

Chapter 1 : M. Tullius Cicero, the Fragmentary Speeches - Jane W. Crawford - Oxford University Press

Hence flows this elaborate presentation of Cicero's fragmentary speeches, which complements the author's previous book in the same vein, M. Tullius Cicero: The Lost and Unpublished Orations (Hypomnemata 80, Göttingen).

Gratidia gens and Maria gens. He was killed circa BC, while serving as a prefect under Antonius in Cilicia. A Lucius Aelius Lamia spoke on behalf of Gratidianus, but the grounds for the suit are unknown. This Marius defeated Publius Servilius Vatia and took control of his army. He took on the prosecution of Quintus Lutatius Catulus, a move that was later to prove fateful. Catulus had been the colleague of Marius during his consulship in BC, and had shared his triumph over the Cimbri, but had later broken with him. Rather than face the inevitable guilty verdict, Catulus committed suicide. A number of praetors and tribunes drafted a currency reform measure to reassert the former official exchange rate of silver the denarius and the bronze as, which had been allowed to fluctuate and destabilize. Gratidianus seized the opportunity to attach his name to the edict and claim credit for publishing it first. The currency measure pleased the equites, or business class, more than did the debt reform legislation of Lucius Valerius Flaccus, which had permitted the repayment of loans at one-quarter of the amount owed, [13] and it was enormously popular with the plebs. This drawing of a fragmentary bas-relief depicting the Compitalia shows the kind of images honored at street shrines compita. An alternative view of the reform, based mainly on a "hopelessly confused" [14] statement by Pliny, is that Gratidianus introduced a method for detecting counterfeit money. The two reforms are not incompatible, [15] but historian and numismatist Michael Crawford finds no widespread evidence of silver-plated or counterfeit denarii in surviving coin hoards from the period leading up to the edict. Each neighborhood vicus had a compitum within which its guardian spirits, or Lares, were thought to reside. During the Compitalia, a new year festival, the cult images were displayed in procession. Festus and Macrobius thought that the "dolls" were ritual replacements for human sacrifices to the spirits of the dead. The sources express no surprise or disapproval toward tending cult for a living man, which may have been a tradition otherwise little evidenced; the theological basis of the homage paid to Gratidianus is unclear. Street theater, including farces that satirized current political events, was a feature. Because it encouraged the people to assemble and possibly foment insurrection, there were sporadic efforts among the elite to regulate or suppress the Compitalia. Although his ambitions were known and his qualifications far exceeded those of his cousin, Gratidianus probably never made a formal announcement of his candidacy for the consulship, and is assumed to have stepped aside for the sake of the unity of the populares. Broughton gives 86 and 84, but the timing of the currency reform makes 85 a more secure date, with the second term in 84, 83, or Second March on Rome. During the closing violence of the civil war, Gratidianus was tortured and killed. Cicero and Sallust offer the earliest accounts, but the works in which these survive are fragmentary. He had been a young man in his twenties at the time of the killing, and possibly an eyewitness. Gratidianus "had his life drained out of him piece by piece, in effect: Marshall argued that the versions of Cicero and Sallust constituted two different traditions, and that only Cicero implicated Catiline, [31] other scholars have found no details in the two Late Republican accounts that are mutually exclusive or that exculpate Catiline. Human sacrifices at Rome were rare, but documented in historical times "their savagery was closely connected with religion" [39] and had been banned by law only fifteen years before the death of Gratidianus. Marius with vine-staffs [43] through the whole city, drove him to the tomb, and there mutilated him with every torture. While he was alive and in an upright position, [44] Catiline took a sword in his own right hand and severed his neck, holding on to the hair at the top of his head with his left hand. He carried the head by hand while streams of blood flowed between his fingers. Who was the henchman on command? Who else but Catilina, even then training his hands at every misdeed? In front of the tomb of Quintus Catulus, he took hold of Marius "a man who had set a bad precedent, but a champion of the people nonetheless, loved not so much undeservedly as too well" and with great seriousness of purpose toward the ashes of a most gentle man, shed his blood drop by measured drop. Marius was worthy of the things that he suffered, Sulla was worthy of what he had ordered, and Catilina was worthy of what he did, but the republic did not deserve to take the sword-blades from both enemies and

