutzungen sind ohne weitere Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber nur im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Schrankenbestimmungen (§§ 44a-63a UrhG) zulässig.

CELIA E. SCHULTZ, *A Commentary on Cicero, De Divinatione I*, Michigan Classical Commentaries, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014. ISBN 978-0-472-03608-0. \$27.95.

A few months back, when I told one of our graduate students that a new commentary on the first book of Cicero's *De divinatione* was about to be published, they replied: 'What is wrong with Book 2?'. The comment was made in jest, but there was a serious point to it. About a decade ago David Wardle published a full-scale commentary on *Div. 1* in the Clarendon Ancient History series, without plans to extend his discussion to Book 2; Celia Schultz (henceforth S.), one of the most original and influential scholars currently at work in the field of Roman religion, has made the same decision, and nothing in this book suggests that she is planning to carry on with a discussion of Book 2. It is hard not to approach this handsome volume without a sense of missed opportunity. The overall quality of S.'s discussion makes that feeling even more acute, once one has gone through the whole commentary.

There is much in this work that commands attention and rewards the reader, and it is immediately apparent that the focus is very different from Wardle's in a number of respects. S. does not provide a translation, but prints a new Latin text (largely based on those of Pease and Ax) and offers a commentary that lends considerable attention to matters of language and style, as well as historical issues. S. also puts forwards a very different reading of *Div.* to the one advocated by Wardle. Following the lead of N. Denyer, M. Beard, and M. Schofield, she regards the case in favour of divination in *Div. 1* as carrying equal weight to the one against divination in Book 2 (perhaps not such a minority view these days, as implied on p. 1). Indeed, S. partly explains her choice to focus exclusively on *Div. 1* with the need to do justice to its importance in the fabric of the dialogue and in the wider intellectual project that Cicero pursued in the mid-40s of the first century BC, and calls for an 'integrative' reading of the dialogue (13; cf. also the reference to 'space constraints' at 1). I have put forward a very different interpretation of *Div.* elsewhere (*Divination, Prediction and the End of the Roman Republic*, Cambridge 2013, 10-36). S. was not able to include it in her discussion (cf. viii), and I do not think it would be either fair or helpful for me to expand any further on the reasons for our disagreement. Whatever their overall understanding of the dialogue may be, readers of *Div.* will find much value in this volume. It is an early instalment of a new series, the *Michigan Classical Commentaries*, which has recently been supplemented by volumes on

Pausanias I and Plautus's *Poenulus*. It will no doubt take some time for this series to set its tone and define its ethos. On the evidence of this volume, one would reckon the level is pitched much closer to that of the Aris and Phillips series than to that of the CUP Green-and-Yellow one.

S.'s discussion is consistently judicious and usually informative. The introduction does not just convey a summary of her interpretation of the dialogue. It also manages to provide a condensed and highly readable overview of Cicero's biography, as well as a brief and helpful account of Roman divination (the discussion of the Sibylline Books at 7-8 may lead an uninformed reader to think that they had no status before 83 BC). The view that *Div.* 1 is partly shaped in response to Cotta's Academic case in *ND* (12) would have merited further discussion; alternatively, readers should at least have been alerted to the fact that J. P. F. Wynne's Cornell dissertation, where that point is made at some length, is readily available online (<https://ecommons.cornell.edu/handle/1813/8323>, last accessed 04.11.16).

References to *TLL* are few and far between (114): when a word is singled out for discussion, readers are usually directed to *OLD*. It is a symptom of the fact that this is a student edition, and in general strikes me as a defensible choice. Yet, I was often left wondering whether the students who will be using this edition may not be pushed a bit harder, and not just in the discussion of individual points of Latin. I shall provide a few examples. We are told that *scientia* is the 'standard rendering' of *episteme* (56), but no corroborating evidence is supplied (e.g. Cic. *De or.* 1.83, 2.30); in the following page, we are reminded that references to *Chaldaei* often have a derogatory tone without any parallel passages being given (e.g. the reference to *grex Chaldaeus* in Juv. 10.94; I would argue that the tone that is elsewhere reserved to them is mostly dismissive, rather than openly derogatory). The occurrence of *ratione et scientia* (1.4) is simply translated without being commented upon (59): students will get no sense that they are facing two of the most dense, problematic, and intensely debated concepts in Roman intellectual history (the recent appearance of the English edition of C. Moatti's *La raison de Rome* with CUP will enable many English-speaking readers to fill that gap somewhat more comfortably than would have otherwise been the case). The same applies to the discussion of *coniectura* in 12 at 73. As ever, pushing students can also be a way of empowering them. Providing them with a list of the instances in which Cicero uses technical terms like *haruspex* and *augurare* 'in a more general way' (58) would have enabled them to get a sense of how Cicero introduces nuances and changes of tone in his discussion for themselves, and to get a first-hand idea of the depth of the discourse on divination in the late Republican period. At 64, a summary of instances in which *uber* (or indeed *ubertas*) is used to describe specific stylistic and rhetorical features would have helpfully catered for the interests of students who are predominantly drawn towards the linguistic and literary dimension

