Sections II ('La guerre mithridatique'). III ('L'image des vainqueurs') and IV ('L'interpretation historique') look at various aspects of Appian's methodology and views. G. has interesting analysis of the speeches (pp. 20–6), and is surely right that their absence in the second half of the work is not due to Appian's sources, but to his care in editing the chapters where Sulla dominates. The sources receive careful consideration in Section VI (pp. 91–125). For all the effort that has gone into analysing Appian's sources over a century and a half, I remain sceptical of the results, but I must say G. gives by far the most balanced and sensible account of the subject I have read. The best we can do is to identify probabilities, such as Sulla's *Memoirs*, Rutilius Rufus' *Histories*, Sallust, and Strabo. None of these survive sufficiently for us to be able to observe closely Appian's working methods—we are not going to be able to say very much at all about what he did with these sources—but in the end it is important to be able to state that Appian used many different sources, some of high quality: as G. concludes, 'le *livre Mithridatique* repose sur une information large et sûre'.

Trinity College Dublin BRIAN McGING

PLUTARCH'S MORALIA

J. Boulogne: *Plutarque:* Oeuvres morales *IV* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. xiv + 466. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002. Cased, €65. ISBN: 2-251-00499-8.

In this volume Jacques Boulogne edits three genuine works of Plutarch, by their Latin titles the *Mul(ierum) virt(utes)*, the *Quaest(iones) Rom(anae)* and *Gr(aecae)*, and one spurious, the *Par(allela) min(ora)*. This is the latest addition to the Budé edition of the *Moralia*, of which the first fascicle appeared in 1972. The series is now nearing its end, and after the recent disastrous fire in the publishers' warehouse, one can only wish it all success.

As usual with the Collection Budé, this volume will provide a handy guide to these works, though in many respects it falls short of the series' high standards. The introductions and notes are very full, following the tendency of the series in recent years to turn what had been texts with translations and a few notes, rather like the Loeb Classical Library, into full commentaries. Possibly for this reason, there now seem to be few limits on the space that introductions and notes may occupy, and this can lead to considerable *longueurs*. At this date, for example, it was surely no longer necessary to spend ten pages (pp. 29–38) arguing that Plutarch in the *Mul. virt.* and Polyaenus in the *Strategemata* did not draw on a common source, but that Polyaenus used Plutarch.

The *Par. min.* present problems all their own. They invoke dozens of historians not elsewhere attested; textually, several of their constituent stories, together with the name of the alleged author, appear elsewhere in a slightly different version, notably in John Stobaeus; above all, the author produces 'facts' curiously similar to the answers that modern students, whether from despair or defiance, sometimes give on examination papers. One example may be cited from early in the work (no. 2, 305 D–E): 'Xerxes accompanied by five million men anchored off Artemision and declared war on the inhabitants. The Athenians in consternation sent Agesilaos, a brother of Themistocles, as a scout, although his father Neocles had had a dream in which he appeared to have

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.321 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lost both his hands. When (Agesilaos) had arrived among the enemy in Persian dress, he killed Mardonios, one of the bodyguards, supposing that he was Xerxes'. Felix Jacoby discussed all these problems in a long and classic paper, *Mnemosyne* ser. 3, 8 (1940), 73–144, arguing that the otherwise unattested historians were the author's own invention, and proposing a stemma which accounted for the versions preserved both in the *Parallela* and elsewhere.

By contrast, B. has no conception of the problems. He dismisses Jacoby's arguments in a sentence or two; he does not cite the parallel passages in Stobaeus and others; and he offers the strange notion that the work represents 'a pile of notes written hastily and combined pell-mell', possibly by a secretary working for Plutarch while he prepared the *Parallel Lives*, and intended for 'internal use' (pp. 232, 241); yet in course of the same discussion he proposes that the work was intended for publication, but had not yet received the final touches (p. 238). Conclusion: 'Les anciens sont moins plagiaires qu'on ne le pense' (p. 241).

After this it is hardly a surprise that B.'s presentation of the *Parallela* is deficient in several ways. Suspect authors are solemnly annotated: for example, we are informed (p. 243 n. 12) that 'Aristides of Miletus' was an author of the late second or early first century B.C., and are given a series of references to modern works. The date comes from the old identification of this 'Aristides' with the author of the *Milesian Tales*, but there is no sign that the genuine Aristides was from Miletus, or that he wrote any of the works attributed to him by our author. Similarly, on 'Agesilaos' the brother of Themistocles, B. merely refers to Plutarch's *Life*, Chapter 1 (p. 243 n. 16), where of course 'Agesilaos' does not appear. It would have been more instructive to refer to J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford, 1971), p. 214, 'a fabrication on the authority of a non-existent historian'.