avengers into her very core. The killing is presented unambiguously as a human sacrifice: We watched when Marius was strung up as a victim for the dreadful underworld rites, though the shades themselves may not have wanted it, a pious deed that should not be spoken of for a tomb that could not be filled. Livy and Plutarch both considered it alien to Roman tradition. This aversion is asserted also in an aetiological myth about sacrifice in which Numa, second king of Rome, negotiates with Jupiter to replace the requested human victims with vegetables. In the first century BC, human sacrifice survived perhaps only as travesty or accusation. Julius Caesar was accused "rather vaguely" of sacrificing two mutinous soldiers in the Campus Martius. Perceptions of the clemency of Augustus on this occasion vary wildly. Various forms of flogging or striking were ritual acts in Roman religion, such as the *sacer Mamurio* in which an old man was driven through the city while beaten with sticks in what has been interpreted as a *pharmakos* or scapegoat ritual; [60] beatings, such as the semi-ritualized *fustuarium*, were also a disciplinary and punitive measure in the military. Finally, his severed head, described as still oozing with life, was carried to the Temple of Apollo in the Campus Martius, a site associated with the ritual of the October Horse, whose head was displayed and whose tail was also carried through the city and delivered freshly bloodied to the Regia.

Chapter 2 : M. Tullius Cicero, the fragmentary speeches : an edition with commentary - JH Libraries

If your organization uses OpenAthens, you can log in using your OpenAthens username and password. To check if your institution is supported, please see this list. Contact your library for more details.

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: An edition with commentary. American Classical Studies 33 Here we have a manifestation of the paradox that scholarship thrives on ignorance. Scanty evidence begets profuse speculation and reconstruction, and often the less we know about something, the more we write about it. With great industry Crawford presents us pages of intense erudition devoted to the explication of about fragments most rather short from sixteen otherwise lost but identifiable Ciceronian orations; this second edition adds a brief appendix of another thirty-one fragmenta incertae sedis. They have been unduly neglected, and deserve to be more widely appreciated. If nothing else they remind us of how much we have lost from antiquity, even of an author such as Cicero from whom so much else has survived. This rich inheritance is nevertheless only a fraction of the original legacy, and we must remember that there are many pieces missing from the puzzle, the loss of which distorts the overall picture. This new edition represents a dedicated effort to fill in some of the neglected pieces not just from along the edges, but also from the vital center, to reconstruct their original context, and thereby to sharpen the focus of the whole. The fact that most of the speeches under view in this study date to the 60s B. The fragments here range in length from single isolated words to several lines; most average one or two lines, though there are about a dozen longer fragments between five and nine lines each. Not included in this edition are orations such as Pro Scauro and Pro Tullio which, though incomplete, are considered essentially extant. Some of the fragments come from minor orations about which we know very little five speeches are represented by a single fragment, while others survive in large clusters from important speeches which were well known in antiquity and whose loss to modern readers must be regretted. But the most extensively preserved are the twin defense speeches Pro C. Over all, Asconius, Quintilian, and the Bobbio scholiast provide the most numerous and significant fragments, augmented by their encasing commentary which provides valuable context and discussion. Less important are the stray words and phrases picked out by some three dozen others, mostly grammarians with narrow linguistic purposes, working as late as the sixth century a. For each of the sixteen orations, arranged here in chronological order, she first gives a preliminary introduction rehearsing what we know of the historical facts about the case and summarizing the scholarship on the issues which surround it. Next come the ancient testimonia for each speech, both Latin and Greek, and then the fragments themselves along with textual apparatus arranged in their probable correct order. She does not offer translations. Finally, each fragment receives a comprehensive commentary addressing matters of date, prosopography, history, politics and law, rhetoric, style, and diction including textual questions. Where the fragments are extensive enough, there is also a good attempt to reconstruct the overall structure and argument of the speech. At the back there is a good

Chapter 3 : Marcus Tullius Cicero - HISTORY

American Journal of Philology () Here we have a manifestation of the paradox that scholarship thrives on ignorance. Scanty evidence begets profuse speculation and reconstruction.

