NOTICES

H. PATZER: *Die Formgesetze des Homerischen Epos.* (Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main: Geisteswissenschaftliche Reihe, 12.) Pp. 230. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. DM 124. ISBN: 3-515-06999-2.

Harald Patzer is a veteran scholar who has rendered good service to classical studies in the past. His new book attempts a survey of the formal principles of Homeric epic (in practice this means simply the *Iliad*—the virtual omission of the *Odyssey* is defended, though inadequately, on p. 21). It follows the lead of Arend, Fenik, Krischer, and others surveyed in the methodological foreword. P. does, however, go beyond purely formalist analysis, with extensive sections on the use of similes, the conventions of the battlefield, and the intervention of the gods in the action.

The book does not altogether fulfil the expectations aroused by the title. The first section (pp.23–86) is an extensive account of the hexameter and of the ways in which Homeric language is adapted to this metre and presumably to oral composition. While we would all agree that metre has an important influence on form, it is less clear why almost one-third of the book had to be devoted to this topic. Part 2 (pp. 87–151) deals with aspects of representation through the poetic language described in Part 1, and Part 3 (pp. 152–222) with the scope of the 'reality' so represented (but this enquiry concerns stylization and convention, rather than questions of historicity). There is a good deal here which, while well said, is not very novel: we are told that the narrative is presented in linear progression, and that the narrator is detached from his subject (the more sophisticated account of Homeric narrative given by de Jong's work is not cited), that similes are often used to express the inner feelings of the characters or to sum up mass behaviour, that the speeches express the state of mind giving rise to impulses to action (even in P.'s own terms, more might have been done by way of analysing the typology of the speeches; it is surprising to find no citation of Latacz on 'Kampfparänese'). The neglect of the *Odyssey* becomes especially damaging in Part 3, in which the life of the warrior is seen as the central concern of epic, and the hero's highest aim is to test his own prowess incessantly through warfare. The one-sidedness of this picture becomes evident as soon as we look away from the main plot of the *Iliad.* Even there, P. writes as though the concept of 'hero' is unproblematic, the conduct of warfare uncontroversial. Although special cases are sometimes noted, they are not discussed at length. The schematic presentation of 'rules' effectively excludes consideration of how these rules are adapted or broken: this applies as much to ethical issues as to typical scenes and conventions. One example: gods normally aid mortals by inspiring them or guiding their weapons on course; they are not usually portrayed as killing human opponents. But 5.842, where Ares is stripping Periphas of his armour, carries divine involvement to extreme lengths: has Ares actually killed him? And what good is such armour to a god? P. does not discuss the point.

A book of this kind might have been valuable for reference if it had given exhaustive documentation of the conventions here documented, but P.'s exposition too often gives merely a scattering of illustrative examples. The *index locorum* will be useful, but it also reveals how many important passages are *not* discussed. For instance, the relatively full discussion of the gods focuses on their rôle as helpers of heroes in battle. But they have other motives and functions as well, and e.g. 4.51–61 (Hera's viciousness towards Troy), one of the most shocking passages in the poem, goes undiscussed, though it figures in a recurrent type of scene, a divine debate.

The bibliography (twenty-nine items) was hardly worth including. One sympathizes with P.'s wish to avoid polemic, but more guidance to other treatments was needed; not even Lohmann on speeches is cited.

It goes without saying that P.'s choice of passages is often excellent, his exposition lucid and informative. Nevertheless, this book is neither an original contribution nor a magisterial synthesis. It would be hard to make a case for an English translation.

Christ Church, Oxford R. B. RUTHERFORD

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I. F. Cook: *The* Odyssey *in Athens: Myths of Cultural Origins* (Myth and Poetics). Pp. xii + 216. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995. Cased, £27.50. ISBN: 0-8014-3121-2.

Athenian Homer? Homer is receiving his civic credentials. C.'s work is part of a recent trend in the historicization of Homer, which places the production and reception of the *Odyssey* in the context of state-formation in the Archaic age. C argues (Chapter V) that the 'crystallization of the text' (p. 168) took place in Athens in the latter half of the seventh century, and in a specific relation to Athenian cult practice. This is very much more than a dusting-down of the 'Peisistratid recension'. C. makes a fascinating case for a link between the Ithacan narrative andthe myths and ritual practices surrounding the Erechtheum. The story of Poseidon and Athena's contest for the patronage of Athens shadows the two gods' relation to Odysseus. The heroic career of Erechtheus is mirrored in that of Odysseus (more might have been made of how Erechthean echoes could illuminate Odysseus' final end ἐξ ἁλός [11.134]). Two idiosyncratic objects of Athena's cult make significant appearances—behind the mysterious and unique golden *lukhnos* the goddess uses to illuminate the hall in Book 19 lies that housed in the Erechtheum. Both function as assurances that the house of Odysseus/city of Athens will continue to stand under her support. While the sacred olive, in Athens an emblem of the city's fate, serves a parallel function for Odysseus and his household. That cult practice sees the olive associated only with Attic Athena is enough to make one take the Athenian reverberations detected by C. seriously.

Some of the planks in C.'s raft are less solid, though his acknowledgement of many problems is disarming. The charge of Athenocentrism, for instance. That the Athenian scene is so much better documented than anywhere else makes the detection of possible cultic links embedded in the epic all the more feasible. In the face of the unarguable panhellenism of the epic, C. entertains the possibility of access to it through parallel rituals in other places. But this comes dangerously close to undermining his own argument, which depends on particularity of time and place.

However, even seventh-century Athenian festival practice could hardly be described as well documented. And C. at times plays rather loose with it in his illumination of Odyssean narrative by the patterns of the Athenian religious calendar. Contested interpretations of scanty evidence become unproblematic 'givens'. Some connections are strained to the point of inefficacy: 'In the conflation of athletic competition and warfare, the *Odyssey* has a direct parallel in games such asthose at the Panathenaia' (p. 157). C. realizes the weakness of the analogy—important to hisargument—between the festival to Apollo held at the winter solstice as the slaughter of the suitors takes place and the Athenian festivals held around the year-end at the summer solstice. His response—that in some regions the new year was indeed celebrated at the winter solstice—seems again to shake his own argument for specifically Athenian genesis.

I have concentrated on the last chapter of this book in recognition of the importance of its thesis. The first four chapters chart the development of the structuring opposition between *metis* and *bie*. Focused on the proem, *apologoi*, and revenge, these readings deploy a fruitful synthesis of structuralist and narrative-based approaches. C.'s overarching argument that the *Odyssey* is indeed coherently driven by these thematics (cf. p. 127) is a strong one, if perhaps today somewhat uncontroversial. He makes many telling points of detail in its elaboration (e.g. on the animalizing effects of *lotos*-eating, p. 57; and on Odysseus' at last passing the test of sexual restraint with Nausikaa, p. 63), but the 'Athenianness' of this interpretation is not always evident, and there remains a certain unevenness between these chapters and the last. And the overall case might have emerged more forcefully had not so much space been devoted to, for instance, the incineration of Analytical straw men.

None of this detracts from the importance of this stimulating new attempt to explain the genesis of the *Odyssey* in terms that respond adequately to the social and religious environment of its age.

University of Warwick PETER WILSON

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

L. EDMUNDS, R. W. WALLACE (edd.): *Poet, Public and Performance in Ancient Greece*, with a preface by Maurizio Bettini. Pp. xiii + 167. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997. Cased, £31. ISBN: 0-8018-5575-6.

This book is an act of homage to Bruno Gentili, and consists of a collection of essays onvarious aspects of 'Greek literary production', loosely linked together by a concern for audiences and performance. Most of the essays are of high quality, but the absence of an index and bibliography is a pity.

Giulio Guidorizzi opens the volume with a discussion of the visionary prophecy of Theoklymenos in *Odyssey* 20, and the collective delirium of the suitors who eat meat 'bedabbled with blood'. G. finds here a covert reference to the practice of ὠμοφαγία, and suggests that the epic's original audiences would have immediately understood that the suitors are as mad as the followers of Dionysus. His interpretation presupposes that Dionysiac ritual, complete with ὠμοφαγία, was a familiar aspect of Homeric culture, despite the scarcity of references to it. Antonio Aloni's study of Simonides' elegy on the battle of Plataea addresses the question of the performance of elegiac poetry, and argues that, in addition to sympotic elegy, there were two forms that might be destined for a wider public: historical elegy and threnodic elegy. Simonides' poem contains elements of both, and could well have been performed at a public event which combined the celebration of victory with mourning for the dead. The seal of Theognis is considered by Lowell Edmunds, who develops the view that the seal is not the autograph of a particular poet, but a statement about the political and ethical character of the poetry. If Theognis' name indicates not an author, but an authority, then the *Theognidea* can be regarded as a miscellaneous collection of traditional wisdom from the start. The anonymous and collective voice of tradition is further explored by Joseph Russo, who draws on the research of folklorists and anthropologists to analyse the creative use of prose in the wisdom speech of Greece, as it appears in the distinct, but overlapping genres of proverb, maxim, and apophthegm.

Charles Segal discusses the role of the chorus in Euripides' *Bacchae*, and suggests that their remoteness from the city and its values anticipates a form of tragedy that is no longer primarily a civic or communal experience for the members of its audience. The isolation of the individual characters at the end of the play is starkly highlighted by the absence of a sympathetic civic chorus, and S. rightly argues that it is therefore impossible to see the *Bacchae* as a celebration of the arrival of Dionysus' worship in Thebes. Thomas Cole considers the probable audience reaction to Euripides' *Ion*, suggesting that the version of the hero's genealogy which the play enacts is revealed to the audience for the first time at the moment of performance. Audience reaction, in so far as it can be reconstructed, is the subject of Robert Wallace's essay, which examines and largely corroborates Plato's view of the 'theatrocracy' which dominated Athenian culture of the fourth century B.C. The volume concludes with an essay by Maria Grazia Bonanno, who reiterates Gentili's central insight, that Greek culture was the culture of performance *par excellence*, which we, in an age of the new orality of cinema, television, and the mass media, are particularly well placed to explore.

University of Warwick PENELOPE MURRAY

F. D'ALFONSO: *Stesicoro e la performance: Studio sulle modalità esecutive dei carmi stesicorei*. (Filologia e critica, 74.) Pp. 180. Rome: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale, 1994. Paper. ISBN: 88-8011-055-1.

Stesichorus' name itself might make you think that his songs were choral. However, late twentieth-century opinion is sceptical about choral performance for long Stesichorean narratives such as the *Geryoneis*, and imagines the poet as a *kitharodos*, singing and accompanying himself, while the rôle of the chorus, if there was one, would have been limited to dancing. This position should never have come to dominate, and D'Alfonso's *Stesicoro e la performance* (anglophone readers may be surprised to find that the word 'performance' has migrated into Italian) treats it with the scepticism it deserves.

There are three sections. The first, 'La determinazione della *performance* in base a dati tecnico-formali', deals with issues of the description of performance in secondary sources: the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

first part (pp. 21ff.) is a useful survey of sources for the terms *στροφή*, *ἀντίστροφος*, and *ἐπῳδός*, arguing rightly that the link between these and dance predates Claudius Ptolemy; the second part (pp. 42ff.) examines critically the use that has been made of Demodocus' performance in the *Odyssey* as a model for Stesichorean *kitharodia*; and a third subdivision deals with the issue of length (rather oddly positioned here, since this is the principal point in the argument against choral performance, and deserved a chapter by itself); in the face of the objection that choral performance of such long poems would have been monotonous, D. points out that such performances were partly in direct speech.

The second major section deals with secondary sources that link Stesichorus with *kitharodia*, principally Heraclides Ponticus fr. 157 and Suda, s.v. *Στησίχορος*; apropos of the latter she suggests that the word *κιθαρῳδία* is being used or misused in the sense of 'playing the *kithara* to accompany a *khoros*', i.e. *κιθαρῳδός* has been confused with *κιθαριστής*.

The third major section attempts to provide positive evidence for a choral Stesichorus. The first part seeks to provide a context in the Spartan *katastasis* (though there is no explicit link to Stesichorus in our sources). In the second part (one of the best in the monograph) D. examines the erotic poems often regarded as spurious (*Kaluke*: *PMG* 277; *Rhadine*: *PMG* 278), and makes a case for their being genuine Stesichorean choral productions, perhaps along the lines of Alcman's *Partheneia.* The third part is devoted to the *δαμώματα* of *PMG* 212, which she interprets as public performances of paeans, plausibly. Appendices deal with minor issues. I might perhaps single out the third one (pp. 137ff.), which deals with the important issue of re-performance of Stesichorean poems at *sumposia.*

Looking at the monograph as a whole, three complaints suggest themselves. First, too little attention is paid to the text of Stesichorus himself; instead, we are treated to a survey of the testimonia, and to secondary sources for the performance of lyric; but appeal to these can never be conclusive because the writers of these secondary sources perhaps had little idea of the real circumstances of performance. Second, since a principal argument against choral performance is the length of the poems, it might have been good if this issue could have been addressed at greater length; is it plausible that songs with many hundreds of lines should have been memorized and performed by choruses? (The answer is surely 'yes', but it needs to be demonstrated; comparative evidence might have been useful here). Third, the book reads a little like a dissertation; primary texts are generally quoted in full, and the pace is a little slow. Nevertheless, the argument for a choral Stesichorus deserved be restated, and in restating it, D. has opened up some interesting questions and assembled a collection of sources useful for anyone seriously interested in the chorus in archaic Greek poetry.

University of Reading IAN RUTHERFORD

M. SOTIRIOU: *Pindarus Homericus. Homer-Rezeption in Pindars Epinikien.* Pp. v + 295. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997. Paper, DM 85. ISBN: 3-525-25216-1.

The title of this book recalls F. Nisetich's *Pindar and Homer* (Baltimore, 1989) and G. Nagy's *Pindar's Homer* (Baltimore, 1990)—two very different books, from which this in turn could scarcely be more different. S. aims to produce a comprehensive, classified catalogue of references illustrating Pindar's dependence on Homer; this is done with a minimum of interpretative commentary, though the notes provide extensive references to secondary literature. The catalogue is organized under the categories: epithets; formulae; gnomic expressions; mythological allusions; 'reminiscences' (a rather miscellaneous category); and scenes, typical and individual.

Properly done, a work of this kind would establish itself as an indispensible reference tool for future research on Pindar. How far this book can take on that rôle will only become clear from sustained use; but my initial soundings reveal some weaknesses. Although S. seems to have been thorough in her examination of the Pindaric text, the presentation of Homeric material is often unhelpful, and sometimes positively misleading. The organization of the chapter on epithets into multiple lists (according to the objects the epithet is applied to in Pindar) fragments the material in a most confusing way. For example, *εὐρυσθένης* appears on pp. 7, 12, 17, 19, 24, and 30; some (but not all) refer back to p. 7, but there are no other cross-references (nor is there an *index verborum*, although there is a very full *index locorum*); and none of these entries points the reader to the very pertinent variant *εὐρυβίας*, itself split between pp. 14 and 17 (with a cross-reference

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from 14 to 17, but not vice versa). When a word or phrase is recurrent in Homer, we are usually given a single reference, apparently chosen at random, with no indication that it is not unique. Moreover, the most apposite Homeric parallels are sometimes passed over in silence.

A few lines from *N*. 7 will illustrate the kind of problem I encountered persistently:

3. *μέλαιναν... εὐφρόναν*: p.78 cites *Il*. 10.297 *νύκτα μέλαιναν*: why just this out of many occurrences?

12. *μεγάλαι... ἀλκαί*: p.27 cites *Il*. 24.42 *μεγάλῃ... βίῃ* but not *Od*. 9.514 *μεγάλην... ἀλκήν*.

16. *κλυταῖς*: for this epithet see pp. 12, 18, 22, 31, 43, 44, and 51; cross-referencing is unsystematic and incomplete.

21. *ἀδυεπῆ... Ὅμηρον*: p. 15 cites *Il*. 1.248, but not the more directly relevant *H. Ap*. 4 *ἀοιδὸς... ἡδυεπής*. (The reference to p. 74 in the *index locorum* for this passage seems to be wrong.)

24. *ὅμιλος ἀνδρῶν*: the combination occurs nine times in Homer. On p. 71 (under the heading 'Homerische Formeln, (A) Wörtliche Übernahme') we find the entry 'P. 10.46 *ἀνδρῶν ὅμιλον* (=N. 7.24)—*Il*. 10.338 *ἀνδρῶν ὅμιλον*.' On p. 95 (under the heading 'Singuläre homerische Wendungen, (C) Umschreibungen') there is an entry for *N*. 7.24 (with no mention of *P*. 10.46, and no cross-reference to p. 71) which cites *Il*. 4.209 (*καθ' ὅμιλον ἀνὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν*) and *Od*. 11.514 (*οὔ ποτ' ἐνὶ πληθυῖ μένεν ἀνδρῶν οὐδ' ἐν ὁμίλῳ*). The choice of examples andthe distribution of material between the two notes is arbitrary and confusing. And surely *Il*.15.616 *πλεῖστον ὅμιλον* would be worth a mention, since Pindar's expression in full is *ὅμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος*.

