

possible. These copies will be made available for publication through the Advanced Papyrological Information System (APIS) at Duke University.

Just as with the previous volumes, the materials are meticulously developed and compiled. I saw no typographical errors, and few areas in which I might disagree with the transcriptions or translations. My only regret is that although some editors noted evidence of diaeresis, perhaps in response to a comment in a review of the earlier volume *Petra Papyri II* by Lajos Berkes,² the transcription of diaeresis is still inconsistent. For example, document 77 reflects diaeresis in the word Ioun (line 1) and in the name Thaious to show the pronunciation (line 7), but not in the name Ioannes (line 32), even though the plates for this document show it in the latter location. This inconsistency is common in many publications, requiring the examination of the document or available photographs to see if diaeresis is present, but more consistency would aid in the research of patterns that may help us understand scribal transmission.

On the other hand, it should be noted that this material was compiled from often very small fragments and reconstructed based on the professional judgment of the editors. Those editors, however, have provided clear copies of the evidence from which they are working, and this will provide an opportunity for those who love jigsaw puzzles to search for better ways to reconstruct the fragments. These documents have already provided a significant opportunity to learn more about the liminal areas between the Byzantine Empire and Arabia, and to explore the diffusion of legal, social and scribal norms across the greater Eastern Mediterranean. The generosity of the editors in explaining their judgment in reconstructing these documents and in providing clear plates for comparison must be applauded. This should permit the continued development of information about this critically important area of the world.

Elizabeth Buchanan

University of Findlay, Ohio
buchanan@findlay.edu

Gesine Manuwald, *Cicero, Agrarian Speeches: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2018. iv + 480 pp. ISBN 9780198715405.

Gesine Manuwald's (hereafter G.M.) *Cicero Agrarian Speeches*, offers a revised edition, translation, and commentary of Cicero's three agrarian speeches, the first of a number of speeches Cicero delivered during his consular year, and consequently published. These speeches aim to rebuke a bill which P. Servilius Rullus recently put forward as Tribute of the Plebs. In his speeches Cicero touches upon some of the most crucial issues of late Republican politics, such as agrarian reforms, the transformation of the *tribunica potestas* during the late Republic, legislation, and the Roman voting system. The speeches also offer a unique gaze of Cicero's state of mind, political intentions, and net of allegiances during the early stages of his consulate, and before the Catiline affair. Likewise, as Cicero himself intended the *Agrarian Speeches* to be his *tour de force* (the first was delivered on his first consular day), these texts are invaluable for any study of Ciceronian rhetoric, late Republican rhetoric in general, and the connection between rhetoric and politics during the late Republic. It is therefore surprising that these speeches were so rarely treated in a commentary form in the past. In fact, and as G.M. herself notes, these speeches were

² Lajos Berkes, 'Review of Ludwig Koenen, Jorma Kaimio, Maarit Kaimio, Robert W. Daniel (ed.), *The Petra Papyri II*', *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2014.05.04.

seldom treated *per se*. The only full commentary is that of A. W. Zumpt (Berlin, 1861). Moreover, there has not been an English translation since the 1930 Loeb edition of J.H. Freese, and while there is the commentary of Jonkers (1963), its author limited himself to the social and economic aspects of these speeches. Manuwald set to fill this gap and she does it admirably.

P. Servilius Rullus entered the post of Tribune of the People on 10 December 64 BCE. Immediately after taking office, he put forward an agrarian bill. It appears that when Cicero delivered his *Agrarian Speeches*, the bill had already been promulgated, hence Cicero had to criticize it *en bloc*. As Rullus' agrarian bill is unattested elsewhere, its reconstruction derives exclusively from Cicero's critique (G.M. xx). Rullus' bill offered impoverished Roman citizen land, which was either owned by the state or to be bought by public funds for the purpose of being redistributed (LA 1.6-22; 2.73-97). The bill made available *ager publicus*, such as the *ager Campanus*, and private Italian land, which would be bought from private owners willing to sell (LA 1.14-15; 2.67; 2.75). Others were to be settled in colonies, existing (LA 1.17; 2.75) or new (LA 1.16; 2.73-5). The necessary funds for the execution of this agrarian reform were to be secured by the sale of land outside of Italy, acquired or inherited after 88 BCE (LA 1.10; 2.38; 2.56), a sale of lands destined to be sold since 81 BCE (LA 2.35-7). Furthermore, the *decemviri* were expected to probe into the status of land outside of Italy. More specifically, they should enquire whether it is public or private, aiming to impose heavier taxation on the use of *ager publicus* (LA 1.10; 2.56-7). The *decemviri* were also to sell land in Italy and Sicily (LA 1.2-4; 2.47-9). Even more politically radical, they should have confiscated all booty, acquired by a Roman army, but having failed to end up in the Roman treasury (LA 1.12-13; 2.59-60). Likewise, the *decemviri* were to collect new *vectigalia* after 63 BCE (LA 1.13; 2.62). Finally, the committee will look into the status of land acquired during the reign of Sulla, with the intention of selling all land illegally procured (LA 2.68-70; 3.6-7; 3.11).