January 23rd, Abstract What applies here applies, I think, a fortiori to the texts discussed in earlier chapters, most of which go back to a time before misgivings about the medium had begun to be voiced at all. Writing is not seen as changing the character of the message in any way. It is merely a useful supplement to the dominant, oral medium through which political, social, and private intercourse was carried on down to the late fifth century. The latter fulfilled its purpose by producing messages accessible and acceptable to all or most of those who would have the opportunity to hear them when first delivered. Any communication which had to satisfy additional or other criteria was increasingly likely to end up in written form—whether its framers were lawgivers, philosophers, seers, scientists, tyrants, or conspirators. To say this much and no more is simply to restate what is already known. But I do not think that the present work adds to what we already know in any significant way. An edition with commentary. *American Classical Studies* 33 Here we have a manifestation of the paradox that scholarship thrives on ignorance. Scanty evidence begets profuse speculation and reconstruction, and often the less we know about something, the more we write about it. With great industry Crawford presents us pages of intense erudition devoted to the explanation of about fragments most rather short from sixteen otherwise lost but identifiable Ciceronian orations; this second edition adds a brief appendix of another thirty-one fragmenta incertae sedis. They have been unduly neglected, and deserve to be more widely appreciated. If nothing else they remind us of how much we have lost from antiquity, even of an author such as Cicero from whom so much else has survived. This rich inheritance is nevertheless only a fraction of the original legacy, and we must remember that there are many pieces missing from the puzzle, the loss of which distorts the overall picture. This new edition represents a dedicated effort to fill in some of the neglected pieces not just from along the edges, but also from the vital center, to reconstruct their original context, and thereby to sharpen the focus of the whole. The fact that most of the speeches under view in this study date to the 60s B. The fragments here range in length from single isolated words to several lines; most average one or two lines, though there are about a dozen longer fragments between five and nine lines each. Not included in this edition are orations such as *Pro Scauro* and *Pro Tullio* which, though incomplete, are considered essentially extant. Some of the fragments come from minor orations about which we know very little five speeches are represented by a single fragment, while others survive in large clusters from important speeches which were well known in antiquity and whose loss to modern readers must be regretted. But the most extensively preserved are the twin defense speeches *Pro C.* Over all, Asconius, Quintilian, and the Bobbio scholiast provide the most numerous and significant fragments, augmented by their encasing commentary which provides valuable context and discussion. Less important are the stray words and phrases picked out by some three dozen others, mostly grammarians with narrow linguistic purposes, working as late as the sixth century A. For each of the sixteen orations, arranged here in chronological order, she first gives a preliminary introduction rehearsing what we know of the historical facts about the case and summarizing the scholarship on the issues which surround it. Next come the ancient testimonia for each speech, both Latin and Greek, and then the fragments themselves along with textual apparatus arranged in their probable correct order. She does not offer translations. Finally, each fragment receives a comprehensive commentary addressing matters of date, prosopography, history, politics and law, rhetoric, style, and diction including textual questions. Where the fragments are extensive enough, there is also a good attempt to reconstruct the overall structure and argument of the speech. At the back there is a good bibliography and a full set of indices. Crawford has thus given us everything we could want to aid our exploration of these fragmentary orations, conveniently drawing together into one place a great mass of information. Her main achievement in the commentary is mostly that of a good referee, bravely wading into troubled waters, weighing disputed issues judiciously, summarizing and giving copious citations to the enormous relevant bibliography. Her systematic presentation is admirably comprehensive and balanced. In the end, these scattered Ciceronian scraps are

reassembled back into a meaningful, though necessarily still incomplete, context. Surely the audience for a monograph such as this will consist of specialists. Yet here, mixed in with detailed and controverted arcana, come discursive expositions of basic knowledge familiar to any novice. Is it really necessary, for example, to rehearse so fully the circumstances of the consular elections of 64 and 63 B. Or to rehash all the details of the Bona Dea scandal before presenting the fragments *In Clodium et Curionem*? Or to digress into the question of the exact length of the *trinundinum* g, or to explain the traditional parts of a typical speech? Such redundant discussions of familiar issues threaten to overwhelm and obscure rather than reinforce the valuable particular contributions which this study makes. Likewise the summaries of past scholarship, sometimes on incidental or peripheral matters, tend to be overexhaustive and to distract attention. For example, since about a quarter of all the fragments come from Asconius, it is natural that there should be due reference to B. And this leads to one final question which Crawford largely ignores here: It is taken for granted that the ancient writers who quote them had a full text before their eyes, but this may not have always been the case, especially for the later citations which may instead have been drawn from rhetorical anthologies and other secondhand sources. A fuller discussion of the *Nachleben* of the oration *In Clodium et Curionem*, for example, would have been of particular interest since we have many of its fragments most from the Bobbio scholia, even though Cicero did not publish it himself and actually tried to suppress it when it leaked into circulation against his will. Apart from her tendency to overannotate, Crawford has produced a very welcome and useful commentary on these fragments which have, understandably, been long overshadowed by the large body of speeches that survive intact. Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility. University of North Carolina Press, A new book on an imperfectly understood and neglected author is always welcome, and without a doubt this one makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of Valerius within the cultural and social conditions in which he lived. Bloomer has organized his book into six chapters with titled subdivisions, a bibliography, and an index. The first two introductory chapters are the most successful in reconciling methodologies. In chapter 1 Bloomer sketches what we know of the life of Valerius, describes his work, and characterizes the milieu in and for which *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* was composed. Bloomer discusses the scanty autobiographical information Valerius supplies at 2.

