

Hannah ČULÍK-BAIRD, *Cicero and the Early Latin Poets*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2022, XIV + 306 pp., ISBN 9781316516089 (hardback); 9781009031820 (ebook).

The volume by H. Čulík-Baird (henceforth the A[uthor]) aims at offering a thorough analysis of the quotations from earlier poets in Cicero's attested works. Such a study has never been attempted since the important, but now outdated monograph by Zillinger 1911 (*Cicero und die altrömische Poesie*, diss. Würzburg). This book, thus, constitutes a welcome addition to the scholarship on Cicero *and* fragmentary poetry in general, positioning itself in the renewed trend of critical studies on poetic fragments. While studies devoted to the reception of individual fragmentary poets have come out – e.g. the case of Ennius' *Annales* in the monograph by J. Elliott, *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales*, Cambridge 2013, a work which the A. discusses with insight throughout the book –, the present volume focuses instead on the citational practice of one of the protagonists of the late Republican debate on literature, delving into the analysis of the context of each poetic fragment.

To do so, the A. structures the book in a series of five chapters constituting the bulk of the work, encircled by an *Introduction* and an *Envoi* which mutually correspond and give a strong sense of unity by opening also a window to the reception of fragmentary poets via Cicero himself (cf. the case of Petrarch and his knowledge of Ennius, discussed on 9-11 and 228, is particularly relevant).

In the Introduction (1-29), the A. firstly provides a summary on past and current trends on matter like quotation and intertextuality: see the references to R. W. Emerson's «Quotation and Originality», which gives the title to the Introduction itself, «All Minds Quote», the discussion of H. Bloom's «anxiety of influence» (5), and that of Habinek's «reanimation through memory of prototypes» (6), a model that informs substantial parts of the books and offers a great deal of innovation to the whole book. After that, the A. offers a succinct but insightful overview of research on fragments involving Ciceronian texts over the last nine centuries (from William of Malmesbury's *Polyhistor* to the recent editions by Courtney 2003² and Blänsdorf 2011). This preliminary discussion is followed by some remarks involving the issues posed by quotations in the Ciceronian corpus: the problem of anonymous lines (24), the insertion of “stage directions” inside poetic quotations (from tragedy, 25), and names of characters and ti-



tles of works quoted (27). This last point deserves special attention, since the reference edition to tragic fragments is not Ribbeck's third edition (1897), but the new collection *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta (TrRF)* by M. Schauer (I, 2012) and G. Manuwald (II, 2012), where previous attributions are replaced by unknown authorship. Such a change helps the reader to focus on the hypothetical nature of some attribution and constitutes a good methodological *memorandum* for critics (see especially 185 and 188-189 in chapter 4 and the general remarks, 230).

Chapter 1, *Cicero and the Poets* (30-79), offers a general overview of the quotations present in the Ciceronian corpus. Taking the cue from the quotation of Enn. *ann.* 337-339 in Cicero's *De senectute*, the A. analyses Ennius' cultural significance, delves into the concept of the "functionality" of poetic quotations (39), and broadens the inquiry to other poetic genres, such as comedy and its intrinsic capacity of representing real life (40-41: the results of this paragraph, entitled «The Mirror of Poetry», should be usefully compared with those by G. Pezzini, *Terence and the speculum vitae. "Realism" and (Roman) Comedy*, «HSCP» 111, 2021, 101-161). The discussion goes on with an analysis of different strategies of quotation: from Cicero's self-quotations (56-58) to the use of Greek poetry, both in Greek (58-66) and in Latin translation (66-74). The chapter concludes with a remark on the question of «citational accuracy» and explore the possibility of Cicero's dependence on books (scholar edition of ancient poets) rather than memory. These conclusions are generally sound but would require a further distinction between quotations of other authors and self-quotations (differences between direct and indirect tradition of Cicero's works might produce citational double redaction of lines: I am referring to some cases in *De natura deorum* and *De divinatione*, especially where the characters responsible for quotations – like Balbus in *nat. deor.* 2, 104 – are represented as quoting lines by heart).