The book's presentational shortcomings will, I fear, prove a source of frustration to users, who will also need to be cautious and critical when drawing on the material it offers.

University of Leeds MALCOLM HEATH

T. VISSER: *Untersuchungen zum Sophokleischen Philoktet*. Pp. x + 289. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 3-519-07659-4.

Despite its general title, this is a clearly focused study of Helenus' oracle in *Philoctetes*. V. begins by setting out the different versions of the oracle both in the play itself and in other relevant sources such as the Epic Cycle and the other Philoctetes plays (pp. 1–15). She concludes that a number of details concerning the oracle are handled with considerable flexibility in Sophocles' *Philoctetes* as well as the tradition as a whole, and stresses that two questions in particular do not permit simple answers: does the oracle speak just about the bow or also about Philoctetes himself? If it does speak about Philoctetes, does it firmly predict that he will go to Troy or does it make the sack of Troy dependent upon his free decision to support the Greek army? Much of this is not new. But the careful presentation of the material is likely to make these pages a standard point of reference.

Over the years, the variation in the way Helenus' oracle is presented has prompted many interpretations. In the main body of her book, V. gives hers. Throughout, she is guided by two central questions: how would spectators understand the oracle at any given point in the play? How are the different characters distinguished in the way they treat the oracle?

On the basis of a detailed analysis, V. argues that *Philoctetes* makes spectators perceive each character's struggle to make sense of the oracle. This is attractive as a general conclusion, and so is much of what she has to say more specifically. Odysseus comes across as a clever man who tries in vain to make the oracle come true by hook and by crook; the Chorus, too, work towards the fulfilment of the oracle, often couching their statements in ambiguity. Philoctetes, by contrast, opposes the oracle almost until the very end and even relishes the opportunity of harming the Greeks by denying them his support. More than any of the others, Neoptolemus appears to reflect on the meaning of the oracle and to come to a fuller understanding in the course of the play.

Nonetheless, attractive as many of V.'s suggestions are, there is also much to criticize. First of all, her study sometimes verges on the laborious. With a tighter organization of the material she could have avoided a certain degree of repetition. Secondly, there are places in which the discussion might have benefited from a more pluralist approach. V. has a tendency of looking for the one explanation of why a character does something, the one dramatic function of a scene, the one reliable report of the oracle. This rigorous approach throws light on many aspects of Philoctetes, but sometimes it can raise questions. Is Odysseus certainly bluffing when he threatens

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to depart with the bow but without Philoctetes (p. 160)? Is the only function of the False Merchant scene to let the spectators know about the oracle (p. 69)? Is it clear that the False Merchant's version of the oracle should be privileged over Neoptolemus' (pp. 193–204)? A greater readiness to accept that there are many cases in which more than one response can do justice to a passage might have made some of V.'s suggestions more convincing.

Yet despite such drawbacks there can be no doubt that the clear and detailed discussion of difficult problems makes this a very helpful book.

University of Manchester FELIX BUDELMANN

G. Basta Donzelli (ed.): *Euripides:* Electra (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana). Pp. xxxviii + 83. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner, 1995. Paper, DM 42. ISBN: 3-8154-1325-7.

Of the Teubner Euripides, published in fascicles by different hands since the mid-sixties, James Diggle had this to say in his lapidary history of Euripidean scholarship (OCT, vol. 1.x): 'dum maiora adfectat [i.e. than the Budé] spem saepius fefellit quam implevit'. That judgement is true as a generality, but some volumes are much better than others. This is one of the better ones. B. D. has chased down the place of publication of a large number of out-of-the-way conjectures (anyone who has tried it knows how laborious this can be). Her text, though conservative in some respects, is not blinkered and marks a real improvement in places. The volume repays study.

I have called her text conservative. Many of its improvements over Diggle spring from a greater patience in considering whether the readings and speaker assignments of L might be correct. Here are some examples. **59**: Diggle's trajection of this verse to follow 56 is rejected, 57–8 being punctuated with Radermacher as a parenthesis; **650–1**: 650 is assigned with L to the Old Man and 651 is deleted following Matthiae; **671–83**: B. D. adopts the speaker changes in L, declining the line-by-line division of the prayer among three speakers (conjectural but without real parallel) that has been usual since Murray: see my discussion in *TAPA* 117 (1987), 263–5; **757**: text retains *τήνδε*; **959–66**: speaker designations as in L are better than those of Camper, adopted by Diggle: e.g. Orestes should be the one to give orders to his own slaves and Electra to recognize Clytaemaestra; **1015**: Diggle's *κακῶς* is rejected, with citation of Cropp; **1292–1307**: the assignment of 1292–3 and 1298–1300 to the Chorus, with consequent change of *μυσαροῖς* to *μυσαραῖς* in 1294, usual since the Renaissance, is rejected together with Arnoldt's trajection of 1295–7 to follow 1302, which means that Castor is consoling Orestes, not condemning him, and the Chorus of Argive women do not obtrude themselves where they have no business. Yet while restoring the reading of L in these places she keeps most of the conjectures (e.g. at 96, 170, 192, 238, 360, 497, 568, 837, 977, 978, 1016, 1034, 1107–8, 1155, 1287, and 1330) that distinguished Diggle's edition from Murray's. In addition, unlike Diggle she mentions Mau's deletion of 518–44, although she has elsewhere argued vigorously against it. For further attractive conjectures see 123, *277, *414 (B. D.), and *570 (asterisk denotes *app. crit.* only).

On the other hand, conservatism has led her astray in some places: **704–5 ~ 718–9**: determination to retain *καλλιπλόκαμον* leaves her without anything plausible to suggest in the antistrophe and has caused her to adopt a less natural colometry; **983–4**: B. D. rejects Weil's assignment to Electra and adopts Matthiae's *ἀλλ' ἦ* in 983, but the surprise inherent in this collocation (see Denniston, *GP* 27) is out of place here; **1174**: Paley's lacuna before this verse is necessary not only because 1174 makes no sense but also because we require the Chorus to announce the eccycling of the bodies.

Here are some further places where text or *app. crit.* could have been improved. ***1**: Murray's explanation of *ἄργος* as *πεδίον* is wrong here and should have been omitted; B. D. might have mentioned her own suggestion, *γῆς Πελασγῶν ὅλβος*, *RFIC* 108 (1980), 385–403 (but *Πελασγῶν* already Semitelos, *BCH* 13 [1889], 205); **8**: Mastronarde, *Glotta* 67 (1989), 101–5, has shown that verbs compounded with *εὖ* have augmented and reduplicated forms in *ηὐ-*; **131**: *λατρεύεις* is an outbreak of *mumpsimus*; **436–7**: the colometry ignores J. A. J. M. Buijs's demonstration, *Mnemosyne* 38 (1985), 74–92, that anaclasis of long and anceps in the Aeolic base is extremely rare where overlap occurs: Musgrave's *ἐνειλισσόμενος* or Willink's *συνειλισσόμενος* does the needful; **656**, **783**, and **1058**: surely West's *κλυοῦσα* and *κλυὼν* are

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

right; **659**: the old Man cannot 'bring the tale to its final lap' but can only ask Electra to do so: Jortin's ἄγε should not have been rejected; **1059**: Well's οὐκ ἔστι, τῇ σῇ δ' ἡδὺ προσθέσθαι φρενί is a better solution. I note one place where the reading of L is defensible but not adopted: in 985 προβλήματος has been defended as the language of sacrifice by West, *BICS* 27 (1980), 14.

Misprints are remarkably few: I found only καίνη for κείνη at 929 and σφαγάς for -ὰς at 1069. Her Latin is accurate and graceful, but the use of *translatio* instead of *versio* to mean 'translation' sounds odd.

University of Virginia DAVID KOVACS

J. DAVIE (trans.): *Euripides,* Electra *and other Plays*. Introduction and notes by R. Rutherford. Pp. l + 265. London: Penguin Press, 1998. Paper, £6.99. ISBN: 0-14-044668-0.

The first volume of the new Penguin translation, containing *Alcestis*, *Medea*, *The Children ofHeracles*, and *Hippolytus*, was published in 1996. This, the second volume, features *Andromache*, *Hecabe*, *Suppliant Women*, *Electra*, and *Trojan Women*. In a remarkably fertile General Introduction Richard Rutherford attempts to set Euripides in his cultural and theatrical context. Section I outlines the earlier history of Attic tragedy, discusses its conditions of performance, and briefly considers the relationship of its mythological subject-matter to contemporary civic life, both political and religious. Section II sketches some major themes in the work of Aeschylus and Sophocles. Only five pages long, this section is a gem of concision and acuity. In Section III R. explores the fascination and enjoyment experienced by Euripides' audience. He highlights the range and variety of Euripides' work, and portrays him as a tireless innovator, always ready to experiment with new types of plot and atmosphere. Section IV (new to Volume II) points out the interconnections between the five plays in this volume, principally their examination of the ethics of war and revenge, and their provocative deconstruction of seemingly obvious moral categories.

John Davie's translations are outstanding. Written in continuous prose, they largely succeed in conveying the wide range of tone and expression used by the individual characters and choruses. So, for example, D. exactly captures the language of ownership with which Menelaus justifies histreatment of Andromache, 'Is his property not mine and mine his?' (*Andr.* 585); Polyxena's appeal to Hecuba is all the more powerful for being so simple, 'That is the fate you can expect. Oh not this, mother, please! You deserve better than this' (*Hec.* 408); the Old Man's entry is both touching and humorous, 'What a steep approach it is to this house for the feet of a wrinkled old fellow like me! Still, it's friends I'm going to; I must drag along this poor bent back and shaky knees' (*El.* 489–92); and the cool formality of the gods' exchange underlines their aloofness from mortal suffering, as Athena addresses Poseidon, 'I thank you for your graciousness. I propose that we discuss a matter of common interest to us both, my royal lord' (*Tro.* 534).

The tone throughout is refreshingly modern yet dignified. In the Translator's Note D. explains that in the lyric passages he has aimed at (p. xlviii) 'a certain archaic formality of language... but the overriding concern has been to let the freshness and beauty of the poetry come through to the reader as directly as possible'. Here too he is wonderfully successful, but one might regret the decision to give up verse translation in the lyrics. Though these are italicized to mark them off from the dialogue, perhaps more is needed to indicate their change of register and to give some idea of the metrical variety of the songs. However, given the success of Martin Hammond's *Iliad* and David West's *Aeneid*, Penguin are perhaps understandably keen to continue with continuous prose translation.

Each of the plays is furnished with a brief preface and helpful notes, which illuminate key points of myth, dramaturgy, and much else. There is also a Note on the Text (stressing the vagaries of the manuscript tradition and the authors' high opinion of Diggle's text), a Chronological Table, and a brief, but useful, Bibliography, listing both general works and treatments of individual plays. Overall this is easily the best book of its kind available in English. [Typos: I detected only one, a misplaced comma on the last line of p. xiv.]

St Anne's College, Oxford WILLIAM ALLAN

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

D. KOVACS (ed., trans.): *Euripides:* Suppliant Women, Electra, Heracles. (Loeb Classical Library, 9.) Pp. viii + 455. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1998. Cased, £11.95. ISBN: 0-674-99566-X.

The new Loeb Euripides proceeds apace (for reviews of the previous two volumes see *CR* 45 [1995], 231–3 and 47 [1997], 18–20). Kovacs has already published a companion to the volume under review and its immediate predecessor in the form of *Euripidea Altera* (Leiden, 1996). The announcement made in the preface of that work to the effect that *Troades* would be included in the third volume was apparently premature as we are here presented with only three plays (as far as I know there has appeared no statement about the number of volumes this edition will occupy, or whether K. will go on to edit the fragments). Since I have already discussed many ofK.'s textual suggestions in a review of *Euripidea Altera* (see *BMCR* 8 [1997], 157–63), the present review can be briefer than those of the first two volumes.

There will inevitably be disagreement regarding the constitution of the text of three plays as wretchedly preserved as these. Many of the textual suggestions made in the companion volume are here advanced no further than the apparatus of this volume and some do not even get that far. I am glad that K. has dropped his suggested λεπαίας (combined with Herwerden's ἀρδμός for ἄργος) at *Electra* 1 (he now reads Πελασγῶν ἀρδμός). Given the extraordinary difficulty of rendering Greek tragic diction into effective English at the turn of this millennium, this is an accurate and successful translation. I have, however, the occasional quibble regarding nuances (*vide infra*).

I append some detailed comments on the text and translation.

Suppl. **62**: ἀλαίνοντα is not really translated (a note here might have helped). **154**: I am not totally happy with εἶτ': 'and there'. **473**: 'out of the waves' for κυμάτων ἄτερ is misleading. **597**:the notion of 'willingness', 'consent' in χρήιζοντα is not really conveyed. **604**: a new Willink suggestion is reported and adopted. **813**: οὐδ' ὑπ' ἀξίων: 'at undeserving hands' does not fully cover the ἄξια... ἀξίων wordplay, but then what would? **830**: σπάσαι, 'rend me in two', better 'tear me apart', 'tear in pieces'. **838**: it is very bold to put what now must be considered Bothe's ἐξήντας into the text. Would this word convey the meaning 'meet'? **1070**: παρεῖται is rendered 'is sped', but what is in question is 'falling', or more exactly the relaxing of the body prior to a fall. **1195**: '*they* must pray' hardly covers πρόστρεπ'. **1196**: '*this* sacrifice': 'this' is not in the Greek. **1219**: a note explaining the idiomatic use of φθάνω with a negative would have been of help.

Electra. **42**: Reiske's ποτέ should be in the text. **294–6**: Steinberg's deletion seems to me preferable to Bothe's transposition. **312–13**: I think that these lines should be deleted. How can Electra 'shun' a divine person (or with the dual, persons) no longer living on earth? **422**: τοι is 'letme tell you', 'you know', rather than 'surely'. **503f.**: Diggle's solution seems to me preferable here. **518–44**: K. brackets these notorious lines. The debate continues: see now M. Davies, *CQ* N.S.48 (1998), 389–403. I have never been greatly attracted by K.'s suggestion that 545ff. should be assigned to Electra. These lines are much better (accepting that 518–44 is interpolated) as a continuation of the old man's thoughts at 516f. **645**: I am inclined to take what follows τοιαῦτα as general. **719**: K.'s ἀμφι λόγοις does not look right. **973**: K.'s χρή for χρῆν may be right, but I am not sure I would put it in the text.

Heracles. **257**: I am no more enamoured of K.'s treatment of this line than I was when I reviewed *Euripidea Altera:* on ἔτης see Radt on P. *Paean.* 6.10 and Andrewes (in *HCT* IV) on Thuc. 5.70.4. **523**: house, doors, *and* hearth? **533**: 'the trouble we are in' is too loose a translation of τίν' ἐς ταραγμὸν ἥκομεν. **581**: a note on ἐκπονήσω θάνατον would have been in place. **656**: κατ' ἄνδρας: I prefer the stronger interpretation advocated by Bond, which also seems to me to be better Greek. **906ff.**: attention might have been drawn to the fact that most editors think these lines are addressed to Athena, not Heracles. **1124**: a hint might have been given that the interpretation of ἀναίνομαι is controversial. **1171**: 'he' should surely be 'you'. **1238**: χάριν σὴν is 'for your sake'. **1267**: ἐπείσφρησε and σπαργάνοις τοῖς ἐμοῖς go together. ἐν σπαργάνοις καὶ γάλαξι (or the reverse) is idiomatic, but that is not what we have here. There is no connective and τοῖς ἐμοῖς has particular reference.

Again K. is to be congratulated on providing a most valuable instrument for Euripidean studies. It remains to wish the series a speedy conclusion.

The work is attractively produced and has been well proof-read: on p. viii read 'Università'.

University of Manchester DAVID BAIN

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

G. ZANETTO (ed., trans): *Euripide.* Ciclope, Reso. Pp. xxxi + 159. Milan: Arnoldo Mondadori, 1998. Paper, L. 12,000. ISBN: 88-04-43177-6.

The *Cyclops* and the *Rhesus* are brought together here as the only extant dramatizations of Homeric narratives. For each play Z. provides a brief introduction, bibliography, text, and facing translation, and brief commentary (but no *apparatus criticus*). The text of *Cyclops* is basically Diggle's (OCT) with ten divergences (none of them with a new reading). The text of *Rhesus* is the one provided for Teubner by Z. himself (1993). Despite its brevity (twenty-five pages), the commentary on the Rhesus is given considerable value by the absence of competition.