Chapter 4 : Writings of Cicero - Wikipedia

M. Tullius Cicero, The Fragmentary Speeches Author(s): Robert W Cape, Jr. *M. Tullius Cicero, The Fragmentary Speeches* by Jane W. Crawford Source: *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (Summer), pp. Published by: University of California Press on behalf of the International Society for the History of.

Bryn Mawr Classical Review An Edition with Commentary. American Classical Studies Reviewed by James E. For most classicists, even for most Latinists, the 58 speeches of Cicero which are completely or largely extant are quite enough; relatively few -- dare I say it? It is, however, both daunting and salutary to remember that the surviving speeches are not all that Cicero made public, and less than half of the total number that he is known to have delivered -- and there are doubtless a great many occasions when Cicero opened his mouth in public of which we have no knowledge whatsoever: In her previous book *M. In her new book*, Crawford has progressed from speeches which are completely lost to those which are attested only in fragments, some eighteen or nineteen, if there was a second speech *Pro Oppio* orations, ranging in preservation from a single word *Pro Oppio II* to more than 60 fragments, some quite substantial *Pro Cornelio I*. The better attested ones are those on which ancient commentaries *Asconius* and the *Bobbio Scholia* survive; in those cases, it is generally possible not only to read the individual scraps that are preserved, but to reconstruct the rhetorical context and argument in which they played a part. But a great many of these fragments are found only in the rhetoricians and grammarians, who quote them as illustrations of types of argument, syntactical peculiarities, or odd words. Many of these speeches survived until late antiquity, and were studied in schools; several of them notably *Pro Cornelio* were widely known and admired. These remains are important for a number of reasons: As Crawford makes clear in her introduction -- and as anyone who has needed to consult them knows -- these fragments have not been well served, perhaps because there is so much of Cicero that is more readily accessible. Neither one of these is very good, and neither has a commentary. Indeed, the last commentaries on these fragments were written by *Sigonius* and *Patricius* in the sixteenth century. For each speech, an introduction on the historical circumstances and chronology is followed by a collection of testimonia, the fragments, and a commentary on each fragment. She deals scrupulously, often minutely, with issues of date, politics, law, and prosopography; she analyses, where possible, the structure of the speeches, and tries to reconstruct the arguments used. To the extent that I am able as a non-historian to judge her work, it seems both accurate and up to date. All this is very good, and will be a valuable resource for historians of the Ciceronian age. In other areas, however, this edition is disappointing. As Crawford says [4], she has tended to follow the available editions of the texts from which the fragments are drawn, but this leads to an irritating level of inconsistency in minor matters such as orthography and abbreviation. She takes *Puccioni* to task [] for adopting the spelling *adcurate* from *Nonius* rather than *accurate* from the lost *Turin manuscript In Clod. F23* , but she is herself perfectly happy to copy the *Bobbio scholia* in the unassimilated *adventi De rege Alex*. There is no consistency in writing *p*. Presentation is also an issue in other respects. One needs constantly to turn to the concordances, and even then the argument is very hard to follow. Another problem is in the numbering of fragments: Crawford is so cautious about actually editing a text that she quotes separately any citation that differs, however, slightly, from another citation of the same fragment. Thus we find *Corn*. And for some reason, two overlapping quotations in *Asconius* of *In toga candida* are both given the number *F* Despite her strictures about precision in distinguishing between verbatim fragments and testimonia, Crawford makes no effort to distinguish typographically or otherwise between fragments cited from a specific speech and those simply cited from Cicero; her testimonia blur the distinction between references to the events underlying a trial and those that describe the trial itself. And the presentation of the testimonia is in some cases very unhelpful. Nor are there cross-references: *T1* is part of *Corn*. *T2* and *T3* are the same texts as *Corn*. *T1* are all *Commentariolum Petitionis 19*, of which a fuller version is unaccountably quoted only in the last citation. Problems of presentation are, however, merely annoyances; there are more serious failings in terms of substance. In the first place, Crawford simply omits all fragments about 30 that can not be assigned to a specific oration. That may be the result of her concentration on the reconstruction and historical circumstances

