

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY (ed.), *Cicero XVa, Philippics 1-6 (Revised by John T. Ramsey and Gesine Manuwald)*. Loeb Classical Library 189, Cambridge, Mass. - London: Harvard University Press, 2009, pp. lxxii + 321, ISBN 9780674996342.

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY (ed.), *Cicero XVb, Philippics 7-14 (Revised by John T. Ramsey and Gesine Manuwald)*. Loeb Classical Library 507, Cambridge, Mass. - London: Harvard University Press, 2009, pp. ix + 365, ISBN 9780674996359.

“Time was, as W. M. Calder III lately reminded us, when eminent scholars were but seldom seen contributing to the Loeb Classical Library. Mediocrity or worse proliferated in the red and green ranks, though not to the exclusion of such meritorious achievements as Colson’s Philo and Anderson’s Sidonius. *Sed haec prius fuere.*” So wrote D. R. Shackleton Bailey in 1979, reviewing (favorably) for *Classical Philology* George Goold’s Loeb Manilius. Today the words are truer yet, not least because of the vast and invaluable contributions of Shackleton Bailey himself, inaugurated with the superb Martial’s *Epigrams* of 1993 and concluding now with these two volumes. A replacement of Walter Ker’s edition of 1926, they fittingly contain the final speeches of the Latin author for whom Shackleton Bailey had the most abiding interest (traced in a delightful and instructive reminiscence, “A Ciceronian Odyssey,” reprinted in his *Selected Classical Papers* [Ann Arbor, 1997] 363-8).

This new Loeb is based on Shackleton Bailey’s earlier (and now out-of-print) edition of the *Philippics* published by the University of North Carolina Press in 1986. In “A Ciceronian Odyssey” this work was characterized “as something like an American Budé: text with short apparatus and translation on facing pages, and some elucidatory notes but no commentary.” While, according to Shackleton Bailey, at that time “no adequate English translation of these speeches existed,” translation—he sagely counseled—is ideally undertaken by the editor of any text: “the discipline is sure to bring out points that would otherwise go unnoticed.” And, Shackleton Bailey hoped, his text and translation would pave the way for an “adequate commentary,” a hope that has now more than been fulfilled for the first two *Philippics* by John Ramsey’s Cambridge edition of 2003 and for *Philippics* 3-9 by Gesine Manuwald’s de Gruyter edition of 2007 (while Ramsey’s edition of the last five speeches, in progress, is eagerly awaited).

It fell to Ramsey and Manuwald to revise the North Carolina *Philippics* for the Loeb (Shackleton Bailey died in 2005), and nobody familiar with their work will be surprised to learn that they have scored a great success here. One clear *desideratum* was a fuller introduction, now supplied in the present volumes (covering “Title”; “Formation of the Corpus”; “Demosthenes and Cicero”; “Strategies

and Aims”; “Rhetoric and Style”). Here one finds summarized the view first proposed by Wilfried Stroh and developed at great length by Manuwald in her earlier commentary that the *Philippics* were intended by Cicero as a corpus of twelve speeches (the third through the fourteen in the present numbering), echoing the earlier collection of twelve consular speeches he outlined in 60 BCE which was also likened to Demosthenes’ *Philippic Orations* (*Att.* 2.1.3 = SB 21); the idea is intriguing, but Manuwald and Ramsey are right to note here that the corpus as it now survives also has its own logic, which could be explored more (the fact that the *Second Philippic* was a pamphlet only written in the *form* of a speech goes more or less unremarked on in the Introduction). One does miss in the Introduction, too, some discussion of the extraordinary afterlives of these speeches, which is undeniably a part of their importance (I would trade this for the reprinting of Shackleton Bailey’s own introduction, pp. xxxiii-xxxvi). The revisers includes a helpful bibliography which reflects a flurry of recent work on the speeches; Syme’s *Roman Revolution*, though, ought to have been included in the section “Historical and Political Background” as it remains indispensable. (One may also wonder why, if Toher’s important article, *CQ* 54 [2004] 174-84, the point of which is to re-date Octavian’s arrival to Rome in April of 44 BCE, is cited, that chronology is not followed in the elaborate and helpful timeline, pp. lix-lxvii.)

While “in a Loeb edition the translation is usually what matters most” (again from Shackleton Bailey’s review of Goold), here text and translation matter equally, since Shackleton Bailey’s was considered (by many, anyway) the best text available. The revisers have made a number of changes (noted at pp. xxxix-xliv), and all of those which I checked seemed acceptable or even virtually certain, though serious students of the *Philippics* will still want to consult the texts Ramsey and Manuwald print in their own editions, as they are not always identical (and their commentaries also explain in detail their divergences from Shackleton Bailey). In revising the translation, the revisers note, they faced a peculiar problem—remaining faithful to Cicero and to Shackleton Bailey’s own translation, which (like his others) was especially readable. Compare, for instance, his rendering of the start of the *Third Philippic*, “Members of the Senate, we have been called together later than the crisis of the Commonwealth demanded; but we meet at last”, with the more literal version of Ker, “This meeting, Conscript Fathers, is altogether later than the public emergency demanded, yet at length we have been called together.” Indeed, any translator of Cicero or even of other Latin prose authors, could benefit from study of Shackleton Bailey’s technique—the way he sometimes breaks down longer sentences, including the recasting of relative clauses into separate sentences; the omission of conjunctions and particles in translation; the conversion of verbs into nouns; the rendering of *hic* as the definite article “the”; and so forth. Points of Latinity can be reviewed or learned from Shackleton Bailey’s translation, e.g., *cupio* = “Yes, I should like” (cf. *OLD* s.v. *cupio* 1c); *at* = “Oh (or Ah), but” (in response to a request or question) (cf. *OLD* s.v. *at* 9, with examples from Plautus at 9a); *ubi x?* = “What has become of *x*?” (cf. *OLD* s.v. *ubi* 2); *nolo* = “to not think proper.”

The revisers preserve much of the readability of their ‘original’, though do prefer (not unreasonably for a Loeb) to stay a bit closer to the Latin; so, for example, where Shackleton Bailey often converted rhetorical questions into statements, the revisers leave them as questions. And, as they note in their preface, for *res publica* they prefer “Republic” (to Shackleton Bailey’s “Commonwealth”), for *patria* “native land” (to “fatherland”), for *boni* “decent men” (to “honest men”).

All in all, this volume is a great success. Ramsey and Manuwald are to be congratulated for their thoughtful revision, which makes Shackleton Bailey’s important work on the *Philippics* more accessible for future generations.

JOSIAH OSGOOD  
Georgetown University  
jo39@georgetown.edu

