this sort would have to take a study of the traditions concerned with
the major works not included in her book in its stride, and con-
ceivably would be of less interest to conservatory teachers.

The pieces of the present collection are a mixed bag; Euclid's (?)
pleasingly rigorous mathematico-scientific little treatise, to be dated
c. 300 CE, contrasts rather strongly with Nicomachus of Gerasa’s
Neopythagorean philosophical essay which attempts to be satisfac-
tory from a literary point of view as well, though both stand out
among the often arid tracts which form the rest. The so-called
manuals are written in a variety of styles. Nicomachus’ piece has
a formal introduction in which the author talks about himself to
another person, and it takes on the airs of a didactic letter rather
than of a manual, whereas Bacchius’ Isagoge is a stilted erotapocritic
dialogue, to be compared with e.g. Cicero’s De partitione oratoria, an
introduction to rhetoric, and Porphyry’s surviving commentary on
the Aristotelian Categories, an elementary introduction to the study
of this treatise. Alypius’ Isagoge\(^3\) is important because it is about
musical notation, which it sets out for the fifteen so-called \(\gamma\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) or \(\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\), starting with the Lydian scale. Z. in her introduction and
comments provides references to the more recent literature and to
the attempts to translate Alypius’ symbols into those of our own
system.

1) Translations in A. Barker’s invaluable Greek Musical Writings: II, Harmonic
and Acoustic Theory (Cambridge etc. 1989). Barker also translates the Euclidean (?)
Sectio canonis and Nicomachus’ Encheiridion, but omits the other tracts included in
Janus and Zanelli, though referring to them in his notes and introductory pages.
2) Not in von Jan. There is no reference in Z.’s bibliography to the
Teubneriana, D. Najock (ed.), Anonyma de musica scripta Bellermanniana (Leipzig
1975).
3) Not in Barker.

CHR. HABICHT, Cicero the Politician. Baltimore/London,
$ 26,50.

Christian Habich has published a short book on Cicero’s career
as a politician. After a rather traditional and conventional introd-
tion into Late Republican Roman politics and Cicero’s predilection
for politics and politically biased litigation in the urbs (p. 1-15), the

Mnemosyne, Vol. XLVI, Fasc. 3 (1993)
The author gives some chapters on Cicero's early career, from the beginning of his career to the end of his consulate (p. 16-34), his ill-fated opposition against Clodius and the triumvirs, 63-56 B.C. (p. 35-52), his come-back as an assistant leader of Pompey, Caesar and some other potentes, 56-47 B.C. (p. 53-67), and his last years, 47-53 B.C., at the end of which he rose to unexpected greatness again (p. 68-86). An Epilogue (p. 87-100), a useful chronological table (p. 101-107), footnotes (p. 109-134), a select bibliography (p. 135-142), and an index were added.

The author has chosen to stay as closely as possible to the text of Cicero's letters, less frequently using the other available sources, and thereby taking the risk of being guided by Cicero's own selection of worthwhile events and Cicero's perception of his own career and the historical processes of his times. He gives a rather narrow political biography, lacking in reference to structural military, economic, and social developments, and without an analysis of changes in political culture and mentalities. The Introduction does not offer sufficient compensation in this respect. Nowhere Habicht enters explicitly and thoroughly into the shift of political momentum from curia, contio and comitia toward castra and collective behaviour in the streets and theatres of Rome which narrowed the effectiveness and possibilities of the rhetorically gifted conservative senatorial politician that Cicero was after 63 B.C. He presents Late Republican Roman history as the history of governing personalities who embodied existing groups and interests in a system of patronage and friendship, clientela, amicitia and necessitudo, a simplifying concept which was originally created by Münzer, but which needs revision now, as Brunt, among others, convincingly argues.

This personalistic view of Late Republican Roman history keeps cropping up in this book. On p. 7 we read: "His (i.e. Cicero's) greatest misfortune was that he had to face two uniquely gifted opponents (i.e. Caesar and Octavian)." On p. 63 a dignitatis contentio is the prime cause of Pompey's clash with Caesar in 50-49 B.C., an interpretation which underestimates the interests and initiatives of the participants in the coming struggle, who sided with the two chiefs. On p. 76 we read: "Cicero had become the symbol of the Republic, just as Caesar had become the token of monarchy and despotism" (cf. p. 99, where Cicero, in a Platonistic terminology, is characterized as the idea of the republic, and p. 87-90). That anyone was the outstanding symbol of the republic, however, is a concept of later sources, for example Plutarch's Cato Minor and