of speeches rather than of fragments, but it is inexcusable: The texts that she does give, moreover, are marred by so many mistakes as to be significantly unreliable. The book is filled with typographical errors, and I list here only those that I have found in the text of the fragments themselves the correction is in parentheses: I F12 *das mihi das enim mihi* and in the apparatus, *da mihi da enim* ; F27 *cum consul cum cum consul esset cum* ; F44 *Philerotum Philerotem* ; F48 *restituerunt restituerent* ; Corn. F9 *inflammere inflammare* ; In Clod. This does not include the numerous mistakes in the surrounding material from the quoting source, in the apparatus, and in the testimonia, some of which are quite serious. That Crawford has taken her texts and abbreviated apparatus from other editions is quite understandable, and common practice in such editions; but her apparatus is filled with trivial and unimportant variants and sometimes omits those that do matter: Her adaptations of apparatus Latin lead her to write nonsense e. T20 -- where, indeed, there are significant differences in the apparatus to the same text -- or De reg. Her text and discussion of some fragments are seriously incomplete or misleading: I F, she never says in what order they appear in the text of Asconius; at Corn. I F39 she does not make it clear that the word *repugnat* or some form of the verb must be a part of the fragment; at Corn. I F46 she omits the sentence in Quintilian which follows the quotation and which reveals that what followed in the speech was praise of Pompey. F there are multiple problems. In the first place, the two fragments are overlapping versions of the same text which ought to be printed, as noted above, as a single fragment ; then, it is only at the end of the commentary that Crawford points out that there is another quotation of the opening of F8 in Valerius Maximus her T4 -- with a variant that is not given in the apparatus to F8; finally, the only entry in the apparatus to F8 is to the phrase "*frons non percussa*": One might add that the commentary here ought to include a reference to the parallel passage in the description of the trial of Rutilius Rufus at De oratore 1. It would be beyond the scope of this review to list all the errors, inconsistencies, and gaps which mar this edition; individually they are minor, but cumulatively they seriously diminish its value. Suffice it to say that for each example that I have given above, I could probably add a dozen more. And that would not include places where her commentary is simply wrong: F6 it is not Jugurtha, but Rome that had a just cause for war; on Reg. F10, Crawford says that *trucidare* appears in Cicero only once outside the speeches: When she says that the ending of Corn. I, with its history of the tribunate and popular legislation, must have been "too dry and remote to have been very effective" [97], one wonders whether she recognizes how striking and important this passage is. T1 "*pro Avito*" should be "*pro Habito*" i. I F1 should not include the phrase "*in qua initio dicendi*"; the first word of the fragment of Manil. F24 should be *Sed credo*. On such matters, readers will have to judge for themselves. Editing fragments is both easier and more difficult than editing continuous literary texts: These do not require the genius of a Bentley, but they do require patience and application. If Crawford had spent another few weeks checking her sources and proofreading, this would be a far better book. As it is, the valuable commentary rests on a text that is inadequate, inaccurate, and misleading. We still need an edition of the fragmentary speeches of Cicero.

Stanford Libraries' official online search tool for books, media, journals, databases, government documents and more.