This excessive tenderness for the *Parallela* reflects a more general weakness of the whole volume, that the author tends to confine his annotation to literature, and gives short shrift to areas such as history or geography. Thus, discussing *Quaest. Gr.* 301 F (p. 420 n. 244), 'Strabon (44, 2, 23, C. 658–9) nous apprend que Zeus Labrandeus était honoré à Labraunda, une ville située sur une colline'. Strabo does not say that Labraunda was a city, but a sanctuary on the territory of Mylasa; and a modern editor ought to mention the extremely fruitful Swedish excavations (for a brief discussion of these, S. Hornblower in *OCD*^{3}, p. 810). Similarly, the *Parallela* (313 B) relate that, 'When the Romans were at war with the Gauls and the grain-supply was insufficient, Cinna reduced the people's food-rations, so that the Romans stoned him to death on the suspicion of aiming at tyranny'. B. notes (p. 266 n. 205: I translate): 'Lucius Cornelius Cinna, praetor in 44 B.C., and brother of Cornelia, the wife of Julius Caesar. Since he had approved the death of the latter because of his attachment to the republic, he was lynched in the proscriptions that followed (Caesar's) death.' Rome was not at war with the Gauls in 44; the Roman mob wanted to lynch the praetor Cinna, but killed the tribune Helvius Cinna instead, and it is not known what became of the praetor; Cornelia was Caesar's second wife, and died in 69; the proscriptions did not begin until late 43. If an editor can produce such a farrago, it is not surprising that he can take the *Parallela* seriously.

In textual matters, B. closely follows the Teubner editors, Nachstädt for the *Mul. virt.* and the *Par. min.*, Titchener for the *Qu. Rom.* and *Gr.*, 'excepté lorsque tous les manuscrits sont d'accord' (p. x). The 'exception' implies that manuscripts must be right when they are unanimous, a dangerous principle. Fortunately, B. does not follow it, so that, for example, the apparatus of the second page of his text has '243 B 5 *μαντικήν* Cobet: *μιμτικήν* codd'.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.321 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A major problem with the Greek text is the frequency of misprints, by my count about one per page. Sometimes entire words are missing, for instance, the main verb ἔχομεν in the first sentence of the *Mul. virt.* At other places there appear monsters, such as ἐξαγένεσθε (ἐξεγένεσθε), δώξας (διώξας), διαθέν (διαρθέν), which one can only hope are due to careless proof-reading. By contrast, the French translations appear faithful to the Greek and are carefully proof-read.

In short, this is not a satisfactory addition to the Budé *Moralia*.

Harvard University CHRISTOPHER P. JONES

LONGINUS THE PLATONIST

I. MÄNNLEIN-ROBERT: *Longin: Philologe und Philosoph. Eine Interpretation der erhaltenen Zeugnisse*. Pp. 795. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2001. Cased, €138. ISBN: 3-598-77692-6.

Cassius Longinus is a fascinating and at the same time rather enigmatic figure of the intellectual history of the turbulent third century A.D. For several decades, he was a leading representative of the Platonic tradition in Athens, who numbered Porphyry among his pupils; the latter, however, left him to join the circle of Plotinus at Rome, whose thinking was to determine the future of Platonism. Towards the end of the 260s, Longinus himself departed from Athens to become an adviser of the Palmyrene ruler Zenobia, whose ever more independent policies led her into armed conflict with the Roman emperor Aurelian; after Aurelian's victory, Longinus was executed for having supported Zenobia's break away from Rome. Thus ended the life of a man who might have claimed to be one of the leading intellectuals of his age—not only as a philosopher, but also as a consummate scholar, with interests in textual philology, rhetoric, and metrics—had he not been overshadowed by Plotinus and his followers. That development resulted in his marginalization within the Platonist tradition and in the almost total loss of his philosophical writings, of which only scanty fragments remain. His philological production fared somewhat better, most of all his works on rhetoric, of which longer excerpts and an epitome are still extant.

In this book, Irmgard Männlein-Robert has set herself the task of collecting and interpreting all the remains (except the purely rhetorical ones) of Longinus' once copious and variegated production. A look at the concordance on pp. 650–2 shows that she has indeed brought together more material than either of her two most important predecessors (L. Vaucher, *Études critiques sur le Traité du Sublime et sur les écrits de Longin* [Geneva, 1854]; and L. Brisson and M. Patillon, 'Longinus Philosophus', *ANRW* ser. II, 36/7 [1994], 5214–99 and 'Longinus Philologus', *ANRW* ser. II, 34/4 [1998], 3023–3108), although she wisely refrains from including the treatise *De sublimitate* as a work written by Longinus; despite recent efforts to prove the contrary, she rightly points out (p. 19) that this work is still overwhelmingly regarded as having been written by an earlier Anonymus.

The book is divided into two rather uneven parts (not counting the ample bibliography and indexes on pp. 653–795). A first section charts an 'outline of a portrait of Longinus' (pp. 26–96), while a much longer second section (pp. 97–649) provides detailed interpretations of all material to which the name of Longinus is still attached. This second section, the *pièce de résistance* of the book, itself comprises a number of substantial chapters: a biographical one (pp. 97–138), and chapters on Longinus and his relations to Porphyry and the circle of Plotinus (pp. 139–250), on

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.321 Published online by Cambridge University Press