of the text. At 75 we are helpfully told that *rores aurora remittit* offers consonance and assonance, and that Cicero ‘liberally’ uses alliteration, but are not given any suggestions on how to find out more about that (R. G. Coleman in R. Mayer and J. N. Adams, eds., *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, Oxford 1999, 47–8 is a very good starting point). At 90 we are told that the analogy between divination and technical fields goes back to Plato, but no reference is supplied (*Phaedr.* 244 and *Tim.* 71e–72b are especially important in that connection). The summary of Appius Claudius’s censorship in 50 is somewhat hasty, and again unreferenced (98; cf. Cic. *Fam.* 8.14.4; Cass. Dio 40.63). The discussion of the Stoic notion of *sumpatheia* suffers from the same shortcoming (107; R. W. Sharples, *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics. An Introduction to Hellenistic Philosophy*, London–New York 1996, 50–2 is invaluable). The list could continue. A summary of the idiosyncrasies of this commentary is on p. 126, where one encounters a brief account of Eudemus of Cyprus’s life without a reference to the evidence for his philosophical training, followed by a tabular overview of the *oratio obliqua* passage in 1.53 that is likely to prove a blessing for students who are working on the text in the original. At 161 we are given a helpful list of occurrences of talking animals, but no list of instances of the expression *laeta exta* (e.g. Livy 27.26.14, 29.10.6, 31.5.7; Plin. *Nat.* 11.190). The criteria of S.’s selection of what to cover, and how much, are often utterly elusive.

The sense of frustration is compounded by the fact that in some cases S. does provide valuable detail: at 61, for instance, we are presented with a very helpful list of references to Socrates’s acceptance of divination, and at 63 with an invaluable overview of the material on Democritus, in Cicero and elsewhere. At 67 we are offered a summary of the evidence for senatorial properties in Tusculum (a reference to Shatzman’s *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics* may have been useful). At 86 there is a serviceable summary of the involvement of the Allobroges in the Catiline affair, with a full set of references, and at 89 a rich list of the instances of the diminutive *Paniscus*. The discussion of *tripudium* at 94 and *sinistra, dira* and *uitiosa* at 96 is excellent; so is that of *galeotae* at 112, and that of the phenomenon of the omission of the final *s* after a short vowel and followed by a word beginning with a consonant at 114.

Inevitably, in a commentary on such a rich and challenging work, there are specific points that prompt disagreement. I am not sure we can confidently say that *saepe* in 1.4 is an exaggeration (60): the case for a far-reaching presence of inspired, free-standing diviners in Republican Rome has been powerfully made by T. P. Wiseman, in a contribution that S. quotes about a specific propogographical matter a few lines below. I would not translate *religio* in 1.7 as ‘religious feeling’ (66), but as ‘religious practice’. The discussion of the practices that appear to fall in between natural and artificial divination (72) would have benefited from a reference to the treatment of the limits of

