speaker, should be based on our evidence for both philosophical and sophistic audiences, rather than just one or the other. The discussion of metaphor, right at the end, is both somewhat stranded, with no direct connection to the chapter before it, and disappointing in content. K. endorses the perception of metaphor as a shaper as well as a mirror of experience, but then does very little with it.

Overall, K.'s study makes a very positive impression. It is a good addition to literature on the Second Sophistic, and his suggestion that the approach might fruitfully be extended to other ancient periods and genres, already supported by his own flirtation with philosophical oratory, is further strengthened by the near-simultaneous publication of Aldrete's work. Whether its insistence on the dialogic element in oratory has all that much to say to modern rhetorical theory is perhaps a more open question.

Production and general standards of accuracy are high, the main exception being the complete failure of both K. and his editors to ensure the correct accent for (*προ*)*λαλιά*.

King's College London M. B. TRAPP

POLYAENUS

M. T. SCHETTINO: *Introduzione a Polieno*. Pp. 341. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 1998 [1999]. Paper, L. 45,000. ISBN: 88-467-0179-8.

Polyaenus' renaissance continues. In the wake of recent Spanish, English, and Italian translations (a Russian translation in progress) and other work, comes a detailed overview by M. T. Schettino, previously known for her *Tradizione annalistica e tradizione ellenistica su Pirro in Dionigi* (Brussels, 1991) and numerous articles. S.'s 'cultural' reading of the text stresses P.'s originality and continuity with Second Sophistic trends to absolve him from any taint as a military writer. This excellent survey of P. and especially his sources also provides bibliography on individual exempla and a useful reference tool for Greek historiography. S. displays meticulous work in, and a genuine talent for, the lost art of *Quellenforschung*.

This expansion of a 1995 Catholic University of Leuven dissertation (*Polyaenus, Strategemata, Books I and II. A Commentary*) has much to offer. For S., analysis of P.'s sources betrays his historiographical knowledge and culture. Hence his 'vision of the past' affords an assessment of his Greek view of the Roman Empire and the imperial power (p.18). The second-century popularity of various historians as a criterion for P.'s sources is new: P. preferred fourth- and third-century B.C. writers, shunned Herodotus' work except as a *Persica* (pp. 134, 142), and probably used Thucydides in a collection of excerpts (pp. 147–8); Theopompus becomes a major source for Books 2–4 (pp. 163–76). Moreover, S. demonstrates correlations with Aelius Aristides' *Panathenaicus* (pp. 218, 221) and familiarity with Pausanias' work (pp. 89–90, 221).

S.'s pro-Roman P. (has anyone argued otherwise?) thinks Greeks, earlier victors over barbarians, have much to teach the Romans militarily. Greek–Roman conflicts are largely ignored (e.g. little attention to the *rusé* Pyrrhus, p. 268), and the Macedonians, P.'s ancestors, become not only defenders of Greek civilization but also intermediaries between classical Greece and Rome (p. 256). S. finds both a *translatio imperii* (pp. 259–60, 288–9) and a *translatio virtutis militaris* in P.'s view of Spartans, Macedonians (esp. Philip II, pp. 175, 225), and Romans. P.'s 'vision of the past' stresses Rome's Greek heritage.

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.36 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The work in five parts initially treats P.'s life and *opera*, before discussing the development of military literature, stratagem collections, and P.'s methodology. Part II, surveying sources, is continued in Part III, where S. argues for a conscious selection of exempla (as opposed to random collection) to demonstrate the 'cultural' argument underlying the work's organization. A brief conclusion summarizes P.'s 'vision of the past' for a second-century Greek in a Roman world. Strangely, S. omits discussion of the authenticity of the indices to each of the eight books, Stoic themes, and paradoxography. S. has not exhausted P.'s connections with the Second Sophistic.

S.'s truly impressive erudition, however, cannot forestall modest objections. Much of S.'s 'cultural' argument depends on inferences from selection of exempla, the *Tendenz* of presumed sources, and drawing general pictures of a commander from the exempla. Apart from P.'s self-serving prefaces, of which only 4 *praef*. and 7 *praef*. relate to the theme of their respective books, S.'s view does not derive from P.'s *ipsissima verba*. For example, combining the texts of 4.21 and 7.6.7 to produce a *translatio imperii* requires imagination. Thus S.'s learned cultural approach is a reading, not a conclusively proven case. Treatment of scholarship on P.'s sources is also unfortunate. If J. Melber's allegedly inadequate discussion (*Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.*, Suppl. 14 [1885], 417–688) justifies S.'s work (pp. 17–18), presenting only disagreements (pp. 134, 142 n. 51) leaves the reader without an overview of Melber's position. Despite many attacks, S. reaches a conclusion similar to Melber's: a 50/50 split between collections and direct use of sources. Further, confirming P.'s claim to originality (pp. 131–3) through his schematic structuring of individual anecdotes is not new, though P.'s distortion of events to create *rusé* anecdotes is ably demonstrated (pp. 115–30; cf. pp. 97–107). But did other stratagem collectors play this game? Conceding (p. 162 n. 126) that the aphoristic conclusion to 2.1.6 appeared in P.'s source compromises (to some extent) the argument. In general, this work needed an editor (e.g. displays of extraneous learning characteristic of a dissertation, pp. 80–1); nor is it well disguised that the most detailed discussion of sources derives from S.'s previous work on Books 1–2.

