material is his discussions about the various deities in *Hippolytus* and *Bacchae*. Artemis’ diverse functions are seen to cohere in the definition of her as ‘the goddess who separates’ (p.42). And Hippolytus, her devotee, is ‘the Would-be Separate man’ (p.43). While *sophrosyne* is employed in a range of ways in the play, according to Sale, Hippolytus uses it to mean ‘*suneinai Artemidi*, to be with Artemis in the profoundest sense’ (p.131). Sale regards the nurse as mentally ill because she is an unconscious manipulator, who acts like this because of her morbid fear of death (pp.70-71, cf. p.67). Perhaps . . .

As with Artemis and Aphrodite in *Hippolytus*, so in chapter four Sale’s discussion is at its best in the attention he devotes to Dionysus, to which are attached further comments on the two goddesses. Certain distinctions drawn between Artemis and Dionysus are interesting: e.g. while both deities exercise sway over the wild, undomesticated nature, Artemis transcends it while Dionysus is immanent in it (pp.85-86). Sale argues that Pentheus’ conscious target is Aphrodite, that he never fully recognises the Lydian stranger/Dionysus as his main opponent (pp.110ff.).

Finally, it is not only technical terms that are off-putting. There is occasional moralising (e.g. pp.23, 49, 53). A.J.A. Wallock’s *Sophocles the Dramatist* (Cambridge: University Press, 1951) would provide a healthy antidote to some examples of the documentary fallacy in Sale (‘what would have happened if . . .’) e.g. pp.72, 73, 77, 78). What are we meant to understand by a comment like that on p.37, that ‘Hippolytus, for all his faults, is a genuine person’? The verse references need careful checking, for several are inaccurate. The book’s greatest lack, to my mind, is a bibliography which could guide the classicist into further studies of this kind. The notes provide a number of references, but not really enough.

There is little point in offering a fuller discussion here, for this monograph undertakes a fairly specialised approach to these tragedies. It needs to be read in its own right, and wrestled with, to see if there is really something useful that such a method can offer the literary critic of the classics.

*G.H.R. Horsley*


The continued fascination which Cicero holds for many readers is illustrated by the production of four new biographies in English since 1971
SOME RECENT BOOKS

(in addition to other Roman history books giving considerable attention to Cicero). This is the most readable of the recent books on Cicero, and makes many perceptive comments on Cicero and his period. As its title indicates, it is more than a biography: it provides useful information and insights which illuminate many aspects of Roman republican history, society and literature. Lacey has a talent for communicating significant detail succinctly, and by interweaving some of Cicero’s more colourful expressions into his own narrative he achieves a forceful and lively account. There are three useful maps (especially the one of Cilicia), good summaries of a number of Cicero’s philosophical works, and some translated passages from Cicero’s own works.

The account is chronological, but the focus of the ten chapters varies. Chapter One gives a clear, good account of the Roman political system and the main features of Roman education. Chapter Two, although one of the shortest chapters, covers many aspects of the period 80-63 B.C. and Cicero’s rise to the consulship. It includes aspects infrequently discussed in text-books, which can be quite illuminating, e.g. the connections, ambitions and interests of Cicero’s wife Terentia, and in Sicily Cicero’s art-collecting and visit to the tomb of Archimedes.

The chapter on Cicero’s consulship and its aftermath is good, bringing out the diversity and energy of Cicero’s activities in 63 B.C. It is also good on the growth of special commands in the late Republic and on social divisions and interests in Rome. In tracing the decline in Cicero’s influence from the late sixties through the fifties, Lacey gives a good detailed account of Caesar’s consulship of 59 B.C. but reiterates the standard view that Pompey was active by mid-58 in efforts to get Cicero recalled from exile. Contemporary evidence suggests that Pompey’s intervention was much later. Lacey also suggests that Cicero’s sponsorship of a special grain commission for Pompey in 57 might reflect Cicero’s restored prestige; but this ignores the strong anti-Pompey feeling in the senate at that time, which made almost all the consulars stay away from the crucial meeting where the command was mooted.

The period from 56 to 48 B.C. is covered comparatively briefly, but brings out the importance of Cicero’s writings of that time and has a good discussion of provincial government. The pages (79-81) on the dialogue *On the Orator* are a valuable supplement to the earlier comments on the Roman educational system.

Lacey is (rightly, for his purpose) less interested in the causes or course of the civil war of 49-48 B.C. than in Cicero’s position under Caesar’s dictatorship. He sees Cicero pursuing a new ambition, to make the teaching of eloquence his ‘honourable life of leisure’. Cicero ‘intended his philosophy to be his contribution to the welfare of his country, and so a continuation of
his previous services; educating the youth aright would be the best contribution he could make' (p.142). Even when Cicero returned to active politics after the death of Caesar in 44 B.C., he continued with his philosophical writings. This was, in fact, his most prolific period for such work. 'Cicero’s last fight, and death', which Lacey identifies with the end of the Republic, is movingly told. Lacey sees the end of 43 B.C. as the triumph of the military junta.

A valuable Epilogue traces Cicero’s continuing influence on the European intellectual tradition, e.g. in education, scholarship, linguistic style. The Bibliography gives a critical résumé of other biographies, translations, and books relevant to Cicero.

The book is elegantly, though not lavishly, produced, which should increase its attractiveness to potential buyers. The general reader who wants an interesting, reliable account of Cicero will not be disappointed. But the serious student cannot help but be frustrated by the one serious defect — the lack of references to sources. The book has no footnotes. Hence it will be impossible for most readers to evaluate Cicero’s quoted comments in their proper context (especially important for Cicero, whose comments and attitude can be influenced by so many factors, e.g. the type of writing — speech or letter or philosophical treatise; its date, specific purpose, audience or recipient). It is similarly impossible to follow up references to modern works, e.g. (p.16) ‘A recent study has illustrated the truth of Cicero’s own claim that Molon repressed the excesses of his youthful exuberance.’ And the reader will never know when uncertainties or controversial problems are being glossed over, e.g. (p.17) the dates of Cicero’s marriage and of the birth of his daughter are not certain; (p.22) Cicero’s attitude to the restoration of equites to the juries in 70 B.C. is not clear; (p.27) it is not certain that Cicero defended the tribune Manilius. However, there are very few real inaccuracies. One is on p.82, where the date for Cicero’s recall from exile should be 57 B.C.

_Beryl Rawson_


This slender and elegant volume from the Professor of Humanity in the University of St Andrews concerns itself with a meticulous analysis of the literary background of the African Church Father Lactantius. The quotations occurrent in the _Divine Institutes (Divinae institutiones)_ are subjected