University of Exeter RICHARD SEAFORD

PH. PAGONARI-ANTONIOU (ed.): *Καλλιμάχου 'Επιγράμματα. Εισαγωγή, κείμενο, μετάφραση, σχόλια.* Pp. 419. Athens: *Α. Καρδαμίτσα*, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 960-354-053-6.

P.-A. has supervised this elegant commentary, the first in Modern Greek, on Callimachus' epigrams. Though the book is the work of thirteen contributors, P.-A. has ensured a satisfactory homogeneity of quality and approach. The book is aimed at and will in general satisfy both professional and amateur classicists. A brief but helpful account in English of the purpose and procedure of the book is provided on p. 18. The introduction is substantial in both length (47 pp.) and content, and at times original: it includes a section on literary imitations of Callimachus' epigrams and a full list of Modern Greek translations of each epigram, well illustrated by a graph (p. 77). The text follows Pfeiffer, with some conjectures of other scholars adopted. The *apparatus criticus* incorporates explanatory matter, only once at excessive length (Epig. LXIII). The translations are close, and successful on the whole; their occasional failures arise from inelegance and some clumsy demotic idioms. The commentaries heavily repeat Gow-Page, Giangrande, etc. (perhaps unavoidable?). However, some strong personal opinions are expressed and there are interesting stylistic evaluations of vocabulary, structure, and metre among the general comments at the close of each epigram. There are also some interesting references to thematic parallels in Modern Greek poetry and folk song. The bibliographies for individual epigrams are generally clear, but they sometimes contain books which have not been cited in the relevant commentaries. Some misspellings and misprints: *διαμορφώνετα* instead of*διαμορφώνεται* (p. 103), *Γραματείας* instead of *Γραμματείας* (p. 153), *Αποκυρηγμένα* instead of *Αποκηρυγμένα*, a word misspelled twice (p. 169), *ὀφθλαμούς* instead of *ὀφθαλμούς* (p. 280), *εἰς τον ἔρωτα* instead of *εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα* (p. 302), Schneíder instead of Schneider (p.366). All in all, this is a good book which fills a gap in Callimachean studies.

University of St Andrews BARBARA SPINOULA

J. H. LESHER: *The Greek Philosophers. Selected Greek Texts from the Presocratics, Plato, and Aristotle.* Pp. viii + 147. London: Duckworth, 1998. Paper, £8.95. ISBN: 1-85399-562-2.

This book aims to give enough assistance in grammar and philosophy for students on bothClassics and Philosophy programmes who have completed *Athenaze* to read Greek philosophy in the original language. Chapters I–VI contain fragments of the Presocratics fromThales to Anaxagoras. Chapters VI–XI (on Plato) contain extracts from *Crito*, *Meno*, *Symposium*, *Republic*, and *Timaeus*, and Chapters XII–XVI (on Aristotle) from *Parts of Animals*, *Nicomachaean Ethics*, *De Anima*, *Posterior Analytics*, and *Metaphysics.* Each chapter is similar: an introduction with reading list, text, and notes. Parts 2 and 3 have brief general introductions.

The extracts are very well chosen and give a succinct view of Greek philosophy to the death of Aristotle. The introductions and notes are interesting, not unduly uncritical of ancient philosophers, and link them with useful comments to some later Western philosophers. The notes are

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

judicious although Guthrie, *The Sophists* (Cambridge, 1971), could be added to the reading list;to dismiss the Sophists as itinerant professors of rhetoric, logic, and bamboozle is too sweeping. The grammatical help is quite generous and there are helpful references to Smyth's and Goodwin's grammars and the Liddell–Scott–Jones lexicon. (There is no vocabulary.) It seems an excellent course book for a group working with a tutor.

It would be harder for a student working alone. There is no general note about dialect in the Presocratics or list of the commonest distinctive forms. Besides this, some of the translations in the notes throughout the book are rather free, e.g. p. 42 (Parmenides, fr. 9 l. 4), p. 97 (*Timaeus* 52b). Reading philosophy in Greek, one needs not merely to know *that* a passage can be construed in a particular way, but *why*.

The book ends rather abruptly. A list (with brief biographies) of the sources for the Presocratics would give an inkling of the amount of Greek philosophy that succeeded Aristotle, and an index of philosophical topics would be useful.

University of Warwick F. BEETHAM

J.-Th. A. Papademetriou: *Aesop as an Archetypal Hero*. Pp. 111. Athens: Hellenic Society for Humanistic Studies, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 960-7184-36-X.

M. W. Haslam commented (*CR* 42 [1992], 189) that 'there are more worthwhile things to do with the Äsoproman than attempt to re-edit one or another of its instantiations'. While a definitive edition of the *Life of Aesop* is still sought, we now recognize this text's considerable hermeneutic potential. Papademetriou's learned essays do not disappoint.

P. studies survival—recurrence of the Aesopic 'type' from antiquity onwards. I prefer 'type' to P.'s 'archetype': 'archetypal hero' irritates, suggesting a Jungian approach (entirely misleadingly). P. sees the Aesopic (arche)type as a *picaro*, more anti-hero than hero (P. rightly notes Cynic characteristics), 'natively... sagacious' (p. 11), but grotesquely ugly (a unifying theme). The *Life* supports P.'s reasoning.

Chapter I, 'Aesop's Depiction: Origins, Style, and Influence', will be the most useful to classical scholars. Taking the brutal description at *Life* 1, P. offers parallels to its 'asyndetic' style, comparing Aesop to other ugly 'heroes'. Clearer definition of terms is desirable: Thersites, Archilochus' general (fr. 114 West) and Socrates are in what sense/s 'heroes'?

Chapter II, 'Recasting an Archetype: Croce's *Bertoldo*', is self-explanatory. Chapter III, '*Aesop Romance* and Picaresque Novel', compares the *Life* with *La Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes* (1554). P. concludes (p. 50) that there are similarities (style) and differences (content).

Chapter IV, 'Echoes of the *Aesop Romance* in Greek Shadow Theater', surprises. In Karaghiozes, a Turkish import, P. sees a 'genetic relation to or... dependence on' the Aesop-type (p. 73). P. raises questions about cultural influence, but we need to know more about readership and transmission of popular/folk literature.

There are few typographical errors, none significant; 'antedates or' should be deleted from 'if the *Life of Aesop* indeed antedates or is contemporary with the Greek romances' (p. 64). There is a full bibliography, indices, and a synopsis in Greek.

Newnham College, Cambridge VICTORIA JENNINGS

M. Bonnet, E. R. Bennett (edd.): *Diodore de Sicile:* Bibliothèque Historique, Livre XIV (Collection Budé). Pp. xxxvi + 227. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997. ISBN: 2-251-00459-9.

Owing to the relative obscurity of the period narrated (404–383 B.C.) and the survival of better sources like Xenophon's *Anabasis* and *Hellenica*, there have been few critical editions of Book 14 of Diodorus Siculus.

The MSS indicate a relatively unitary textual tradition, with two families of codices derived from the exemplars Codd. Patmiacus 50 (P) and Marcianus gr. 375 (M), both dating from around

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the end of the tenth century. These, together with two fifteenth-century codices, Scorialensis Σ.III.5 (S) and Laurentianus 70.12 (F), respectively direct and indirect apographs of P and M, form the basis of the new Budé edition. The apograph sample is rather too limited for resolution of all the textual problems. Notable among the MSS ignored by the editors are Besançon MS gr. 1, MS gr. 835; Elassona, M. Olympus MS gr. 103; Florence Riccar. MS gr. 33 (K.11.6); Geneva MS gr. 40; Leiden Perizon F 6; Munich MS gr. 7; Patmos M. Ioannou MS gr. 50; Vaticanus gr. 132 (Vatican City); and Venice append. gr. VII.8. For a more complete catalogue of MSS, see now R. E. Sinkewicz, *Manuscript Listings for the Authors of Classical and Late Antiquity*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies Greek Index Project Series 3 (Toronto, 1990) microfiche 002.

14.1–53 are edited by Martine Bonnet and 14.54–117 by Eric Bennett. A sample of the readings indicates the editors' generally conservative approach: 7.1 follows the consensus of the MSS in reading τὴν Σικελίαν... τῶν Σικελῶν, which may be the result of dittography (for Σικελῶν read Συρακουσῶν, but cf. 18.1); 8.5 adopts the reading Ἔλωρις (cf. 87.1, 103.5) for the name ofthe friend of Dionysius who originated the epigram καλὸν ἐντάφιόν ἐστιν ἡ τυραννίς (the probable source for Isocrates, *Archidamos* 45, and Theodora's famous exhortation to Justinian: Procopius, *BP* 1.38); 8.1 restores δεῖν after ἔφησεν (deleted by Vogel); 14.8 follows Hertlein in reading ψιλοὺς, 'light infantry', for φιλοὺς, which makes perfectly good sense tactically; at 16.1 τῶν ἀπόρων for τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν is logical and economical; 17.4 rejects Reiske's emendation (on the basis of Xen. *Hell*. 3.2.22) of Ἄγιν for Παυσανίαν (either reading is possible historically and B.'s discussion at p. 168 is inconclusive); Ἀρριδαῖος for Ἀριδαῖος at 22.5, 24.1, 24.7, and 26.3, 5 is clearly correct; for Φάλυνος at 25.1 read Φαλῖνος, which appears in F and is supported by Xen. *Anab*. 2.1.7; the lacuna in 28.5 is glossed over with Rhodoman's inadequate addition of <ἐν δὲ>; 83.4 rightly follows Reiske in reading στενά for στενὴν and Ortelius in reading Λώρυμα for Δώρυμα, despite the unanimity of the MSS; at 84.4 rejection of Reiske's reading μεταστάσεως and restoration of the *textus receptus* τοιαύτης δὲ τὴς καταστάσεως οὔσης σπουδή is not cogent, as it is obvious from the context that it was for revolt from Spartan hegemony, not stability, that the Greek states were eager; at 88.3 rejection of Dindorf's emendation of the MSS ἀθρόως to ἀθρόων, as required by both the tactical context and Diodorus' genitive absolute, is not cogent; emendation of the MSS πόλεως to Πέλλης at 92.2 is unjustified; 94.1 correctly omits the καὶ inserted by PS between Πόπλιος and Κορνήλιος, to restore the name Publius Cornelius (cf. Livy 5.24.1); and ἐν at 100.3 ad fin. (deleted by Post) is rightly restored.

The editors provide a useful introduction (pp. vii–xxxvi), with discussions of Diodorus' sources, his chronology (illustrated with chronological tables), and the historiographical value and literary merits of the book. As befits a Budé edition, the editorial work is of a very high order, but—an Oxonian quibble—the inimitable Tony Andrewes (p. xxxvi) was *Wykeham* Professor of Ancient History at Oxford. The interfaced French translation is an accurate rendition of Diodorus' text, but the notes on the manuscript tradition (pp. xxxiii–v) are much too brief for the complexity of the issues raised by the text. Pp. 153–206 are devoted to predominantly historical and historiographical notes on the text. The discussion (p. 171) of Diodorus' description (14.21) of the strategically important Cilician–Syrian Gates and their environs is woefully inadequate: see now Devine, *AncW* 12 (1985), 26. Map 3 (illustrating the March of the Ten Thousand) places the Gates (with the Beilan Pass at their southern extremity) too far north, wrongly linking them with the town of Issus, which in fact lies at the northern end of the coastal plain fringed by the Amanus range. Thapsacus, whose location is still conjectural, must have lain further north than shown: D. W. Engels, *Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1978), pp. 66–7, 158, map 6.

The narrative of the battle of Cunaxa (pp. 22–4) provides the best sample in this book of Diodorus' tactical terminology, evidently derived from his source here, the 'universal historian' Ephorus (22.2). As I argued in I. Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 89–102, analysis of the battle-narratives in Hellenistic historians, as regards vocabulary and level of understanding of events narrated, enables us to distinguish and to reconstruct their sources. Diodorus, Books 18–20, preserves the characteristically Hellenistic tactical terminology of Hieronymus of Cardia, while Diodorus' account of the Cunaxa campaign, by contrast, is characterized by 'classicizing' usage.

All in all, this is a highly serviceable edition of an important author and goes a long way towards superseding the older, mostly German, editions on which fourth-century historians have hitherto relied.

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto A. M. DEVINE

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

D. KONSTAN, D. CLAY, C. E. GLAD, J. C. THOM, J. WARE: *Philodemus*, On Frank Criticism. Pp. xi + 191. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1998. Cased, $34.95. ISBN: 0-7885-0434-7.

Philodemus might naturally be thought to be of most interest to students of later Greek education, but his close connection with the Pisones and his broad acquaintance with many major figures of late Republican letters make him also a significant figure in first-century Roman letters. Recently, however, he has caught the attention of New Testament scholars, intrigued by apparent similarities between his presentation of Epicurean communal education and that implied by Christian texts. It is members of this last group who have produced this introduction to and translation of his ethical treatise, *Περὶ Παρρησίας*, known frequently by the Latin title *De libertate dicendi*. It describes itself as the epitome of the lectures (*σχολαί*) of Zeno, and presents *παρρησία* as the virtue and duty of the philosopher, avoiding both flattery and harshness, and bringing ethical salvation to his pupils. It has recently fallen out of fashion to refer to the text by a literal English translation of the Latin: as the translators rightly reiterate, the *παρρησία* of the title refers to the liberty of speech exercised by friends or associates criticizing one another. It has little if anything to do with political rights.

The text was edited from charred papyrus remains discovered in the 'Piso' house in Herculaneum by Alexander Olivieri in 1914, but not, until now, translated into a modern language. This is not a new edition: while some small changes have been made, the authors do notclaim to have made emendations on palaeographic grounds. The principal stated aim of this book is to provide a reliable translation, and it does so admirably. Not only is it accurate, it also provides clear guidance through the complexities of textual problems, while explaining concisely the grounds for editorial decisions. Alphabetical indices (in Greek and English) provide references for all significant words in the text—this is especially useful where the progression of the argument is barely if at all preserved in the order of the fragments, and navigation by memory therefore virtually impossible.

The translators also claim, however, to be providing an introduction and brief commentary, and in these regards classicists will find the book quite frustrating. Philodemus' significance for Roman history and letters is almost entirely ignored. Cicero is mentioned once in a footnote tothe introduction, but that omits reference to *In Pisonem* 68–72, almost universally regarded asa description of Philodemus; no mention whatsover is made of Lucretius or Horace. More could perhaps have been said in the introduction about the form of the text. We are told that it isthe 'transcript of lecture notes [Philodemus] took at Zeno's classes in Athens', but it is not unreasonable to ask questions about the nature of the transcription, about what Philodemus did and thought between hearing the lectures and writing his book. Are the words really Zeno's, and, if not, why present them as such? What similarity, if any, does the description of a community of philosophical associates criticizing one another freely have to any which Philodemus or Zeno actually participated in?

The translation, which is the book's *raison d'être*, is extremely useful, but this volume should certainly not be thought in any way a companion to Dirk Obbink's recent edition of *De pietate.* The bibliography and references are satisfactory, but both could have been more substantial. It is throughout assumed that readers share the editors' reasons for interest in Philodemus, and little is provided for those who do not.

Brasenose College, Oxford LAURENCE EMMETT

J. L. MARR (ed., trans.): *Plutarch: Life of Themistocles* (Classical Texts). Pp. 172. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1998. Paper, £13.25. ISBN: 0-85668-677-8.

Marr's book advances scholarship little but adequately meets its modest goal of filling a gap in the Aris & Phillips series of translations-with-commentaries for Plutarch's *Lives.* Its Greek text is that of Ziegler's Teubner (4th edn, 1969), with twenty-five differences noted at p. 7. Its good, rather literal translation avowedly owes much to Scott-Kilvert's Penguin Classic *Plutarch: the Rise and Fall of Athens* (1960) (I think more highly of Perrin's Loeb [1948] than Marr does). Its commentary similarly avowedly owes much to F. Frost's *Plutarch's Themistocles: a Historical Commentary* (Princeton, 1980). Its brief introduction refers the reader to other introductions in

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Aris & Phillips series for more detailed accounts of Plutarch's life, his position in the tradition of literary biography, and his literary devices. Such originality as the project claims depends upon its being 'the first English language edition which combines an introduction, text, translation, and commentary into a single volume'.

The 100 pages of commentary are articulated by passages of brief introduction to groups of chapters. The notes are on the whole concise, with more extended discussions of the ostracisms of Themistocles and Aristides, the recall of exiles before Salamis, Themistocles' indictment for treason, his arbitration between the Corcyreans and Corinthians, his trip to Sicily, the Athenian siege of Naxos, and Athenian involvement in Egypt. They direct the reader to some of the otherancient sources of relevance, and occasionally to scholarship. Given that sparse reference to thelatter is evidently a policy, it is largely pointless to complain about omissions, but I cannot contain my dismay at finding no reference, even in the two pages dedicated to bibliography of texts, editions, and general works, to Adolf Bauer's *Plutarchs Themistokles für quellenkritisch Übungen* (Leipzig, 1884), which was augmented and revised by the favoured Frost (Chicago, 1967). This superb alignment of the text of Plutarch's *Themistocles* with those of all relevant literary and epigraphical sources remains the single most powerful tool for the study of the biography and of the man, and should certainly have been advertised.