Robert W Cape , Jr. *A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, Vol. JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. *A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*. Given the number of typographical errors and minor factual errors, it looks as if this book were written and edited in a great hurry. Fifty-eight orations are transmitted by manuscripts more or less complete and only sixteen or so exist as fragments, usually as single words or lines quoted by grammarians and rhetoricians, but a few as lines quoted in the systematic commentary of Asconius and the Bobbio Scholiast. We have information about approximately ninety other speeches which Cicero delivered, but most of those he chose not to publish and the rest have been completely lost. This content downloaded from There have been several editions of the fragments themselves, including two in this century, but the last edition with a commentary appeared in the sixteenth century. Jane Crawford has now given us a much needed new edition and commentary of the fragmentary speeches that forms a useful companion to her earlier work, *M. The Lost and Unpublished Speeches* Gottingen. For each of the sixteen speeches in this book Crawford provides a detailed historical introduction, gives the ancient testimonia and surviving fragments, and comments extensively on each fragment. This second edition appeared less than a year after the first, correcting errata and adding the *fragmenta incertae sedis* and an appendix on the fragments which have been falsely identified. A few minor errors still remain and there is, unfortunately, no commentary on the *fragmenta incertae sedis*, but the latter was not in the original plan. She does include a valuable commentary on the "fragment" of *Pro Vatinius*, tacitly correcting her own previous omission of the oration as a lost speech, and makes a convincing argument for not considering it a true fragment. It requires the skills of a textual critic, historian, and rhetorician. The great strength of her work lies in the historical perspective she brings to the speeches. The introductions and commentary provide a wealth of useful background material against which one must view each speech. Crawford generally follows the views of other scholars on historical events and is generous about citing opposing views. Readers will be grateful for her balanced discussions since controversy surrounds most of the events she covers. Footnotes and the bibliography provide further information for those who wish to know more about the details. In terms of historical commentary alone she has made a useful contribution. In most cases she provides the apparatus criticus for the fragment as it appears in a modern edition and is conscientious about noting disagreements among editors. Testimonia are also clearly selected and usefully presented. The rhetorical commentary is the most challenging part of the project, given the imprecise information we have about the settings of speeches and that only a few words and phrases survive. The critic tries to determine the argument, its structure, and how the whole and its parts relate to other Ciceronian speeches. There has been more scholarly work done on the more extensive fragments quoted by Asconius and the Bobbio Scholiast, and Crawford has correspondingly more to say about them. In this area we must admit that there is much we do not know and cannot reconstruct. At issue is a question of balance: Crawford takes the traditional approach of judging the structure of an oration by the rules of the rhetorical handbooks, especially *De inventione*. While these schemata can be useful as a way to think about the general outline of a speech, they are insufficient as the basis for reconstructing an argument. Another is the sheer difficulty of reconstructing an oration of, say, sentences, based on a handful of phrases or words! Granted, some comments from the grammarians and rhetoricians provide a modicum of help, but This content downloaded from The process would be similar to constructing detailed outlines of arguments for works cited by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca in *The New Rhetoric* Notre Dame, based on their references and quotations but without the footnotes. When Asconius or the Bobbio Scholiast quote a speech there is a fairly good chance that we can understand the structure. There is a much smaller chance when the fragments are random quotations from other writers. The case of *Pro C. Comelio I* and 11 is instructive. Half of the 62 fragments of *Pro Comelio I* are given by Asconius and provide the basic outline of the speech. All are quoted

in order as Asconius works his way systematicaly through the oration, and the only room for disagreement comes in the placement of the non-Asconian material. Thus, the detailed structures worked out for the speech on pp. The situation is different with Pro Cornelio U, where 13 of the 18 fragments are random citations and Asconius states explicitly that he quotes one F5 out of order. As a result, the five-part structure and not a traditional one! Scholars working on In toga Candida are surely right that Asconius quotes some fragments out of order: But where to place them? It would take more than argument to rearrange other fragments from Asconius. In fact, the presentation by Asconius argues strongly for its position between F9 and F11. Cicero is rarely so linear in his argument, whereas Asconius is more so in his commentary and This content downloaded from Sometimes it would be better to accept the fact that we do not know the order of the fragments. In the case of Contra contionem Q. Metelli Crawford says as much p. This seems highly doubtful and the reordering contributes little. Previous generations of commentators, anxious to get a firm hold on what material does survive, fixated on rules and systems and rearranged the texts to match. More often than not their comments focused on minutiae and ignored larger issues of the persuasive process and Ciceronian practice. Two examples will have to suffice. First, the argument about fair-weather friends and inimicissima civitas at the beginning of Pro Vareno F1 corresponds to the first section of a speech Cicero delivered at around the same time. Roscio amerino there are other parallels as well, some concerning the nature of the case, others in argumentation, as when Cicero argues in similarly joking manner against the same prosecutor, Erucius [F10]. As a result, the standard judgments on Pro Roscio by historians and rhetoricians should be revisited with these fragments in mind. The second example is De Aere alieno This content downloaded from Jane Crawford has provided a rich and valuable book that will be the necessary starting point for future work on the fragments. Historians and students of classical rhetoric are in her debt. Oxford University Press, pp. Rhetorical criticism appears to have become fashionable in biblical studies lately, and some people seem to regard it as a kind of magic providing answers to all questions and solutions to all problems of interpretation. Critics of modern literature discovered some decades ago that rhetoric had something to offer for the interpretation of texts, while classicists never lost sight of the ancient handbooks of rhetoric and their precepts. It is most fortunate, therefore, that a scholar with both a classical and a theological training should have chosen to write a book on Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul, addressing himself to two questions: This section is not very satisfactory, because This content downloaded from