The treatments of P.'s life and his relationship to military literature are the book's weakest aspects. A contrast between P.'s culture and military literature is exaggerated: Arrian's *paideia* did not conflict with his military interests. Likewise, S.'s Frontinus, a mere copier from a supposed stratagematic canon, assumes an undemonstrable 'fixed' content of such collections, and an attempt (p. 78) to distinguish Frontinus' emphasis on aims from P.'s on method is unconvincing. If (as S. believes, p. 278) P. produced the first collection of female stratagems, though derived from Plutarch's *Mulierum Virtutes*, earlier Hellenistic collections of female exempla, some possibly *rusé*, are not investigated (cf. recently D. Gera, *Warrior Women* [Leiden, 1997], pp. 33–4). S.'s discussions of stratagematic vocabulary and military literature, closely following this reviewer's work, merit detailed responses elsewhere.

S.'s conventional views of P.'s life and *opera*, rehearsing long-debated opinions, are hardly definitive. P. the 'Roman job-seeker' (accepted at p. 267) does not appear in the discussion of P.'s life (pp. 21–5). Identification of the *Suda's Tactica* of P. in three books with the *Strategica* in eight revives a view long-rejected despite an ingenious explanation for understanding 'three' as 'eight'. Fragments of P. 'the Athenian' (*FGrHist* 639) are assigned to an otherwise unknown second- or third-century chronographer (pp. 29–30). Further, the *Strategica*'s conjectured second edition assumes the authenticity of the last sentence of 1 *praef*. 13, bracketed (correctly) as a gloss by all modern editors (pp. 33–4; cf. pp. 93 n. 1, 200). No doubt P. worked on his collection long before 161 (pp. 34–5), but that any books appeared before autumn 161

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.36 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is unjustified speculation. P.'s collection is more closely tied to the Parthian war of 161–6 than S. realizes.

Despite these criticisms, this welcome, erudite contribution, invaluable to cultural historians of the second century and students of Greek literature, establishes S. as a talented scholar of Greek historiography and a refreshing new voice in Second Sophistic studies.

Duke University EVERETT L. WHEELER

DIO

C. L. MURISON: *Rebellion and Reconstruction. Galba to Domitian. An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's* Roman History *Books 64–67 (A.D. 68–96)*. Pp. xxi + 291, maps. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999. Cased, £42. ISBN: 0-7885-0547-5.

The appearance of an historical commentary on a portion of *The Roman History* of Cassius Dio is a very welcome event, and an important one for Roman historians—particularly in this day and age, when more people need access to the classical sources whilst fewer can grapple unaided with the complexities of a difficult and controversial Greek text. This is the ninth volume in a series which will make Dio's extensive history more widely available.

The books of Dio chosen for the present commentary concern the civil war which precipitated and followed the death of Nero in A.D. 68 and the ensuing rise and fall of the Flavian dynasty (A.D. 69–96). This is by any standards an episode in Roman history that is difficult to interpret, and for which it is difficult, too, even to establish the 'facts'; these problems are not helped by the complexities of the source-tradition, around which in recent years has grown a considerable bibliography. Murison's 'credentials' for such a task as this need no stressing, as he has already published widely and significantly on many of the controversies which arise in the interpretation of the events of A.D. 68–9.

M.'s introduction (pp. 1–27) covers the topics that are standard, and includes particularly helpful and succinct 'essays' on Dio's life, on his sources, and on the effects of epitomization. His attitudes, too, to emperors are discussed, demonstrating that, whilst Dio echoes the 'moral outrage' over Otho's succession (a theme familiar to the reader of Tacitus' *Historiae*), he is at the same time much less critical of Vitellius than are either Tacitus or Suetonius: M. persuasively attributes this (p. 24) to the lack of an obvious 'double' for Vitellius in the events of the 190s. Indeed, this section of the introduction, which holds up for comparison the imperial figures of 69–96 with those of Dio's own lifetime, is especially valuable and penetrating.

Reviewing the commentary itself is a less than simple task, because by its nature it necessarily lacks obviously 'followable' themes and arguments. Its layout is clear and straightforward, and the reader/user is guided through it by short subsidiary introductions to new themes in the narrative. Substantial efforts are made to clarify details of campaigns and, thereby, to demonstrate areas of Dio's (or his Epitomators') confusions; the user of the commentary is frequently and helpfully referred to the larger treatments of these matters by Wellesley and Chilver. M.'s notes are throughout clear and succinct, with thorough discussion and relevant bibliographical citation: comments are always illuminating and to-the-point, without falling for the temptation,

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.36 Published online by Cambridge University Press