Chapter 2, *Poetic Citation by Ciceronian Genre* (80-154), offers a discussion of Cicero's citational practice throughout his own literary works: from philosophical treatises (80-93, via the influence of Plato, Aristotle's lost *Protrepticus* and the Stoics) to oratory (93-103, with a complete discussion of poetic quotations and four case studies, 103-141) and letters (141-153). Leaving aside the A.'s conclusions of each discussion, the major strength of this chapter is the capacity to clarify the interconnection inside a single genre and between different genres. Comic undertones present in the portrait of Clodia in the *Pro Caelio* (133-141) are thus con-

sidered against a wider citational practice fully developed in the earlier speeches *Pro Roscio Amerino* (108-116) and *Pro Murena* (116-121, where the influence of tragic models is discussed through the lens of Gaius Gracchus' oratory) and the contemporary *Pro Sestio* (121-132). Furthermore, the strong links in citational practice existing between single letters and philosophical treatises are analysed in detail (the cases represented by the diptychs of *Att.* 13, 21, 3 and *Luc.* 49 and *fam.* 15, 6, 1 and *Tusc.* 4, 67 are particularly significant).

The next two chapters are thematically interwoven, dealing with a specific genre of poetic performances: Chapter 3, *Roman Comedy and Scholarship* (155-172), pinpoints the reception of comedy in Cicero via ancient Roman scholarship, while Chapter 4, *Singing in Cicero* (173-196), analyses Ciceronian reactions to music in tragic *cantica*. The former explores the historical figure of L. Aelius Stilo and his erudite interest in comedy and deals with Cicero's and Varro's different reactions to his Stoic etymological doctrines: among the etymologies quoted (158), perhaps it should have been mentioned Ael. Stilo fr. 13 *GRF* Funaioli, *i.e.* the derivation of *lepus* ("hare") from *leuipes* ("lightfooted"), rebutted twice in Varro *rust.* 3, 12, 6 and *ant. rer. div.* fr. 89 Cardauns while accepted in Cic. *Arat.* 121 (see also J. J. O'Hara, *True Names. Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Ann Arbor, 2017², esp. 42-50). Of course, the discussion is not limited to this material but offers an in-depth analysis of how Ciceronian quotations develop a discourse on Roman language comparable to that in Varro's ones and how philosophical theories on etymology informs Cicero's selection of comic materials. The following chapter deals with music in late Republican literature with a specific focus on material evidence attested in papyri (177) and the moral value associated to it (175) before dealing with the "philosophical" reception of tragic *cantica* in the treatise *Tusculan disputations*, derived from Accius' *Philocteta*, Pacuvius' *Niptra*, a now unknown tragedy attested in *Tusc.* 3, 25-26 – formerly assigned to Ennius' *Thyestes* – and Ennius' *Andromacha*. On the latter it would have been helpful to discuss or at least cite I. Gildenhard, *Paideia Romana: Cicero's Tusculan disputations*, Cambridge 2007, 165-166 and to deepen the political aspect of the tragic quotation.

Chapter 5, *Poetry as Artefact* (197-225), represents a conclusion of sorts, without making the general epilogue in the *Envoi* (226-230) superfluous. In this last thematic chapter, the A. examines the value of the poetry as a cultural product, dealing with the socio-cultural dimension of

poetic quotations as a way to explore Roman past (via reference to Varro's and Atticus' erudite works): Cicero's quotations of Lucilian fragments on the much admired orator L. Licinius Crassus (202-210) thus contribute to legitimising a particular intellectual portrait of the man, and in a similar way Ennius' *Annales* are read as a way to eternalise a «common memory» (224) of past men and their deeds.

The last part of the book is dedicated to ancillary materials fundamental for the full understanding of some chapters of the book: in three lengthy *Appendices* (231-278), the reader may find all the poetic quotations present in the Ciceronian corpus listed «by Ciceronian Work» (I), «by Latin Poet» (II) and «by Greek Poet» (III), and two helpful *Indices* printed at the very end of the volume, the former devoted to «passages discussed» (295-298), the latter helping to keep track of the themes faced in the book (the «General» one: 299-306).

Informatively written and carefully type proofed (I noticed typos only 112 n. 114; 167; 175 n. 12 and some minor faults in the Bibliography), the volume is completed by a rich Bibliography (279-304) which contains all the relevant items to the discussion: a small infelicity due to concision perhaps occurs in the definition of the *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (*FPL*), as a work «most recently edited by Willy Morel (2011)» (XI), while the reference is to be intended to J. Blänsdorf's second edition of the *FPL*, a miscellaneous work issued for the first time by W. Morel in 1927 (after E. Baehrens' collection), by K. Büchner in 1982, and then by Blänsdorf himself twice, in 1995 and 2011, as the A. clearly shows (18: the reference to Blänsdorf 2011 might have been updated also in the final bibliography, where the indication is to Blänsdorf 1995).

To sum up, this work stands as a referential book for all of those interested in Ciceronian citational practice: scholars and students alike dealing with “fragments” and Cicero's oeuvre will take enormous benefit from reading and consulting it.

Adalberto MAGNAVACCA