that distinction by M. Flower (*The Seer in Ancient Greece*, Princeton 2008, 90). The discussion of the burning of the Capitol in 83 BC at 79 should have directed students to the recent major pieces by H. Flower and A. Thein. A *lituus* may be read as a reference to fully endorsed *imperium* even when it is not paired with a *simpulum*: see *RRC* 359, struck by Sulla on his way back from the East (see P. Assenmaker, *De la victoire au pouvoir. Développement et manifestations de l'idéologie impériatoriale à l'époque de Marius à Sylla*, Brussels 2014, 193–213, with ample bibliography). The discussion of the Sibylline Books on 104 states that 'the Romans preferred' to consult the Sibylline Books rather than the Sibyl herself: this way of setting out the problem tends to obscure the fact that the Books were a central part of the functioning of the Roman *government*. The transition from mythical to historical examples in 43 is not just a transition from weaker to stronger instances (116): Quintus is again anticipating an objection of Marcus and evoking examples that are closer (*propiora*) to their historical experience, and hence less controversial. On Tarquinius's dream in Accius's *Brutus* (quoted at 1.45) see the discussion by J. Rüpke (*Religion in Republican Rome: Rationalization and Ritual Change*, 2012, 58–60, with further bibliography), who helpfully ties in with the exploration of wider developments in Roman intellectual history. 'Made for me' is not an entirely clear translation for *conitior*, at least in the context of a commentary: 'charged against me' would have been more effective. It is doubtful that the 'annalistic histories' produced before Coelius Antipater were 'popular' (122). It is worth canvassing the hypothesis that the adjective *clarum admodum* may not refer to the fame enjoyed by the Simonides dream narrated in 1.57, but to its clarity (131); both meanings of the word may well have been evoked by this passage. The discussion of Cassandra's *missa sum* in 1.66 (141) declaredly builds on Jocelyn's commentary, but fails to make clear that it may be drawing an analogy with a mare (cf. the discussion in Timpanaro's commentary, p. 283). There was no link between the victory in the Social War and the mounting threat of a civil war between Marius and Sulla (148; again, a reference to one of the main modern discussions of the period, e.g. Seager in *CAH IX*<sup>2</sup>, would have been helpful). I would be more optimistic than S. is on the possibility of discerning the different meanings of terms like *ostentum* and *signum* (151–52); the discussion by D. Engels that she quotes enables some progress in that direction. It is impossible to rule out that the same haruspices who were 'for hire' (155) did not also advise the government on the expiation of public prodigies in the Republican period. On weeping statues, a reference to A. Corbeill's paper in T. Fögen and M. Lee (eds.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World* (2009, 297–310) may have been in order (172). I am not entirely clear how we should read Quintus's argument on the inevitability of Caesar's death in 1.119 as contradicting preceding sections of the book (189); the reading of Wardle, who proposes to read *ut uideret interitum* and *non ut caueret* as result clauses, should have

been illustrated more clearly; Timpanaro did not actually flag up any contradiction in Quintus's case (cf. p. 320 of his edition). *Nunc illa testabor* at 132 does not mark a transition from the outline of the Stoic doctrine to Quintus's own assessment (196-7), but opens a lively discussion of forms of divinatory practice that are close to his historical experience and on which he feels the need to offer a qualification. I struggle to share S.'s optimism that anything 'of any real significance' has gone lost in the lacuna at the end of Book 1: every single word carries considerable weight in a text of this kind, especially in a concluding section that must have had special significance. References to individual priests should have directed readers to Rüpke's *Fasti sacerdotum* (Stuttgart 2005; English ed., Oxford 2008).

The bibliography is quite heavily slanted towards English-speaking scholarship; again, an unsurprising choice in a teaching edition. Yet, some important contributions are overlooked. The names of A. Bendlin, J. Rüpke, and (most strikingly) J. North are absent from the bibliography; J. Scheid is mentioned only as a co-author of a French edition of *Div.* One of the stated aims of this volume is to reach out to scholars working on religious studies: engaging with that body of work in this context would have enabled S. to situate *Div.* much more effectively. North's ground-breaking discussion of the use of the term *diuinatio* in Cicero (in M. Beard-J. North, eds., *Pagan Priests*, London 1990, 57-60) would have warranted a mention in the discussion of 1.1. At 67, *ad* 1.7, we are cursorily told that 'belittling his opponents' religious beliefs' is a customary strategy in Cicero: I. Gildenhard's *Creative Eloquence* (2011) has shown that there is something much more complex and intellectually stimulating unfolding that front, and that it is central to the assessment of Cicero's political and literary agendas. The book is on the whole well produced, with a handful of blemishes: I have spotted 'Dyrrachium' at 91, '*ancila*' at 100, 'he Roman State' at 102, 'seige of Nola' at 148 and 'Pausanius' in the prelims. There are helpful cross-references to a number of passages in Book 2 that directly echo or engage with sections of Book 1.

To sum up, then – where does S.'s commentary leave us? It does not replace Pease's *magnum opus*, nor does it set out or purport to do that; in fact, S. candidly states that one of the reasons that led her to write this commentary is that most modern readers of *Div.* lack the knowledge base to meaningfully engage with Pease's work (vii). Readers who are interested in points of Latin and in the rendition of specific passages will still have to turn to Timpanaro, whose terse prose is likely to prove accessible even to those with a modest reading knowledge of Italian. Wardle's translation of *Div.* I is an invaluable working tool, and his commentary remains the go-to place for any serious reader of that text. The same reader will also do well not to overlook what S. has to say on a number of specific points, but the first and foremost reward of her engagement with *Div.* is that she has provided the English-speaking classroom with a very serviceable edition of the dialogue.

From now on, if one wants to teach an Advanced Latin course on *Div.*, S.'s book will be an excellent companion, which will provide students with thoughtful and well-informed guidance. Yet, some of us may still be reluctant to teach a course that takes students no further than Book 1 – precisely in the name of integrative reading.

FEDERICO SANTANGELO  
Newcastle University  
federico.santangelo@ncl.ac.uk