Chapter 6 : Speeches | Open Library

Of all published articles, the following were the most read within the past 12 months.

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: An edition with commentary. American Classical Studies 33 Here we have a manifestation of the paradox that scholarship thrives on ignorance. Scanty evidence begets profuse speculation and reconstruction, and often the less we know about something, the more we write about it. With great industry Crawford presents us pages of intense erudition devoted to the explication of about fragments most rather short from sixteen otherwise lost but identifiable Ciceronian orations; this second edition adds a brief appendix of another thirty-one fragmenta incertae sedis. They have been unduly neglected, and deserve to be more widely appreciated. If nothing else they remind us of how much we have lost from antiquity, even of an author such as Cicero from whom so much else has survived. This rich inheritance is nevertheless only a fraction of the original legacy, and we must remember that there are many pieces missing from the puzzle, the loss of which distorts the overall picture. This new edition represents a dedicated effort to fill in some of the neglected pieces not just from along the edges, but also from the vital center, to reconstruct their original context, and thereby to sharpen the focus of the whole. The fact that most of the speeches under view in this study date to the 60s B. The fragments here range in length from single isolated words to several lines; most average one or two lines, though there are about a dozen longer fragments between five and nine lines each. Not included in this edition are orations such as Pro Scauro and Pro Tullio which, though incomplete, are considered essentially extant. Some of the fragments come from minor orations about which we know very little five speeches are represented by a single fragment, while others survive in large clusters from important speeches which were well known in antiquity and whose loss to modern readers must be regretted. But the most extensively preserved are the twin defense speeches Pro C. Over all, Asconius, Quintilian, and the Bobbio scholiast provide the most numerous and significant fragments, augmented by their encasing commentary which provides valuable context and discussion. Less important are the stray words and phrases picked out by some three dozen others, mostly grammarians with narrow linguistic purposes, working as late as the sixth century a. For each of the sixteen orations, arranged here in chronological order, she first gives a preliminary introduction rehearsing what we know of the historical facts about the case and summarizing the scholarship on the issues which surround it. Next come the ancient testimonia for each speech, both Latin and Greek, and then the fragments themselves along with textual apparatus arranged in their probable correct order. She does not offer translations. Finally, each fragment receives a comprehensive commentary addressing matters of date, prosopography, history, politics and law, rhetoric, style, and diction including textual questions. Where the fragments are extensive enough, there is also a good attempt to reconstruct the overall structure and argument of the speech. At the back there is a good You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

Chapter 7 : Bryn Mawr Classical Review

This volume contains testimonia and fragments of Cicero's speeches that circulated in antiquity but which have since been lost. This edition includes the fragmenta incertae sedis and an appendix on.

Chapter 8 : Fragmentary Speeches

To send this article to your Kindle, first ensure no-reply@www.nxgvision.com is added to your Approved Personal Document E-mail List under your Personal Document Settings on the Manage Your Content and Devices page of your Amazon account.

Chapter 9 : The Fragmentary Speeches, 2nd ed.

The writings of Marcus Tullius Cicero constitute one of the most famous bodies of historical and philosophical work in all of classical antiquity. Cicero, a Roman statesman, lawyer, political theorist, philosopher, and Roman constitutionalist, lived from to 43 BC.