Marr declares his emphasis to be 'unashamedly historical' and makes it his chief task to discover what the real Themistocles actually did or did not do (the word 'unhistorical' is found often in the notes, and Plutarch can be 'uncritical and naïve' about the worth of sources). This doggedly 'empiricist' way of approaching the text is certainly an old one but the temptation to portray it as old-*fashioned* should be checked: someone at any rate must continue to keep the historian's conscience. This approach is probably the right one for the book's target audience, defined only as 'most[ly]... Greekless', but presumably A-level students and weaker undergraduates in the first instance. Yet when will we get a commentary on the *Themistocles* that takes a sympathetic (structuralist?) interest in the rich mythologized traditions it contains?

University of Wales, Swansea DANIEL OGDEN

R. WATERFIELD: *Plutarch: Greek Lives. A Selection of Nine GreekLives* (World's Classics). Pp. xxxviii + 490, 3 maps. Oxford andNewYork: Oxford University Press, 1998. Paper, £8.99. ISBN: 0-19-282501-1.

The *Lives* featured in this attractively produced addition to the Oxford World's Classics series are *Lycurgus*, *Solon*, *Themistocles*, *Cimon*, *Pericles*, *Nicias*, *Alcibiades*, *Agesilaus*, and *Alexander.* The translations are based upon the most recent Teubner editions of the texts; such different readings as have been adopted are tabulated in a three-page appendix. The translation is accurate and useable enough, although it is not always as literal as its occasional stiltedness suggests. In sample comparisons Ian Scott-Kilvert's Penguin versions did not seem further from the Greek yet read more easily, and perhaps reflected the tone of the original better.

The translations are accompanied by a considerable amount of rather good paraphernalia by Philip Stadter. The thirty-page general introduction succinctly discusses Plutarch's purpose; his selection of sources and compositional method; his development of 'integrated' characterization; his use and distribution of anecdotes; his ability to narrate sympathetically from the point of view of his protagonist; his moral open-mindedness; his 'wise adviser' motif and his conceptualization of himself in this rôle; and his place in the history of biography. Each *Life* also has (on average) nine pages of uncontroversial notes and a dedicated introduction, of up to six pages, which identifies the sources specific to it. Indeed, the attention to sources is the best feature of the volume, and the four-page index of sources cited by Plutarch (which directs to chapters in the *Lives* rather than pages in the volume) may even be of use to scholars for a quick reference. The bibliographies are healthy for a project of this nature.

It is regrettable that the publisher has subjected the texts of the *Parallel Lives* to the usual butchery, with the Greek *Lives* separated from their Roman counterparts (some of which appear in a companion volume of Roman *Lives*), and the linking Comparisons discarded as so much offal. What other ancient work is repeatedly treated with such disdain for its author's literary project? Stadter is conscious of this misuse: he apologetically reminds us that Plutarch perceived the pairs as single works, and that the parallelisms were fundamental in shaping the presentation

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of both *Lives* in the pair (pp. xi–xii); he dwells upon the relationship to the suppressed Roman parallel in his dedicated introductions to the individual *Lives*; he tabulates the broken pairs (p.383); and his observation that among the Greek *Lives* presented Cimon and Pericles on the one hand and Nicias and Alcibiades on the other form complementary pairs accordingly makes uncomfortable reading (p. xxv).

Also, the relative neglect of the fourth-century and the complete abandonment of the Hellenistic *Lives* is deplorable. Which *Life* is more thrilling than Demetrius'? One realizes what a service Penguin did for the promotion of fourth-century and Hellenistic studies by hitching a good selection of the *Lives* of these periods to the sales-engine of the *Alexander*.

University of Wales, Swansea DANIEL OGDEN

C. TORNAU: *Plotin* Enneaden VI 4–5 [22–23]. Pp. 519. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner,1998. Cased. ISBN: 3-519-07662-4.

Commentaries on treatises by Plotinus have in recent years outnumbered those on dialogues of Plato. Small wonder, for they are even less dispensable, and this volume owes its thickness to the subject, not to any undue prolixity in the treatment. Tornau's aims, as he states them on p. 11, are to expound the train of thought in every passage, to explain its place in the argument of the treatise and in the *Enneads* as a whole, and finally to determine its relation to its forerunners in Plato, Aristotle, and the Middle Platonists. He notes that the importance of the treatises is self-evident, as they are products of that period of Plotinus' life which Porphyry regarded as his acme, and that Porphyry's own testimony requires us to read the two books as a continuous meditation on the omnipresent unity of being (p. 9). His conclusion takes the form of a ten-page abstract of the treatises after nearly 500 pages of annotation; all readers of Plotinus will be aware that such a summary is as precious, as laborious, and as idiosyncratic as a poem. He wisely refrains from asking how Plotinus' thought would fare in the modern age (p. 12); to many it might seem strange that he even thinks of doing so, and perhaps it is only in Germany that living systems could be found commensurable with Neoplatonism. Philosophy in the English-speaking world abhors idealism even in the moderate form espoused by Aristotle, though it may be that its prejudice in favour of empirical perceptions is no longer underwritten by the postulates and discoveries of science.

It is the aim of every commentary to be at once intelligible, compendious, and precise. Wherethe scholar's chief task is collation, all these qualities are amply demonstrated in this volume. One might instance pp. 207–13, where a subtle braid of Aristotle, Plato, and the *Enneads* circumscribes the meaning of the words *eidolon*, *eikon*, and *indalma*. There are, however, three features that will render the book unduly difficult for many readers. First, there is no index of Greek terms—an indefensible omission for which we authors always blame the publisher. Secondly, the Greek is nowhere printed *in extenso*, and the student who does not already know the text by heart is therefore forced to take the commentary in one hand and the edition of Henry and Schwyzer in the other. Thirdly, T. misses no occasion to refer to his extensive bibliography, even when constraints of space oblige him to abbreviate or reserve his own position. One might wish, for example, that he had offered a more perspicuous account of his views on 'forms of individuals' (p. 387), or expanded his remarks on the word *hypostasis* (pp. 204–5) to match his fine discussion of its protean neighbour *logos* (pp. 226–7). The fact that such laconic passages are not the rule makes their occurrence all the more regrettable. Not everyone will have time to peruse the monographs of Spanish, Italian, French, and German writers on some detail of small interest to the treatise, and the few who have read them already will be even more desirous to hear a new opinion from the commentator. There is nothing in this book to make one fear that his judgement would be less fastidious than that of other scholars, or his knowledge less complete.

Christ Church, Oxford M. J. EDWARDS

C. M. J. SICKING: *Distant Companions. Selected Papers.* Pp. ix + 268. Leiden, etc.: Brill, 1998. Cased, $82.50. ISBN: 90-04-11054-2.

This volume collects sixteen essays on a wide range of topics. Two papers on Protagoras ('Homo or philosophus mensura?', 'Plato's *Protagoras*: a "Battle of Wits"?') appear here for the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

first time; the others are reprinted, but in revised form. Two ('Pindar's First *Olympian*', 'Pericles' Funeral Oration and Last Speech as Political Documents') first appeared in English; another ('Aristophanes laetus?', on the *Peace*) is reprinted in the original German. Ten papers originally published in the Dutch journal *Lampas* now appear in English for this first time: 'Solon on Wealth' (on Solon fr. 13W); 'Oedipus and Teiresias' (on Sophocles' *OT*); 'Aristotle and Sophocles' *Electra*' (which, starting from an excellent exposition of Aristotle, considers the apparent inconsistency between the play and Aristotelian principles: S. characteristically declines to stop with the obvious and superficial conclusion, and probes illuminatingly beyond it; his diagnosis of the play's weakness is one with which I concur); 'Admetus' Case' (on Euripides' *Alcestis*); 'Jason's Case' (Euripides' *Medea*, a valuable contribution); 'Preplatonic, Platonic and Aristotelian Poetics of Imitation' (the argument that Plato's critique of poetry 'was largely inspired by the innovations in mimetic art of around 400' [p. 98] surely fails to do justice to its radical nature; and Plato's focus on Homer suggests a very different conclusion); 'Plutarch's Literary Theory' (an account of *De audiendis poetis* too profoundly unsympathetic toPlutarch's project to shed much light); 'Aristotle and Herodotus'; 'Lucian, Cicero and Historiography'; and 'The Classicists' Nostalgia' (an interesting discussion of ways in which classical scholars of the eighteenth century sought to cope with the changing social and intellectual context of their discipline; the interpretation of Wolf complements that in Grafton's *Defenders of the Text*). A further contribution to the history of classical scholarship, also translated from Dutch, is devoted to Cobet.

Inevitably I do not always agree with S.'s conclusions, but I value his unfailing lucidity and good sense, and the clarity of thought which enables him to deflate flawed interpretations with elegant economy. So I am pleased that these essays have been collected and made more accessible. One thing causes me regret: whenever I found myself thinking that it would be good to put one of the essays in the hand of my students, I soon came across a bit of untranslated Greek, Latin, German, or French that would defeat them. S. apologizes, with undue modesty, for his English style; but he perhaps underestimates the extent to which 'those whose privilege it is that the *lingua franca* of today happens to be their mother tongue' (p. ix) allow themselves, in consequence of that privilege, to cut themselves off from other languages. Our fault, not his.

University of Leeds MALCOLM HEATH

G. Luck (ed.): *Albii Tibulli Aliorumque Carmina* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana). Pp. xliv + 417. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998 (edn 2; edn 1, 1988). Paper. ISBN: 3-519-11864-5.

Of Luck's first edition of these poems, our reviewer, J. L. Butrica, said that perhaps a corrected reprint could be considered. Ten years on, here it is, with a much expanded list of MSS. The second edition has been newly reset, though the *mise-en-page* of the poems and apparatus is a replica of the first. I have combed through the first five poems of the first book for changes, and can report that they are numerous, though in the main L. has chosen his reading from within a variety of long-available options; my impression is that he is now even more willing than he was before to accept a conjecture into the text. One such is A. D. Lee's *nunc* at 5.47 (*hunc* in the apparatus should not be italicized, for it is a MS reading). Further conjectures are added to the apparatus, e.g. at 1.55 and 4.44. L. has followed Butrica's advice (and presumably, where he is convinced, that of other reviewers of the previous edition) in dropping from the apparatus criticus *aestus* at 1.27 and a ghost MS at 5.62, and from the text his own conjectures at 4.34 (*stulte*) and 5.47 (*at*). He has clarified a critical note at 2.1.83–4, which was queried by Butrica. He has added *loci similes* at 5.42 (but they do not seem to resolve the issue). The text does not entirely represent his change of mind in at least one instance: at 2.37 the apparatus has been rearranged to suggest that the first word of the line should now be *ne*, but *neu* is still printed as in the first edition; at 1.45 *ed* is a clear misprint. Readers will of course still occasionally prefer a different text; a doubt of my own occurs at 1.78: L. first printed *despiciam dites*, but now reverses the word order, which strikes me as unTibullian (cf. 1.4.82, 1.7.64, 2.5.100).

King's College London ROLAND MAYER

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

G. W. SHEA: *Delia and Nemesis: The Elegies of Albius Tibullus. Introduction, Translation and Literary Commentary.* Pp. xiii + 150. Lanham, New York, and Oxford: University Press of America, 1998. Paper, $26.50. ISBN: 0-7618-1226-1.

Shea states his rationale and main aims on p. vii of his preface: to help Latinless readers enjoy the poetry of Tibullus, they need an accurate and appealing translation together with historical, cultural, and mythological data, to facilitate understanding of the text, and some guidance in a critical reading of the poetry; so each poem receives an introduction to give the background, followed by a translation and a brief literary commentary. The rationale and aims are admirable. Unfortunately the execution leaves much to be desired, and this book does not adequately represent or interpret the poetry of Tibullus for those without Latin (who are still best served by Guy Lee's *Tibullus: Elegies*).

The text translated is that of Putnam 'with a few exceptions' (not noted anywhere). S. produces short lines with 'a loose iambic rhythm' varying in length from two to six feet. While these fail to suggest the overall regularity of the elegiac couplets and drastically increase the number of lines per poem, some readers will find them conducive to ease of flow. There are some felicities and insights in the translation: on p. 26 'fields/ That are alive with song, alive with dance,/ Where, here and there, the wandering birds/ Set slender throats aquiver with sweet song' does justice to the melodious sound of 1.3.59f.; on p. 87 'let your shining bosom, Peace,/ Teem with tumbling fruit' catches well the alliteration and homoeoteleuton in 1.10.68; and on p. 140 'and then/ I die with longing and anxiety' astutely brings out the two senses to the noun in *tunc morior curis* at 2.6.51. S. aims at a colloquial style to achieve accessibility, and this does often work. But at times thecolloquialisms are so outmoded as to be quaint (e.g. 'swinging set', 'flower child', and 'rot') orjarringly anachronistic (e.g. sabres, buttoned-up nightgowns, and legionnaires). And one is frequently brought up short by stilted English (e.g 'May given love, love taken too/ Preserve you mine when I am gone'), syntactical oddities (e.g. 'I hope my head will glow with white,/ An aged man who tells his tales/ of days gone by') and unclear expression ('Falernia, that lies in Bacchus' palm' for *Bacchi cura Falernus ager*, etc.). Overall the versions are very loose, with no particular gains from the freedom, but with clear losses (when significant words in the Latin are not translated, as at 1.3.4f., 1.9.58, 2.1.70, and so on). Many of S.'s interpretations of the sense and connotations seem to me dubious, and there are definite errors in translation. Apart from his consistently cavalier treatment of moods and tenses, I count thirty-nine mistakes (e.g. *gratia magna Iovi* = 'Give thanks to mighty Jupiter', *pace bidens vomerque nitent* = 'In peace, the two-edged plough shines bright', and *Delos ubi nunc, Phoebe, tua est, ubi Delphica Pytho?* = 'Where, Phoebus, is your Delos now?/ Where Delphi, Pytho too?').

S. holds out the prospect of new and stimulating imaginative insights in the literary commentary, but what we get is mainly quite basic discussion of structure and repeated motifs inindividual elegies together with rather vague and rambling remarks on instability, change, andthepassage of time (which are supposedly major preoccupations of Tibullus). Although the avoidance of problems of text and interpretation makes for an uncluttered flow and some of the observations are interesting (e.g. on motion as a theme in 1.5), I am afraid that there is much that is woolly, fanciful, and plainly wrong here. So despite the clear delineation of her as an *anus* at 58 and 63f., S. claims that Delia's *mater* in 1.6 was middle-aged, to abet his schema of three groups (young, middle-aged, and old men and women) presented as 'a kind of calculus of age and sexuality' in the poem. He presents 2.1 as 'a meditation upon the elemental and irrational forces [including wolves and weeds] that pervade all human existence', and maintains that with the allusion to night, sleep, and dreams at 2.1.87ff. Tibullus has 'brought us to the edge of the abyss, the very abyss with which the civilized ritual he depicted was designed to cope and coexist'. And S. sees 1.2 as the drunken ramblings of the poet at a party or tavern, and also (somehow) a paraclausithyron, in which doors stand for vaginas (including the door of Venus' temple on which Tibullus offers to plant kisses and bang his head).

McMaster University P. MURGATROYD

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

R. W. LAMB: *Annales Phaedriani 1596–1996. A Bibliography of Phaedrus*. Pp. xiii + 143. Lowestoft: published by the author, 1998 (and obtainable from him at Talbot House, 158 Denmark Rd, Lowestoft NR32 2EL, UK). Paper, £11. ISBN: 0-95333610-7.

This unassuming checklist of 1128 published editions and studies on the *Fables* of Phaedrus isa labour of love from a dedicated bookman and historian of scholarship, and delivers a challenge to the community of professional Latinists. Chronological arrangement into eight periods covering four centuries since Pithou's *editio princeps* shows up a stark pattern of rise, through the eighteenth-century celebrity of Burman and Bentley, to the late nineteenth-century zenith of Lucien Müller, Hervieux, and Havet, followed by precipitous fall into the virtual blank of our times, with hardly a twentieth-century edition worthy of the name.

Lamb distributes sound information and acute insight between a lively introductory survey andthe individual entries (which are substantial where appropriate: a page each for the giants, thefacts rubbing shoulders with the foibles). There are the makings here of a curious history, for the editors of Phaedrus 'provide a collection of scholars of whom many are unrivalled for their strangeness and eccentricity' (p. i), and L. peeks expertly into every physical nook and conceptual cranny of their books. Highlights include heated flurries between Bentley, Hare, and Burman in1726–7, and Cassitto's sinister skulduggery against Iannelli in 1808–12. Authors of contributions are fully indexed; so too places of publication. The booklet is boon and spur to Phaedrian studies.