G.M. offers a revised edition of all three of Cicero's agrarian speeches, accompanied by a translation, commentary, and succinct introductory section. This section begins with a survey of existing scholarship on the speeches (ix-x). Manuwald then offers a survey of the political situation in 64-63 BCE (x-xii); of Roman agrarian laws (xiii-xix); Rullus' agrarian bill of 64/3 BCE (xx-xxviii); procedural context, which focuses on the *contio* (xxviii-xxx); and the consulate of Cicero (xxxiii-xxxiv). G. M. then turns to the *corpus* of the agrarian speeches themselves, offering a clear analysis of their title and structure (xxxiii-xxxv); delivery and publication (xxxv-xxxviii); and political and rhetorical strategies (xxxviii-l). The introductory section concludes with a short comment on the text and the translation (l-liv). All in all, this introduction is concise, clear, up-to-date, and offers a useful start for further study.

One key issue an editor of Cicero's *Agrarian Speeches* must address is the two major lacunas. The beginning of the first LA is not in extent, because two leaves of the archetype, from which all later manuscripts derive are now lost. Likewise, the fourth speech, which might have filled a whole volume, is mutilate beyond repute (M.G. li). The *editio princeps* is that of Io. A. Bussi Aleriensis (Rome, 1471), but the speeches were thereafter repeatedly edited and printed. M.G. uses as a basis for her edition the text of V. Merek (Teubner, 1983), who uses the presumably lost, but recently found manuscript of Poggio. Of course, M.G. only uses Merek's edition as a point of departure, and offers a lucid apparatus to her own text. Her choices throughout are conservative and easy to follow. Furthermore, M.G. prints all available *testimonia* before the speeches themselves. These texts appear in the original Greek and Latin, with parallel translation and relevant commentary. Surely, this section will prove invaluable for future students. Texts hereby printed include: Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 32 (63 BCE); Cic. *Sull.* 65 (62 BCE); Cic. *Att.* 2.1.3 (60 BCE);

Cic. *Pis.* 4 (55 BCE); Cic. *Fam.* 1.9.2 (54 BCE); Cic. *Fam.* 13.4.1-2 (46 BCE); Cic. *Fam.* 8.6.5 (50 BCE); Plin. *HN* 7.116-17; Plin. *HN* 8.210; Quint. *Inst.* 2.16.7-8; Quint. *Inst.* 5.3.13; Quint. *Inst.* 8.4.12; Plut. *Cic.* 12.2-6. The lacunas are discussed and evaluated, and, together with the *testimonia*, the reader is suitably informed as to the hazards of relying solely on the speeches which have survived.

The commentary itself is useful, detailed, and broad. G.M. does not focus on one aspect of the text, and future students and scholar will find it authoritative. In order to fulfil my reviewer's task diligently, I point out one omission, which is a reference to the *lex (Roscia) Mamilia*. Cicero himself referred to a *lex Mamilia* in his *Topica* 43 and *Leg.* 1.55. According to Cicero, the this law emended a pre-existing one (in fact, an item of the *XII Tables*), which required three *arbitri* to preside over boundary disputes, into a more humble requirement of one *arbiter*. It is possible to assume that in this context Cicero identified *arbitri* with *finitores*. The single *arbiter*, who presided over boundary disputes might have shed a different light on what Cicero present as an unlawful novelty in *LA* 2.33 where the *decemviri* were to rest on the report of a single *finitor* they themselves dispatched. It might indicate that Rullus alluded to a pre-existing habit, and that his bill was less revolutionary than Cicero suggests. Such a hypothesis finds further support in three items of a *lex Mamilia* (probably, but not surely, the same law) concerning the marking of boundaries. These were recorded by Bruns, *Fontes iuris Romani antiqui* p. 95 in a collection of the *Scriptores Gromatici* and have been associated with Mamilius. It is the only known quotation of these chapters of law. Their content is different from the *lex Mamilia* Cicero mentioned in *Top.* 43 and *Leg.* 1.55. They are numbered K.L.III, K.L.IIIII, and K.L.V. All three concern the safeguarding of boundaries and landmarks (*limites* and *termini*) by individual owners, state commissioners, or local boundaries in newly founded colonies, *municipia*, *fraefectura*, *fora*, or *conciliabula*, which were established by law.¹ Needless to say, this criticism is petty. It is an admirable work, which appeals to students and researchers alike.

Ido Israelowich

Tel Aviv University
ido0572@tauex.tau.ac.il

Cédric Brélaz (ed.), *L'Héritage grec des colonies romaines d'Orient. Interactions culturelles dans les provinces hellénophones de l'empire romain*. Collections de l'Université de Strasbourg. Études d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne. Éditions de Boccard: Paris, 2017. 467 pp. ISBN 978-2701804972.

The formal settlement of groups of Roman citizens as new communities in conquered territories was a long-lived and fundamental aspect of Roman imperialism, one which helped consolidate the empire and also mitigated some socio-economic pressures by the resettlement of poor citizens. In Italy, and then in the western provinces, these colonies offered strategic security, and promoted Roman rule and the ruling dynasty. They also acted, if unintentionally, as engines of cultural change, spreading Roman law, customs, cults and institutions, as well as Latin.

¹ On this *lex Mamilia* see Hardy, E.G. (1925), 'The *lex Mamila Roscia Peducaea Alliena Fabia*', *CQ* 19: 185-91; Cary, M. (1929), 'Notes on the legislation of Julius Caesar', *JRS* 19: 113-19; Crawford, M.H. (1989), 'The *lex Julia Agraria*', *Athenaeum* 77: 179-90; Bispham, E. (2007), *From Asculum to Actium* (Oxford).