King's College, Cambridge JOHN HENDERSON

P. HOWELL (ed.): *Martial: The Epigrams: Book V* (Classical Texts). Pp. iv + 172. Warminister: Aris & Phillips, 1995. Cased, £35/$49.95 (Paper, £11.95/$19.95). ISBN: 0-85668-589-5 (0-85668-560-9 pbk).

This book comes as a welcome addition to Peter Howell's more substantial commentary on Martial Book I (London, 1980). Originally commissioned by JACT, the book was later taken on by Aris & Phillips and adapted to suit their house-style. A clear and succinct introduction sets Martial's work in its historical and literary context, with sections on Martial's relations with Domitian, the dating of Book V (to December A.D. 89 or 90), the text, the metre, and Martial's place in the development of epigram. The text is accompanied by a brief critical apparatus and a facing prose translation. The commentary is to the point, providing clear guidance on matters of interpretation, *realia*, and literary background for students who may be tackling Martial for the first time. The listing of parallels is kept to a minimum and discussion of alternative or mistaken interpretations is avoided except where absolutely necessary (as at p. 158, where H. is surely right to question E. Gowers's over-imaginative interpretation of 5.78 in *The Loaded Table* [Oxford, 1993], pp. 250–5).

Some features of the layout disconcert, especially the indiscriminate mixture of lemmata in the notes from the Latin and the English versions of the text. To take a random example, p. 149 (notes on epigram 65) offers the following lemmata, with no distinction of typeface:

> 3 ceroma: 5 was accustomed: 6 non rectas: 7 quota pars: 8 in the morning:

This must be confusing for Latinless readers. Perhaps the Latin lemmata should have been set in brackets or in a different type, and they surely need to be translated.

The metre of the poems is discussed generally in pp. 8–9 of the introduction, but, as students are now often unsure of these matters, more help with the metrical schemes of the elegiacs, hendecasyllables, and scazons should perhaps have been provided, and the metre of each epigram should have been named in the commentary.

The prose translation is for the most part clear and accurate. Occasionally a word is not explained or translated (e.g. 5.1.4 *plana*), and at 5.16.14 the translation 'reader' for *causidicum* must be a misprint for 'pleader'. Otherwise the translation fulfils pretty well the rôle assigned to it by H. of 'assisting the understanding of the Latin' (Preface, p. iv). However, different readers have different requirements and no one translation will suit them all. A good prose translation will

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

undoubtedly help students of Latin to a better understanding of Martial's meaning, but it mayleave students of Classics in Translation with little feeling for Martial as poetry. Short of providing both prose and verse versions, which is clearly impractical, I do not see any solution to this problem.

Even the best commentary, as H. himself is well aware (Preface, p. iv), cannot satisfy all its readers. My own preference would have been for slightly more discussion of Martial's attitude to, and borrowings from, Catullus and the Augustan elegists. At 5.2.3 some reference in the notes tothe use of the term *nequitia* in elegy (Gallus, Propertius, and Ovid) would perhaps have thrownmore light on Martial's meaning. The note on *libellus* at 5.6.12–15, with its interesting reference to the use of *libellus* as a 'petition', should surely have brought in Catullus 1.1, and mention of the poet's poverty contrasted with *innumeros... greges* at 5.13.1 and 8 deserves at least a passing reference to Tibullus 1.1, where his present *paupertas* 5 is contrasted with his previous *innumeros... iuvencos* 21. Although H. discusses Martial's employment of *variatio* inthe arrangement of the poems in a book (Introduction, pp. 8–9), it seems to me that in somecases another organizational principle may be work. I suggest that proper names may act as a link between adjacent poems. For example, poem 43 about *dentes* 'teeth' is followed by poem 44 addressed to *Dento*. Poem 45, addressing *Bassa*, is followed by poem 46, beginning *basia*. That poem ends with *ames* and the following poem 47 opens with an address to *Philo* (Greek for *amo*). I hope to discuss other examples of this in Martial elsewhere.

All in all, H. has produced a text and commentary which has much to contribute both as a teaching aid and as a research tool on Martial.

University of Leeds ROBERT MALTBY

H. P. Obermayer: *Martial und der Diskurs über männliche 'Homosexualität' in der Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit*. Pp. xiv + 378. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1998. Paper, DM 96. ISBN: 3-8233-4877-9.

The study of Roman, as distinct from Greek, sexuality has finally begun to come into its own. An important part of this process has been a new attention to previously marginalized texts. Experiencing a renaissance of his own, Martial is perhaps the single richest source for sexually explicit Latin literary texts, but his homoerotic epigrams have not had the impact on our understanding of sexual mores that they ought. J. P. Sullivan's landmark study of the poet, for example, gives surprisingly little space to homosexual themes in Martial. Accordingly, a book taking this important subject as its sole topic is a welcome addition to the study of Roman sexual attitudes and practices.

In *Martial und der Diskurs über männliche 'Homosexualität' in der Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit*, H. P. Obermayer has attempted to analyze the various homoerotic themes and motifs in Martial and related literature, both by comparing the epigrams to earlier and contemporary literature (especially Catullus, Petronius, the *Carmina Priapea*, and the pederastic poems of the *Greek Anthology*), and by interpreting individual poems from a narratological perspective drawn from Genette. Obermayer summarizes his goal in this way: 'Gegenstand der vorliegenden Untersuchung ist die Darstellung der gleichgeschlechtlichen Interessen, Neigungen und Aktivitäten von Personen männlichen Geschlects, die sich in der Literatur der zweiten Hälfte des ersten Jahrhunderts n. Chr., vor allem bei Martial und seinem literarischen Umfeld, erhalten hat.' This admirable and ambitious project offers interested readers much food for thought, but also suffers from several serious flaws.

The book consists of an introduction and seven chapters, each of which covers a major category of homoerotic topoi: '*Persona Martialis*: Der Ich-Sagende als Begehrender von Personen männlichen Geschlects', 'Der Übergang von *puer* zum *vir*: Das Motiv "Haartracht-Bartwuchs-Körperbehaarung" ', 'Ausgrenzung des Anus—Totem und Tabu: Die Lust der *pathici*', 'Der strafende Phallus: Sexuelle Praktiken als Strafe—Strafe für sexuelle Praktiken', 'Das Motiv desunreinen Mundes bei Martial', 'Die Invektiven gegen *pathici* bei Martial', and 'Männliche Impotenz'.

Structure is a problem: while O. derives each category from the poems themselves, his attempt to use them as a general framework for discussion of homosexuality in Martial strikes one as rather arbitrary, especially since certain epigrams are treated in several of the chapters. For

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

instance, after reading the first chapter, in which O. discusses poems treating the speaker's desirefor other males, one might expect (following O.'s own narratological signposts) Chapter IItocover poems in which the desire for men belongs to an addressee (second person) or to a third party. Instead O. gives us 'The Transition from Boy to Man'. Furthermore, none of these chapters is quite complete in itself.

Problematic too are O.'s narratological leanings. After the introduction, the narratology occurs mostly in parentheses—it plays little or no rôle in most of the interpretations. What O. does do instead is provide (sometimes) detailed readings of poems from a more or less philological or social-historical perspective. The book would have been more useful perhaps if O. had simply organized it as a set of essays on poems and groups of poems of Martial.

The biggest problem is that O. has tried to do too much. He switches between simply categorizing poems under various headings and sub-headings, interpreting individual poems in some depth, reviewing recent scholarship on ancient sexuality, and discussing the literary and social background of Martial's *oeuvre*. The book is, therefore, rough going, and many readers will find themselves picking through the index for individual discussions.

All of this is to be regretted, because there is much of real interest here. O. has much of value to say in his introduction (pp. 1–16), and in the discussion of the natural or social origin of sexual passivity (pp. 145–61). There are useful insights too in the discussion of certain pederastic epigrams (e.g. the Dindymus and Hedylus poems, pp. 69–78) as programmatic, though here O. could certainly have gone further. The author is at his best when discussing sexual matters generally or when interpreting individual texts; unfortunately, his attempt at completeness means that much of value has been relegated to the footnotes so that the text proper can include brief mention of poems which O. otherwise neglects. Erudition is certainly not lacking, and the book will be valuable to some just for the evidence marshaled in it and for the bibliography it contains. O. is a perceptive reader of others' work, and his book is certainly worth consulting for that alone. Despite its flaws, then, *Martial und der Diskurs über männliche 'Homosexualität'* constitutes a worthwhile addition to the study of Roman sexuality.

Smith College CHRISTOPHER NAPPA

J. W. GEYSSEN: *Imperial Panegyric in Statius: A Literary Commentary on* Silvae 1.1. (Studies on Themes and Motifs in Literature, 24.) Pp. xii + 172. New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 1996. Cased, £29. ISBN: 0-8024-2870-1.

Geyssen has produced a valuable study of one facet of the *Silvae* of Statius, which both instructs and corrects. A Duke dissertation of 1992 has been revised and (he hopes) 'strengthened by experience' (p. xi). The new version that has emerged naturally has some oftheweaknesses and advantages we associate with dissertations. The style lacks lustre at timesand minor points may be treated disproportionately. On the other hand, there is good documentation and the central objective of the work is kept firmly in view.

G. begins by reminding us that there has been a tendency among scholars to see Statius' panegyrics of Domitian as to be excused rather than appreciated as poems. To combat this negative and unhistorical approach is, he argues, both desirable and possible; and there is no need to resort to the untenable view that the poet was at some surreptitious or 'ironic' level attacking the emperor. Indeed, G.'s book may be seen as a strong but measured counterblow against those who still have lingering sympathy for the analysis of Statius as a crypto-revolutionary in the 1960s style.

G., as others before him, treats laudation of the ruler as more or less a subdivision of the broader encomiastic genre, that has acquired in its own history a set of rules and a game-plan that were or could later be formalized. It was from within, therefore, that innovation had to start and,for G., Statius is indeed an innovator, producing imperial panegyrics that differed radically from Augustan precedent. To demonstrate this 'novelty' of approach, as he sees it, G. examines indepth *S*.1.1 (the 'Equus Maximus'), though with many discussions of and comparisons with Statius' other poems in honour of the last Flavian.

After juxtaposing Statius and Propertius (2.31), G. concludes that 'the innovative quality of Statius' poem in terms of *ekphrasis* and myth must be unquestioned' (p. 10). Statius was 'not... content merely to describe an object', and the description was not 'simply an ornamental device,

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

embedded in the poem'. What then? 'Rather, the monument itself became the poem's *raison d'être*.' The gist of the argument is fair enough; but a poem may of course have more than one reason for existing. G. continues by emphasizing the importance of the object's setting (*sedes*). This is to be viewed not only in physical terms (Domitian's statue is close to monuments recalling Julius Caesar, and so forth), but equally conceptually (the association of the imperial *equus* with figures and tales from myth and with the literary treatments of them, well exemplified by G. in a chain of Virgilian allusions). This double approach to the *sedes*—which G. calls 'explicit' and 'implicit' (p. 11)—provides him with 'a new way of interpreting Statius' Domitianic poems'.

Praise through an object is most certainly Statius' favoured literary form, and he was a master of the technique. It was not for emperors only. In a sense, the great are reflected in what they possess; the shields of Achilles and of Aeneas were after all given to them because they were no ordinary mortals. Eulogy by *ekphrasis* is, therefore, a natural extension of that greatness in wealth and status that enables individuals to appropriate costly villas and art-objects: or, in the case of rulers, of the power by which they carry out public works or wage wars, and so receive marks of gratitude like statues from their loyal subjects. Before Christianity, with rare exceptions, eminence implied wealth, which implied the material adjuncts of that wealth. Statius, we might say, uses this nexus as a literary dynamic. The person and the thing are inseparable. The thing and the poem are both ostensive, ostentatious.

G. pursues his germinal idea throughout the 'literary commentary'. Readers should not allow disagreement on lesser points (unavoidable as they must be) to obscure his central thesis. Henri Bremond (*Histoire litt. du sentiment religieux en France*... iii.491) pointed out that critics know more of the beauties—we may add subtleties—of poems than ever their authors did. A boon and a peril. G. has certainly made sense of poems many have found distasteful and does not forget that they are poems. We are free to develop or to disagree: but, whichever, we shall have profited.

University of London D. W. T. VESSEY

P. GREEN (trans.): *Juvenal. The Sixteen Satires.* Pp. lxvii + 252. London: Penguin Books, 1998 (3rd revised edn; first edn published 1967). Paper, £7.99. ISBN: 0-14-044704-0.

Substantial revision has ensured that this new edition is to be assessed in its own right. The preface is entirely new. It depicts the 'metamorphosis' (G.'s word) of the irreverent dilettante, a dweller on Lesbos who enjoyed spear-fishing, into a full-time university professor in Texas. The first edition of the Penguin Juvenal belongs to the end of his first period.

In the first section of his introduction G. continues to accept Gilbert Highet's reconstruction of Juvenal's life (1954), in which banishment by *deportatio* in A.D. 93 to Upper Egypt for having lampooned an imperial favourite was followed by the return to Rome on the death of Domitian in A.D. 96 of a pauper eager for revenge. It is unfortunate that the inexperienced student should be offered without qualification this novelistic hypothesis, based on a discredited short ancient *Vita*. G. admits but brushes aside the hard evidence that men who committed lesser offences against Domitian's majesty were executed (p. xix).

In the next section G. explores Juvenal's social attitudes. He accepts Courtney's analysis of Umbricius' views of Rome in *Sat*. 3 (Commentary [London, 1980], pp. 150–5) as corresponding in many respects to those of the author himself as a narrow snob who despised the public tasks necessary for the healthy management of the state, but believed himself to be entitled to easy access to unearned financial resources.

In discussing style G. refers back to Lucretius' 'neurotic method of exposition' (p. liii) as parallel for Juvenal's moral purpose. He recognizes Lucan's general importance for Juvenal, but neglects him as precedent for satirical invective in hexameters (esp. 10.104–71). More attention should be given to Juvenal as a declamatory satirist whose work received public recitation. G.'s handling of Juvenal's comment on Domitian's incest is an adroit piece of literary criticism (p. liv).

The text translated by G. is basically that of Clausen; words obelized are rendered by the most plausible substitute. He shows good judgement in the places where he departs from the OCT, as at 11.112, where he accepts Nisbet's emendation *tacitamque* for (*media*) *mediamque* of the MSS. G.'s chosen verse form for his translation is a variable six-stress line, with latitude in the number and position of stresses (p. lxii). The understanding of Juvenal's often oblique mythological and historical references is facilitated either by the insertion of a short, explanatory phrase or by the substitution of a 'representative type' for proper names, e.g. 'lesser informers' for Massa and

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Carus (1.35–6). This offers smooth simplicity for the general reader, but many will prefer the closer proximity to the original in Rudd's verse translation (Oxford, 1992).

In his translation G. achieves a consistent vitality both in narrative, such as Eppia's elopement with a gladiator (6.82–113), and in argumentation, e.g. the deficiencies of those of high birth in contrast to the success of lower classes (8.39–86). He aims for the spirit of the meaning by a free rendering of the words with idiomatic turns of phrase. Some examples of verbal detail mainly from *Sat.* 1 will illustrate his method: *Tuscum | figat aprum* (22–3) 'pig-sticking up-country'; *causidici Mathonis* (31) 'shyster lawyer Matho', where the all too topical American slang is most telling; cf. *qui spoliet te* (3.302) 'cat-burglar'. Less successful: *equos Auruncae flexit alumnus* (1.20) 'Auruncan blazed'; better keep the original metaphor, 'drove his team', as Rudd; *in praecipiti* (1.148) is not 'zenith', as G., but up to the edge of a vertiginous precipice.

In addition to a general bibliography, the notes to each satire are preceded by a special list of items relevant to that poem. Some notes are concentrated, e.g. on the *pompa circensis* (10.42), others more generous in their scope, as on Democritus and Epicurus (10.33). At 6.1 essential information about *Saturno rege* is missing, but is to be found in the expansive note on 13.31–41 on the same theme (p. 203). G.'s long note at 15.174 on Pythagorean beans suggests material for an urbane and discursive seminar; cf. the Aegean bird lore at 11.128.

Wider literary issues arise from G.'s introduction. More scholars than his Cambridge contemporaries share a dislike of such procedures and terminology as 'deconstruction of authorial intention'. While the writer may distance himself from speakers in his work, the elaborate complexities applied to the notion of the *persona* cause disquiet (p. lxv). But G. is most unwise to assert that 'source hunting is generally unprofitable' (p. liii). It is necessary for the inexperienced reader of Juvenal to realize the importance of his predecessors in the genre and the multiplicity of relevant literary parallels and associations. Fortunately G.'s notes are helpful in explaining these and other aspects of Juvenal's experience.

University College London MICHAEL COFFEY

C. HEUSCH: *Die Achilles-Ethopoiie des Codex Salmasianus. Untersuchungen zu einer spätlateinischen Versdeklamation.* Pp. 238. Paderborn, etc.: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1997. Paper, DM 48. ISBN: 3-506-79062-5.

Clear testimony to the resilience of classical culture in late antiquity is a Latin hexameter declamation from Vandal North Africa representing the reaction of Achilles on Scyros to Diomedes' trumpet-call to arms. Homer's brooding and terrible hero here lingers in the women's quarters to articulate his response, his distinctive passionate language (Griffin, *JHS* 106 [1986]) now transformed with neoteric artistry (p. 57), his thoughts spiked with Stoic sentiment and devoid of tragic overtones (pp. 67–70). This new Achilles is, of course, the product of over a millenium's evolution, whose several aspects H. meticulously documents in her preliminary studies (pp. 13–89).

The eighty-nine-line poem survives only in the late eighth-century Italian uncial manuscript, acquired by Claude de Saumaise (Salmasius) in 1615, which forms the core of our *Anthologia Latina.* H. has no new light to shed on the history of this manuscript, and accepts Vössing's viewthat the author of the Achilles *ethopoeia* knew Dracontius' work, which ties it to the Carthaginian *Ur*-collection and indicates a date between about 490 and the Vandal collapse in 533/4 (pp. 18, 60).

Ethopoeic declamation flourished in late antiquity and many Greek and Latin examples survive (although none on this exact topic: pp. 47–9). In the East it continued into the middle Byzantine period when biblical themes became common—Nicephorus Basilakes has the Virgin commenting on the miracle at Cana—but myth too remained a rich quarry, even among ecclesiastics: the *codex Salmasianus* includes fifty-three hexameters of Dracontius spoken by Hercules struggling with the hydra. Our piece is, however, one of the last from the West and the only western one centred on Achilles, although Ennodius has Thetis appeal to him on Scyros. In art Achilles' Scyros-sojourn begins with the Niobe-painter, but is commonest on sarcophagi, where his relinquishment of women's clothing symbolizes conquest of death (pp. 81–4); Lucian and Libanius record that it was also a theme for ballet and pantomime (p. 80).

The poem's closest links are, however, arguably with epic, where farewell scenes begin with

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*Iliad*6 and ethopoeic soliloquy becomes increasingly common: Statius' unfinished *Achilleid* provides a Scyrian instance as the transvestite hero berates himself by night for his absence from war even as he recognizes his passion for Deidamia (1.623–39). Our anonymous poem's anonymous interlocutor, who intervenes at 44 to oppose Achilles' resolve to go to war, is a figure familiar not only from diatribe (pp. 624) but also from Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*, one of several indications that this writer is not narrowly bound to Latin tradition.

The poet follows a traditional chronological arrangement for the *ethopoiia* (pp. 40–3), glancing back to Thetis' fearful recourse to disguise (1–3) and looking forward to deathless glory through Stoic *virtus* (30–6); this temporal sequence is elegantly reiterated in the mock-dialogue (44–77).

H. has re-examined the text and alters Shackleton Bailey's 1982 Teubner in several places (1, 12, 13, 41, 49, 58, 74, 83), with additional punctuation changes (38, 40, 41, 56, 82). (The Teubner's erroneous *sanguine* for *semine* [13] was noted by Courtney: p. 114). Her dense commentary, thecore of the study, elucidates textual, linguistic, stylistic, and literary issues, especially links with other versions of this story. The poem offers a fine subject for doctoral research on diverse topics, and H. has done a thorough job. But the *opusculum* totters somewhat under its weight of scholarship: in particular the introductory studies offer an impressive compilation, but perhaps disappoint in the little they have to tell that is strikingly new.

Royal Holloway, London MARY WHITBY

C. J. CLASSEN (trans. P. Landi): *Diritto, retorica, politica. La strategia retorica di Cicerone* (Collezioni di testi e di studi). Pp. 396. Bologna: Il Mulino, 1998. Paper, L. 52,000. ISBN: 88-15-05803-6.

C.'s important book *Recht Rhetorik Politik* (Darmstadt 1985; reviewed, e.g., by D. H. Berry in *JRS* 79 [1989], 198) is now available in Italian, translated by Paola Landi with the participation of C. (p. 8). Minor errors and misprints have been corrected (p. 13), and the section discussing Stroh's treatment of the *pro Cluentio* is omitted (pp. 106–19 of the original); otherwise the text, including the bibliography, is not altered (though the pagination has changed). There are in addition two pages of introduction by Lucia Calboli Montefusco (pp. 7–8), who expresses thehope that the book will be of interest outside the 'little world of scholars', and a new preface(pp. 13–18) by C., in which he takes account of reviews of the German edition and, in particular, responds to the criticisms of Schottlaender (in *Rhetorik* 7 [1988], 157–60). C. also notes, very briefly, the existence of some of the important work on Cicero to have appeared since 1986 (p. 16).

In short, Ciceronians who find Italian easier than German have reason to be grateful to the publishers, particularly given that the price is not extortionate.

University of Glasgow C. E. W. STEEL

N. RUDD (trans.), J. POWELL (ed.): *Cicero. The Republic and the Laws.* Pp. xliii + 242. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Paper, £6.99. ISBN: 0-19-283236-0.

Book covers cannot but obtrude, particularly in cases when one cannot remove the dust-jacket before getting down to serious scholarly activity. In the case of R.'s translation of the *Republic* and the *Laws* the reader gazes at an eighteenth-century fantasy view of the Pantheon, with the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius bizarrely to one side and the requisite masonry chunks and appealing small dog in the foreground. Above, the heading 'Oxford World's Classics'. It isamusing to compare it with Griffin and Atkins's translation of the *On Duties* (Cambridge, 1991): no pictures there, but a dynamically written title, in red, rises at an angle against a plain background; this is a 'Cambridge Text in the History of Political Thought'.

The aspirations these images embody could of course be analysed further, and in predictable directions. And the cover illustration of the R. & P. volume is rather unfortunate: it suggests the nostalgic search for a past which never existed, a view of Cicero's motives against which, in the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

case of the *Republic*, P. has rightly inveighed elsewhere (*CR* 46 [1996], p. 247), and which he and R. resist in their introduction. Moreover, these are texts which 'offer considerable rewards to themodern reader, and especially to the student of the history of political thought' (p. ix); so, forexample, the introduction concludes with the potential relevance of the Laws to modern environmental debates (p. xxxi). Escapism this is not.

The introduction covers the political circumstances and philosophical training which led Cicero to write in this genre, as well as the structure, literary affiliations, and purpose of each dialogue; there is also an illuminating section on the theory of Natural Law and its afterlife (pp.xxvii–xxxi). Cicero's independence, within the traditions of Greek political thinking, is emphasized (pp. xvii–xviii): his writing springs directly from his experience as a politician. Neither work envisages fundamental changes to the government of the Roman state, and the *rector rei publicae* is not a specific office, but a way of being a statesman to which all politicians can aspire (p. xxii).

The translation is crisp, accurate, and readable: it has no serious rival in English. In particular, R. captures well the slightly ponderous formality of the conversational exchanges. He deals with the problems of translating a difficult and fragmentary text confidently, and guides the reader through *lacunae* by means of brief summaries of what may have been in the missing sections, inserted into the translation in square brackets. And scholars will for the time being be using the translation as a guide to what P.'s OCT will look like, since '[m]any of the decisions taken [sc. inconstituting the text] will be reflected in the Oxford Classical Text which Jonathan Powell ispreparing' (p. vii). The translation is accompanied by a section of 'Explanatory Notes' (pp.174–221). There are also a full and very helpful bibliography, brief discussions of the Latin text and of the translation, a table of dates, an appendix on the Roman constitution, and a descriptive index of persons. The range of supporting material will do much to make the works accessible to students, with or without Latin.

In short, a very useful volume lies under the protective colouring, and one which should help to support the growing interest among anglophone scholars in Cicero's political philosophy as well as making these texts available and comprehensible to other interested parties.

University of Glasgow C. E. W. STEEL

D. R. Shackleton Bailey (ed., trans.): *Cicero:* Letters to Atticus. (Loeb Classical Library 7, 8, 97, 491.) Vol. I, Introduction, Letters 1–89; Vol. II, Letters 90–165A; Vol. III, Letters 166–281; Vol. IV, Letters 282–426, Appendix, Concordance, Glossary, Index, Maps (3). Pp. 343; 345; 343; 343. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1999. Cased, £12.95 (each). ISBN: 0-674-99571-6; 0-674-99572-4; 0-674-99573-2; 0-674-99540-6.

Professor Shackleton Bailey first published an edition of Books 9–16 of the *Letters to Atticus* in the Oxford Classical Text series in 1961. There followed a splendid seven-volume edition in the Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries series (1965–70), which contained the whole text with translation and commentary. This enterprise was enthusiastically reviewed by the late Frank Goodyear for *Gnomon*, and his reviews are handily reprinted in his *Papers on Latin Literature* (London, 1992). It would be impertinence in me to try to stand on his shoulders and express anything other than simple gratitude for the recombination of the text and brilliant translation—S. B. is a master of our difficult idiom—in the Loeb Library. For the two went their own ways: the text achieved a third edition in the Teubner series in 1987 (and variants from the Cambridge edition were conveniently tabulated there), and the translation was republished in the Penguin Classics series in 1978. As S. B. says in his introduction, pp. 21 and 23, the present translation is a thorough revision of that one, whilst the text is essentially that of the Teubner, with the admission of rather more conjectural readings (e.g. at 1.14.2 = 14 the second 'in senatu', which was proposed for deletion in the Teubner, is now put within square brackets and untranslated).

The *Letters* are chronologically ordered once again as in the Cambridge edition, rather than in

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

book order. The appendix and glossary in the last volume are helpful; in them S. B. explains Roman nomenclature (on which he has written) and dating methods, as well as some technical terminology of political and administrative life.

The *Letters* now appear in four volumes, where three had sufficed before, and yet there is no appreciable difference in the total number of pages. One has noticed this inflation in the Loeb series: the Martial is now in three volumes, where two had served before, and the *Minor Latin Poets* volume, always something of a whopper, is now bipartite. Still, at £12.95, each book is a good deal cheaper than a modern novel, which, after all, one might read but once. Here is excellent scholarship and fascinating matter at much lower cost.

King's College London ROLAND MAYER

F. E. ROMER: *Pomponius Mela's Description of the World.* Pp. ix + 165. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998. Paper, £15.95. ISBN: 0-472-08452-6.

Pomponius Mela is the author of the first surviving Latin work on geography, traditionally called *De Chorographia.* It was extensively used by Pliny the Elder and widely read in the age of discoveries. It then enjoyed a long 'Nachleben' as a school text, but was nearly forgotten after the invention of geography as a separate school subject in the nineteenth century. Mela is, after all, nothing more than a 'minor writer and popularizer', as Frank Romer states (p. 30) in his new translation, and Mela is sometimes 'simply wrong' (p. 97).

In recent years, however, Mela has been rediscovered: there are now, *inter alia,* a Latin–French edition (1988), a Spanish translation (1989, not mentioned by R.), and a Latin–German edition (1994), which has sold more than 7,000 copies in five years—ten times more than the new bilingual edition of Pliny's geographical books. Obviously, then, Mela has an appeal for modern readers. Thus, R.'s new translation will be a most welcome book for many, even though it is not 'the first English version in more than four hundred years' (p. 30)—Paul Berry's English translation was published in 1997.

R.'s well-written introduction concentrates on the author and his work. Here, R. suggests that Mela wrote as a young man, witness his 'jejune' style (p. 23) and 'inquisitiveness', which is 'real enough but is not very broad or imaginative' (p. 25). But does imaginativeness really increase with age, I wonder (at the unimaginative age of forty, blessed with four rather more imaginative children)? On a more serious point, R. claims that 'chorographia' was 'the Roman name for public maps' (p. 21, note the plural) and that the work's title therefore deliberately refers to one such public map, the so-called Map of Agrippa. However, the evidence for such a meaning in the time of the author is nil (the *OLD* gives the more probable translation 'a work of geography'), and anyway, 'chorographia' does not appear in Mela's text itself (we cannot be sure that it was the work's title, as R. admits on p. 8). Hence, R's further claims on the relation between Mela's text and the supposed Augustan 'public map' are not well founded.

The translation, however, is solid and reads fluently (if not exactly jejune, e.g. when, on p. 115, *quippe* is 'lo and behold!'); my favourite version is that of Latin *ergo* as, indeed, English 'ergo'(p.114). As always, textual problems present a difficulty for the translator: R. chooses either to ignore them (on p. 79 he translates the corrupt *Corynthya* in 2.35 as 'Erymenae' without an explanation; similarly, *ipparchius*, a gloss in 3.70, remains untranslated and unexplained onp.122), or to comment on them in a footnote (in 3.53 a medieval scribe, having copied Mela'sclaim that the Irish are *virtutium ignari <magis> quam aliae gentes*, felt compelled to add: *aliquatenus tamen gnari*).

R.'s notes 'are motivated by items that stand out in Mela's narrative' and aim to give 'useful information that suits his miscellany' (p. ix). Now Mela is an author with wide-ranging interests, so a commentary on his work can easily become huge (an Italian edition and commentary, published in 1984, runs to some 470 pages). But even so, the selection of items R. chooses to comment upon is sometimes no less miscellaneous: why give details on the word-history of English 'suttee' (p. 74), when Mela does not mention this? Why note that on Acrocorinth 'the climber is as likely as not to share the pinnacle with a wandering flock of sheep' (p. 82), when Mela does not talk about animals here? Why suggest apropos of Rome (p. 87) that Mela 'would be neither the first nor the last visitor to fall in love with the city and its people', when literally all that Mela says about the city is *Roma quondam a pastoribus condita, nunc si pro materia dicatur*

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

alterum opus? Why refer to 'a pleasant ride by bus and train', which 'confirmed that the headland of Cape Misenum was shaped naturally like a huge tumulus' (p. 89), when Mela does not refer to such a shape (and went by boat, if at all)? There is, to be sure, nothing wrong with taking your Mela with you when travelling (Cabral read his copy on his journey which led to the discovery of Brasil), but giving such 'holiday snaps' at the expense of potentially more relevant notes on other items seems slightly unbalanced: Egypt (or 'Aegypt', as R. calls it), for example, has to do without such (or indeed other, more detailed) notes.

But then, Mela's work is unbalanced as well. In sum, R.'s book provides today's readers with a good introduction, a fresh translation, miscellaneous notes, and helpful indexes. It can serve as a first introduction to a minor, but fascinating Latin writer and popularizer.

Universität Mannheim KAI BRODERSEN

R. HEREDIA CORREA: *Petronio: Fragmentos y Poemas*. Pp. 44 + xxxix. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 968-36-6431-8.

R. HEREDIA CORREA: *Petronio: Satiricon.* Pp. lii + 147 + clix. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1997. Cased. ISBN: 968-36-6135-1.

Almost thirty years after the publication of the impressive *Petronio Árbitro*, *Satiricón. Texto revisado y traducido por Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz* (Barcelona, 1968–9), a new Spanish translation of Petronius' novel, accompanied by an introduction, the Latin text, brief linguistic notes, andshort explanatory notes, has now appeared in two beautifully produced volumes, one containing the extant text, the other containing twenty-five fragments and thirty-one poems attributed to Petronius.

Since so much has been written on the *Satyricon* (and on the ancient novel, in general) during the past three decades, the translator ought to have taken this opportunity and updated the work of his predecessor and sole rival in this field; however, C. appears not to have consulted the most recent editions of the novel (he mentions neither *Petronius. Satyrica*, edd. K. Müller, W. Ehlers [Munich, 1983], nor *Petronius. Satyricon Reliquiae*, ed. K. Müller [Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1995]), and fails to inform his Spanish readers of the new scholarly approaches to Petronius' text (only acouple of works published in the 1990s appear in the bibliography, while ground-breaking books, such as Niall W. Slater, *Reading Petronius* [Baltimore and London, 1990], are not given due consideration); instead of all this, C. prefers to print M. Heseltine's Loeb Classical Library text of Petronius (revised by E. H. Warmington), which dates back to the years of Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz's edition of the *Satyricon*, while in the introduction he predictably confines himself to an account of Petronius' life and times, the significance of the novel's title, a summary of Encolpius' adventures, and the formative literary genres of the *Satyricon* (the connection between Petronius' text and the Menippean satire is unnecessarily stressed at the expense of other literary genres, which receive only a brief mention). The obvious contribution of these volumes to Petronian studies is, of course, the new Spanish translation, but, in view of the existing Spanish translations (see G. Schmeling and J. Stuckey, *A Bibliography of Petronius* [Leiden, 1977], pp.120–5), how important is this contribution?

If the above shortcomings are due to a deliberate editorial policy of the general series in whichthese volumes appear, the Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Mexicana, one wonders what the intended readership of this series is. Is C. addressing students? If so, the linguistic notes are not adequate to enable them to follow the Latin text. Is he addressing a wide audience? Why then add to the cost of the book by incorporating the Latin text and by having the fragments and the poems in a different volume? Is he attempting to satisfy both the average reader and the undergraduate student? If so, the outcome is unsatisfactory.

University of Glasgow COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

J.-P. CALLU (ed.): *Symmaque:* Lettres. *Tome III:* Livres VI–VIII (Collection des Universités de France sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. xii + 199 (text double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1995. Cased, frs. 325. ISBN: 2-251-01385-7 (ISSN: 0184-7155).

This, the penultimate of the projected volumes of Callu's Budé, offers three books of very different degrees of homogeneity. Once again C. has examined the manuscript tradition afresh, with some reluctance ('sans nous dissimuler le caractère ingrat de l'opération', p. v); he has in the past attached considerable importance to the medieval and later florilegia, to which yet another is now added (F39).

While the correspondence of the great and the good at historical turning-points offers an automatic interest, the actual contents of Symmachus' letters are frequently disappointing, and might be likened to a sort of fourth-century senatorial e-mail: for every letter where there is the promise of substantial information there seem to be several where the bulk of the shortest of texts is concerned with little more than eloquently announcing that the letter is being sent at all. Some of the textual reporting reveals the evident trouble that scribes experience less with the flourishes of late Latin *politesses* than with late Latin proper names (*Sibidio* 6.50, *Prosdocium* 6.74, *Theodulo* 7.56, *Annius* 8.31). On such unpromising contents supporting annotation is generally spare, concentrating on details of official posts that contribute to chronology, or unravelling thecomplexities of titular protocols and the generally effusive style of greetings; a few more ambitious annotations are consigned to an appendix. C. has also taken advantage of the long interval since his second volume (1982) to avail himself of the considerable bulk of new material accumulating around his author, including Paschoud's Geneva colloquium papers (1986) and Haverling's treatment of Symmachus' language and style (Gothenburg, 1988).

A few detailed observations on the text:

6.11: C. prints *respondes et* following P *Π*, in preference to *respondetis* (Suse), the plural that seems to be demanded both by the plural address (*Nicomachis filiis*) and the following plural *quaeratis*. There is no right answer, as the previous letter to the same addressees appends a plural *valete* to the prevailing singular in the text itself. Any writer to double addressees is almost committed to problems of minor inconsistency.

6.45: At the crux *tamquam intempestiva*, the loss of *immerita* does remain a possibility: *tam immerita quam intempestiva* or its variants appears in a number of the florilegium citations. The simple omission of *immerita* between *tam* and *quam* would then account for the generation of a *tamquam*, whereas the gratuitous insertion of *immerita* might be less easy to explain.

6.47: The apparatus records a catalogue of attempts of scribes to cope with *visentium*, which inminuscule can quickly degenerate into just about anything. Scioppius' *inmanium* for F37 *inmantium* seems hardly worth citing, if, as seems most likely, the latter is itself an extreme corruption.

7.16: C. may well be right here in his conservative reverence for the *Parisinus*: he allows its *nunc sanitatem tibi gratulor* to stand, translating 'A présent je me félicite de votre guérison'; the last word rather seems to imply the *redditam* contained in nine of the variants in the apparatus, even if there is no very obvious circumstance to account for its omission. In other words, it may at first sight seem rather harsh to construe *sanitatem* on its own not as 'health' but 'recovery'. But support might be cited from Celsus 8.8 (Lewis and Short s.v. I), where *donec sanitate ossis dolor finiatur* must mean 'until the pain can cease through the bone's being completely healed'.

C.'s relatively sparing conjectures are within the bounds of possibility and common sense: at 7.17 he prints *arcessar heres* for codd. *arcesseres* (where Seeck points the way by marking a lacuna); and he supplies *promptus ero* more boldly later in the same sentence as what he himself sees as a *pis-aller*. Often there is not a great deal to choose between contenders, as at 8.2 fin.: C. varies Seeck's solution slightly with <*antequam*> *molestiae*; though at 6.53 C.'s *gravitas* for P *Π gratia* seems a distinct improvement on Seeck's *iteratio*. There is a strong sense of immersion in the specialized style and substance of these verbose studies in phrasing, as in his supplement of <*provectionis*> at 7.50. But even the most careful proof-reader can be caught out by unexpected howlers in the running heads: hence LIBER SECXTUS (p. 15).

All in all, a steady, purposeful, and unpretentious progress towards a goal now at last in sight. No less than Browning after the first volume of 1972, we should all wish for a more ambitious treatment of the whole cultural phenomenon raised by these letters from C. himself, who is singularly well equipped for the task.

University of Kent at Canterbury GRAHAM ANDERSON

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

J. Y. GUILLAUMIN (ed.): *Boèce:* Institution Arithmétique (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. xcv + 253 (text double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1995. frs. 395. ISBN: 2-251-01390-3.

Boethius' *Institutio Arithmetica* is never likely to be at the top of the average reader's list of favourite books, being written at an unpopular period (late antiquity), by an unfashionable author, and on a subject which most find unappealing. Yet historically it is an important work,one of the formative influences behind the intellectual life of the Middle Ages, and it has been recently enjoying a sort of mini-boom in scholarly interest which will be given a welcome impetus by Guillaumin's new Budé edition. It is not before time. The last (and so far as I know, the only) previous critical edition was Friedlein's Teubner of 1867 (the other easily available text, that of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, reprints the text of a sixteenth-century edition). What is more, the text has never before been translated into French (though anglophone readers have had the benefit M. Masi's 1983 translation). This is a striking contrast to the popularity of the work in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance; G. knows of more than 180 manuscripts which contain all or part of the *Institutio Arithmetica*, and in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries about twenty-five different editions were printed. This is the measure of the extent to which post-Renaissance classical scholars have chosen to turn their backs on the mathematical and scientific aspects of the classical heritage.

The translator of a mathematical text faces an initial dilemma. Before the development of modern mathematical notation, mathematical proofs and propositions were expressed in ways which are likely to seem strange, or even impenetrable, to the modern reader. The temptation then is to replace the ancient expressions with the modern mathematical equivalent written using the conventions and symbols with which we are familiar. On the other hand, if our interest in mathematics is in the subject as construct of a particular society at a particular period (as surely it must be in the case of an obsolete mathematical work like the *Institutio Arithmetica*, which nobody is now going to read as a textbook), then modernization is less than helpful; very often itis the way in which a mathematical proposition is articulated and expressed, rather than the mathematical significance of the proposition in its purest form, which is of interest. G. happily gives the best of both worlds. In the translation he sticks quite closely to Boethius' Latin, and then, in the extensive notes, helps the reader with the more obscure sections by restating them in modern form, an excellent procedure which all writers on ancient mathematics would do well to imitate.

G.'s introduction brings out well the way the work occupies a crossroads in the history ofscience. The *Institutio Arithmetica* is based on (and much of it is simply a translation of) the*Introducion to Arithmetic* of Nicomachus of Gerasa (about A.D. 100), who wrote a highly Pythagoreanized account of the state of arithmetic (or more properly number-theory) in his day, which earned for him the title of the Euclid of arithmetic (although, unlike Euclid, he does not seem to have been a creative mathematician in his own right). The text of Nicomachus has survived and there are also translations into Latin (by Apuleius) and into Arabic, so Boethius' translation does not really add a great deal to our knowledge of ancient mathematics. It does, however, reveal a great deal about the preconceptions and interests of the old Roman élite at that period in the fifth and sixth centuries when it was trying to pick up the pieces of traditional classical culture under their regime of the new German kings. G. brings out the unique position of Boethius in this process; not only was he himself Theoderic's *magister officiorum*, he also had strong connections with the old Roman aristocracy (for example, his father had been *praefectus urbis* and consul, and he married the daughter of Symmachus), and in addition he had an excellent knowledge of Greek and of contemporary Greek thought, which was less usual in his day than it had been some centuries earlier, and which put him in a position where he could beauniquely valuable mediator of classical culture to the medieval Latin West. G. is sceptical about the standard view that Boethius learned his Greek during a supposed stay at Athens, andargues instead for a period in Alexandria. One puzzle about the *Institutio Arithmetica* arises from the fact that Boethius (who wrote the work while still young, and who was by no means an accomplished mathematician) does not always translate what Nicomachus says, but introduces variations and omits some sections. G. gives a full catalogue of the variants, and does his best toexplain them (specifically Platonic sections are curtailed, for example; elsewhere changes areintended to make the work more accessible; other variants may be explicable as attempts to copewith problems in the Greek text he had available). Rightly, however, G. concentrates on the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

history of this work in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, where it became one of the bases of mathematical education. It is to be hoped that this splendid edition will do something to remind us of the importance of the work.

University of Keele RICHARD WALLACE

C. J. Classen: *Zur Literatur und Gesellschaft der Römer.* Pp. 315. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998. Cased, DM 120. ISBN: 3-515-07110-5.

In putting the present collection of his essays together Professor Classen has taken the opportunity to revise the arguments thoroughly (where he has felt it necessary), and to update the bibliographies. There are in addition five helpful indexes (the largest contain proper names, words and things, and Latin words). The list of contents shows the range of C.'s interests: DasStudium der lateinischen Literatur; Romulus in der römischen Republik; Die KönigszeitimSpiegel der Literatur der römischen Republik; Kommentare Caesars in Caesars *Commentariirerum gestarum belli civilis*; Die Anklage gegen A. Cluentius Habitus (66 v. Chr.); Bemerkungenzu Ciceros Äußerungen über die Gesetze; Verres' Gehilfen in Sizilien (nach CicerosDarstellung); Zur Ausbildung der Agrimensoren in Rom zur Zeit der Republik (einige vorläufige Bemerkungen); Die Kritik des Horaz an Lucilius in den Satiren I 4 und I 5; Die Wertvorstellungen des Horaz in seinen Satiren; Zum Anfang der *Annalen* des Tacitus; Der Stil Tertullians. Beobachtungen zum *Apologeticum*; Griechisches und Römisches bei Ammianus Marcellinus; *Virtutes Romanorum.* Römische Tradition und griechischer Einfluß; *Virtutes imperatoriae*; Die Klassische Philologie in Deutschland 1918–1988; Register; Übersicht über die Erstveröffentlichungen.

King's College London ROLAND MAYER

G. Brugnoli, F. Stok (edd.): *Pompei Exitus. Variazioni sul tema dall'antichità alla controriforma*. Pp. 255. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 1996. Paper, L. 30,000. ISBN: 88-7741-913-X.

This entertaining miscellany investigates seven responses to the death of Pompey from Valerius Maximus on to Lucan, Dante, Petrarch, and finally the seventeenth-century Jesuit dramatist Ludovico Aureli. In its totality, it is an excellent example of how an interest in reception can inform and invigorate traditional classical scholarship.

C. Santini examines the omen of the death of Pompey at Val. Max. 1.5.6, applying ideas from folklore and anthropology to elucidate the morphology of this and related anecdotes. S. also notes the conversation with the helmsman in Book 8 of Lucan but might perhaps make more of 8.191–2: 'tunc certus eram quae litora vellem,/ nunc portum fortuna dabit.' One type of port is death (Soph. *Ant*. 1284; Eur. *HF* 770; Enn. *Scaen*. 298 Jocelyn; Plin. *HN* 25.24; Sen. *Ep*. 70.3).

F. Stok looks at the two dreams of Pompey at Luc. 3.8–40 and 7.7–44, then relates them to his ascent into the heavens at 9.1–18. The overall scheme is identified and its notional relationship to the Ciceronian *Somnium Scipionis* is rather forced, but S. has many acute observations to make and devotes ten pages of rigorous argument to the interpretative problems thrown up by Lucan 3.38–40.

P. Esposito follows Lucan's account of the decline and fall of Pompey from Pharsalus to the sands of Egypt. This contribution is rather descriptive and perhaps needs a more specific claim toadvance, but it demonstrates intelligent judgements on specific points of interpretation. Particularly helpful are pp. 90–1 on Luc. 8.568–76, cf. Sen. *Ep.* 107.9–12 on the 'magnus animus' which gives way to fate, though here Feeney, *CQ* 36 (1986), 239–43 would help; pp. 94–7 on themoment of the crime, the monologue and self-control of Pompey, and the tragic lament of Cornelia; p. 114 on Luc. 8.793, cf. Ov. *Met*. 2.327-8; p. 118 on Sen. *Ep*. 104.31 and Cato opposed to both Caesar and Pompey as like 'Atriden Priamumque et saevom ambobus Achillem.'

R. Scarcia presents a rather bizarre free-association on the theme of Servius' identification of Vergil's Priam with Pompey, bodies on the beach, shipwrecked mariners, and fallen rulers. It feels a bit like what E. R. Curtius might have written had he resorted to LSD.

G. Brugnoli interprets Dante, *Par*. 6.55–81, esp. 65–6 'e Farsalia percosse/ sí ch'al Nilo caldo si

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sentí del duolo', which he relates to Luc. 9.1094–5 'sentiat adventum soceri vocesque querentis/ audiat umbra pias' and the medieval *Li Fet des Romains* p. 620, 10–17 'Je voill que il se sente de ma venue et que l'ame de lui perçoive comme je en sui doulanz par mes lermes et par ma pive complainte'. B. finally points to Ov. *Met*. 15.823 'Pharsalia sentiet illum', and argues that Ov. *Met*. 15.822–34 is a direct source for *Par*. 6.73–81.

G. Crevatin's analysis of Petrarch's numerous references to the death of Pompey and the presentation of his head to Caesar is exceptionally valuable. C. prints the relevant portions of the *De gestis Cesaris*, last edited by Schneider in 1827, and it is to be hoped that her own edition of this work will soon make it easier to obtain. What emerges is that Petrarch exploits the full range of ancient treatments of the death of Pompey: the sorrows of living too long and the instability of fortune are prominent; so too are different versions of the presentation of the head. If *De gestis Cesaris* attributes Caesar's lament to pity for one to whom he was once close and to the consciousness that a similar fate might well await him, *Rime Sparse* 44 and 102 require a reader familiar with Lucan and the allegation of hypocrisy. C. says little about the dependence of these sonnets on Lucan, but it is surely possible to go beyond E. Fraenkel, *Kleine Beiträge* II.263–4. *Rime Sparse* 102 must require the reader to supply the awareness that, just as Hannibal laughs amidst his sorrowing people, so the sorrow of Caesar is no less feigned than the delight displayed by his entourage (Luc. 9.1104–8); *Rime Sparse* 44 may make no specific allusion to Caesar's hypocrisy, but the reproduction of Lucan's antithesis at 9.1043–6 shows from which tradition Petrarch is working, and invites the inference that the show of *pietà* which Petrarch asks of Laura will be welcome even if it is no more than the false *pietas* which Caesar displays at 9.1056 and 1095.

G. Flammini introduces and publishes for the first time the 1628 *Pompejus* of Aureli. This is a genuine treat, not least because it reveals in Aureli an alert and playful reader of Lucan. F.'s notes highlight a number of points of contact between the *Pompejus* and the *Pharsalia*, but there are far more which might be noted: Aureli 116 cf. 7.88; Aureli 144 cf. 7.545 and 579; Aureli 145 cf. 7.580–1; Aureli 146–7 cf. 7.583; Aureli 151–2 cf. 7.698–9 and 7.794–5; Aureli 159–61 cf. 7.689–91 and 794–5; Aureli 514–17 cf. 8.269–70 and 273–6; Aureli 562–5 cf. 266–9 and 272–3; Aureli 664–5 cf. 1.70–82; Aureli 1081–7 cf. 1.498–504; Aureli 1107–11 cf. 8.545–50; Aureli 1213–14 cf. 9.1094–5.

Nor does Aureli just borrow lines. There is some clever wordplay, most notably Aureli 146–7 'cadunt... cadunt' cf. Luc. 7.583 'caedunt... caedunt'. More significantly, he regularly picks up on significant themes and problems in the related scenes from the *Pharsalia.* Aureli 151–2 on the pleasure of Pompey as spectator at Pharsalus ('iuvat... iuvat') both inverts Luc. 7.698–9 ('iuvat') on the pleasure of quitting the battle and not watching it through and assimilates Luc. 7.794–5 on the guilty voyeurism of Caesar ('iuvat Emathiam non cernere terram'). Likewise, Aureli 159–61 has Pompey telling the troops what Lucan urges him to say at 7.689–91, but the additional claim that they no longer die for him *or* for the city ('nec urbi') shows Aureli's awareness of what makes the original scene in Lucan so troubling. Another high point is the scene between Pompey and Lentulus, which reproduces the debate between these characters in Book 8 of Lucan, but with thedifference that, at Aureli 514–17 and 562–5, the characters adopt each other's lines from the previous episode.

The volume is attractively produced. There is an index of authors cited and a rather slight index of notable themes. The following should have been picked up by the editors: p. 19: for 'Ciprus' read 'Cyprus'; p. 40: for '6, 566–584' read '9, 566–584'; pp. 112 and 247: for 'Meyer' read 'Mayer'; pp. 83 and 94: for 'C'e' read 'C'è'; p. 89: for 'forni-te' read 'fornite'; p. 93 n. 15: for 'la stesso' read 'lo stesso'; p. 137: for 'pompeio' read 'Pompeio'; p. 149: for '811' read '81'; p. 175 n. 33: for '10, 1035–1104' read '9. 1035–1104'; p. 235 l. 1153: for 'triplaci' read 'triplici'; p. 234 l. 1231 'Aut taminavit' sounds odd. Read 'contaminavit'?

The most impressive contributions are undoubtedly those on Dante, Petrarch, and Aureli, but *Pompei Exitus* has much to recommend it to anyone interested in Latin and especially in Lucan.

St Anne's College, Oxford MATTHEW LEIGH

M. CITRONI: *Poesia e lettori in Roma antica: Forme della comunicazione letteraria* (Collezione storica). Pp. xv + 507. Rome and Bari: Laterza, 1995. L. 70,000. ISBN: 88-420-4653-1.

This volume contains, apart from new material, the updated and adapted versions of nine essays which Citroni published between 1978 and 1993 (pp. xiv–v); they cover about half of the overall

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

length of the book. C. intends to analyse Latin poetry from its beginnings up to the earlyempire, and to investigate both the specific formal aspects which set up a dialogue with thecontemporary 'real' readers and how the intention of communication conditions the production of these texts. He combines analytical passages with synthesizing résumés.

He begins with some theoretical reflections about the potential difference between 'public' and 'private' literary communication in Rome (pp. 3–29). He concludes that even in the Augustan and post-Augustan ages the reading public was a social minority, though not entirely homogeneous (pp. 17–18). The borderline between public and private became obsolete as soon as an author authorized a certain form of his work which he considered definitive and which could then be copied by anybody interested (p. 7).

A second, again more general, chapter is devoted to the reception of literature from the Archaic age up to the time of Caesar, when the originally 'national' literature (Naevius, Ennius, Plautus, and Terence; pp. 39–40) changed into something esoteric for a minority (pp. 31–56). From the end of the second century onwards we can observe the inclination of the literary élite to savour a refined aesthetic style, thus moving from *utilitas* / *negotium* towards *dulcedo* / *otium.* This change culminates in Catullus' 'revolution' (p. 51), which combines this type of literature with a new set of values, namely the personal life of the individual as a legitimate topic for poetry.

The following two chapters deal with Catullus' poetry in more detail, especially its destination (the educated, artistically demanding reader of *all* times; p. 61), and its various modes of expression, which use private occasions (like the death of a family member or a love affair) to show a capacity for formal poetic variation. C. illustrates this in a close analysis of poem 96 on p.101, where especially the difference in language employed by the poet when dealing with the same theme in different contexts is highlighted. The same is the case in the various treatments of his brother's death in 68a, 68b, and at the beginning of 65 (pp. 57–117). The functions of Catullus' poetry lie between pathos, rituality, and joking (pp. 119–205); for example, the *passer* poems are described as both love lyric and the ritual attitude of an epikedion (pp. 120–3). Similar ambiguities are stated for poems 4, 6, 31, 35, 45, 46, 55, 58b, 61, 68, and others. The Lesbia poems are seen as standing between meditation and exhibition (pp. 179–84). The last part of this chapter deals with the increasing literary formalization of communication in Catullus' poems and Cicero's letters (pp.184–7).

The fifth chapter forms again a more general introduction to the second half of the book. Its main thesis it that the poetry of Virgil and Horace, with the Augustan public as its point of reference, reverses the development of poetry which had before become a poetry for a minority, and turns it again into 'national literature' (pp. 207–69). The horizons of literary communication are now becoming more extensive and the 'project' of Virgil and Horace, to write 'Roman' literature again, is supported by the changes in society and politics. C. concentrates in this context in particular on the public and timeless dimensions in Virgil's (mainly *Georgics* and *Eclogues*) and Horace's poetry, despite their sometimes seemingly private and ephemeral frames.

The following chapter concentrates on Horace's lyric and the various levels of its destination, with some remarks on the *Satires* and *Epistles*, as well (pp. 271–375).

The last two chapters deal with the addressees and the readers of the poetry of Propertius and Tibullus (pp. 377–429) and the 'affectionate reader' of Ovid (pp. 431–74). A short epilogue (pp.475–82) sketches the changed conditions for literary production after Ovid, where the emperor and aristocrats as powerful patrons generated a wider variety of communicative possibilities in poetry.

The general results of C.'s investigation appear superficial, and often unconvincing, as, for example, no distinction is made between the audience as a national entity and the intended 'private' reader, who could nevertheless be identical with the 'national' audience. On the other hand, even if Augustan poets dealt again with themes of more 'public' relevance, their readers arenot that different from those of Catullus. It is surprising that no theoretical works on theliterary reader were consulted (e.g. W. Iser, *The Implied Reader* [Baltimore, 1974], or C.'s 'Greekcounterpart', B. Gentili, *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece* [Baltimore, 1988; Italian original: Rome and Bari, 1984]), which could have helped C. to avoid over-generalizations in thisrespect. Nonetheless, the detailed analysis of the texts is mostly convincing, erudite, and welldocumented, both for primary and secondary sources. All ancient texts quoted are translated, and included are an analytical index, an index of ancient passages quoted, and an index of modern authors.

St Andrews University/Princeton University KARLA POLLMANN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

E. A. ARSLAN etc. (edd.): *La 'parola' delle immagini e delle forme di scrittura. Modi e techniche della comunicazione nel mondo antico.* Pp. 313. Messina: Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità dell'Università degli Studi di Messina, 1998. L. 60,000.

Italian scholarship pioneered the immensely valuable approach to ancient texts, artefacts, andlanguage in terms of their communicative functions and in a manner informed by contemporary developments in the fields of semiotics, communication, and performance. This rather heterogeneous volume is an offspring, if somewhat distant, of this fine tradition. Its contributions, the product of seminars of interdisciplinary inspiration held in Messina and Calabria, are linked (more or less firmly) by an interest in 'communication' in the ancient world, its modes and techniques. There are some fine studies here, but as a full survey is out of place I would (in addition to providing a table of contents) signal that there will be things of value for those with special interests in the relation between word and image, performance culture, money as sign and mode of communication, cross-cultural communication in the Greek world, and the construction of memory in Roman literature and historiography.

Contents: F. Pomponio, 'Gli antenati della scrittura nel Vicino oriente'; A. Zumbo, 'L'*ekphrasis* d'opera d'arte: esercitazione letteraria o strumento di comunicazione?'; R. Pretagostini, '*Μουσική*: poesia e performance'; M. Caccamo Caltabiano, 'Immagini/parola, grammatica e sintassi di un lessico iconografico monetale'; P. Radici Colace, 'Comunicare con le monete'; B. Tripodi, 'Parlare con l'altro: la comunicazione verbale fra greci e barbari e il ruolo dell'interprete nell'*Anabasi* di Senofonte'; M. Silvana Celentano, 'Comunicazione, persuasione e consenso in Grecia e a Roma'; M. Torelli, 'Struttura e linguaggio del rilievo storico romano'; I. Bitto, 'Tra oralità e scrittura: il verso su pietra'; A. Grillo, 'Poesia epica e ideologia a Roma. Alcuni riferimenti testuali e considerazioni'; A. De Vivo, 'La costruzione della memoria nelle forme della comunicazione di Roma antica: stroriografia e codice letterario'; A. Fraschetti, 'La "parola" delle immagini'; F. Minissale, 'Il colore e le immagini del colore. (Colore e linguaggio nelle *Georgiche* di Virgilio)'; M. Cannatà Fera, 'Comunicazione e umorismo: l'*Ippia* di Luciano'; L. De Salvo, C. Neri, 'La letteratura omiletica come forma di comunicazione. Giovanni Crisostomo tra Antiochia e Costantinopoli'; L. Perria, 'Lo spazio dei segni. Comunicazione grafica e percezione visiva'; E. A. Arslan, 'Comunicazione, messaggio, formazione nelle Mostre: il tema isiaco nella monetazione antica'.

University of Warwick PETER WILSON

M. R. CITTADINI (ed.): *Presenze classiche nelle letterature occidentali: il mito dall'età antica all'età moderna e contemporanea: Convegno Internazionale di Didattica, Perugia, 7–10 novembre 1990*. Pp.xliii + 567. Perugia: Istituto Regionale di Ricerca, Sperimentazione e Aggiornamento Educativi dell'Umbria, 1995.

This volume contains the proceedings of a conference designed to explore the uses of the study of myth in the context of the need to keep classics relevant in the modern school curriculum: particular emphasis is placed on the potential for reworkings of ancient myth in literature down to the modern period. The contributions, very broad in scope, for the most part offer solid syntheses of their topics rather than original scholarship. The 'Relazioni' include (i) discussions of ancient and modern perceptions of the nature and functions of myth: B. Gentili on the social uses of myth in Greece; F. Graf on Heyne's claims to be the founder of the modern scientific study of myth; C. Calame on the viability of the modern category of myth; A. Pieretti on thedevelopment of the modern understanding of myth as an autonomous sphere of human activity through the theories of Vico, Cassirer, and Ricoeur; (ii) discussions of myth in classical texts: G. A. Privitera on the coexistence of folktale and heroic-mythical elements in Homer, showing how the Polyphemus story has been adapted to the model of a heroic *aristeia*; L. Canfora on the boundary between the semi-mythical and historical in ancient historiographical thinking, defending Herodotus' good sense against Thucydidean slurs; S. Grandolini on Pindar's use of Odysseus as an 'antimodel'; D. Poli on the historicization of mythical figures in

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Homer; P. Fedeli on the use of Homeric myths in the Latin elegists; A. Setaioli on the figure of Ulysses in the *Aeneid*; C. Santini on the myth of Orpheus in Virgil and Ovid; E. A. Fontecedro on the mythical structures underlying the literary versions of the dream of Ilia: (iii) discussions of the reception of classical myth: A. Quacquarelli on pagan myths and the language of the early Christian catechism; P. Wülfing on Christa Wolf's use of the Cassandra myth; F. Ruggieri on the cultural-historical determinants of James Joyce's use of myth; E. Balmas on Orpheus in modern French literature; W. Pedullà on Savinio's use of myth. There follow 'Seminari didattici' on further aspects of myth in ancient and modern literatures, and on the early Christian use of pagan myth; and a concluding section of 'Comunicazioni su ricerche ed esperienze didattiche'. One is left impressed by the seriousness of the endeavour to forge links between professional scholarship and the school curriculum.

New Hall, Cambridge PHILIP HARDIE

L. Munzi (ed.): *Forme della parodia, parodia delle forme nel mondo greco e latino. Atti del Convegno Napoli, 9 maggio 1995* (Annali dell' Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli 18, 1996). Pp. 183. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli, 1998. Paper.

The volume of this periodical contains the following essays:

Presentazione; G. Baldo, 'La metamorfosi ovvero l'impossibile parodia'; A. Barchiesi, 'La guerra di Troia non avrà luogo: il proemio dell'*Achilleide* di Stazio'; M. S. Celentano, 'La parodia tra retorica e letteratura'; V. Ferraro, 'Mai chiamare Metello un Metello'; M. G. Iodice di Martino, 'Effetti parodici nella poesia dell'esilio di Ovidio: il motivo del libro "vivente" '; L. Munzi, 'Da Properzio a Ovidio: un itinerario letterario nel *pastiche* di un anonimo Pompeiano'; M. Pellegrino, 'La figura di Zeus nell'*archaia* tra parodia e "Carnevale" '; P. Pinotti, 'Aurora e Titono: le riscritture di un mito'; P. Radici Colace, 'Riuso e parodia in Catullo'; P. Sartori, 'Alcune note su procedimenti e tecniche della parodia'.

Kings College London ROLAND MAYER

P. J. Ahrensdorf: *The Death of Socrates and the Life of Philosophy: An Interpretation of Plato's* Phaedo. Pp. x + 238. New York: State University of New York Press, 1995. Paper, $21.95. ISBN: 0-7914-2634-3.

This commentary on the *Phaedo*, like others of the genre, is designed to pay special attention to the dramatic character of the dialogue. In particular, the author intends to pierce its veil of words by closely observing both Socrates' strategic concealment of his actual meanings in ironic 'double-talk' (pp. 5–6) and the concerns of his interlocutors (p. 7). On A.'s account, these concerns center on the threat that philosophical investigation poses to traditional Greek religion; and thus, the text is to be interpreted as another Platonic attempt to exonerate Socratic piety and the life of philosophy. A.'s overall reading is, however, unusual. As he reads the text, Socrates' arguments for the immortality of the soul—whether those of the historical Socrates or Plato's creature is never clear—are deliberately flawed, and he himself rejects immortality and the prospect of rewards and punishments in an afterlife (e.g. p. 199).

Although the book has its virtues (e.g. it nicely insists that to fully understand the *Phaedo* we need to understand its ancient religious context), much of it seems a speculative, personal reaction to the text, rather than a scholarly study. The brevity of the bibliography and index, and the lack of an Index of Passages are indicative of this. The book's central argument seems particularly hard to reconcile with the other companion dialogues of Plato's mature and epistemically optimistic period, which seem, at the very least, to postulate the individual soul's disincarnate and direct apprehension of Forms (e.g. *Symp*. 210a–212b; *R*. 490b, 500d, 540a; *Phdr*. 247d–e, 249b–250c), and the soul's experience of post-mortem judgement (e.g. *G*. 523a–527e; *R*.611b–621d). Moreover, the dialogues' expressions of the soul's immortality rest on proofs (e.g. *R*. 608d–611b, *Phdr*. 245c–e) whose relation to the proofs of the *Phaedo* A. leaves unmentioned

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and unexplored. There are many other scholarly gaps of this kind. For example, in view of his religious focus, A.'s analysis of Socrates' famous last words commanding Crito to sacrifice a cockto Asclepius is surprisingly superficial. A. postulates that Socrates' request displays a Cephalus-like fear of post-mortem retribution for sacrifices neglected (p. 113) and (thus) an expectation that he is taking a journey to Hades (p. 198), but there is only a cursory attempt to render this interpretation fully consistent with Socrates' alleged denial of the soul's immortality. There is also no attempt to take into account the several important interpretations of this passage in the literature and no citation of a paper essential to the sort of literary interpretation of this passage A. seeks (namely, C. Gill, 'The Death of Socrates,' *CQ* 23 [1973], 25–8).

In sum, this book is not without merit, but I would suggest that its lack of rigor makes it optional reading for serious students of the *Phaedo* and the religion of Socrates.

The University of Maine at Farmington MARK McPHERRAN

G. BÖHME: *Idee und Kosmos: Platons Zeitlehre—Eine Einführung inseine theoretische Philosophie.* (Philosophische Abhandlungen, 66.) Pp.vi + 168. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1996. DM 68. ISBN: 3-465-02866-2.

Böhme has written extensively on Plato, starting with his *Habilitationsschrift*, and in particular from a Kantian perspective. In this elegant monograph he brings together his previous interests in a study of Plato's metaphysics and natural philosophy, focusing on the *Timaeus.* It is encouraging to see the *Timaeus* coming back into mainstream Platonic scholarship, not as thecentre of a controversy on the ordering of the dialogues or sidelined as a somewhat embarrassing oddity in the corpus, but studied in its own right for its contribution to key interests in Plato; in this respect the present work complements the volume of essays from the 1995 *Symposium Platonicum* on *Timaeus* and *Critias.*

B.'s first chapter is concerned with the concept of representation and the method of natural science in the *Timaeus*, providing an analysis of the truth-status of the cosmology myth as εἰκὼς λόγος against the background of the 'plausible fiction' of Odysseus' narrative (*Od.* 19.203), the Muses' claim to combine truth and fiction (Hesiod, *Theog.* 27–8), and the use of δόξα by both Xenophanes and Parmenides. This allows the connection between παράδειγμα and εἰκών in the *Timaeus* to be more readily understood along with the corresponding ontological relationship of being to becoming and the status given to truth contrasted with that of belief (cf. *Tim.* 29c). The conclusions reached here shed light in their turn on the image-language of *Theaetetus* (240a–b), *Politicus* (595a–e), and *Sophist* (233d–234b).

The second and third chapters in *Idee und Kosmos* deal with the grand themes of time (αἰών), life, and eternity. In the *Timaeus* the παράδειγμα is given as ever-existing, and it was the intention of the Demiurge to make its copy, the created heaven with its circles of fixed stars and planets, assimilar to it as possible; consequently, in imitating eternity, the οὐρανός was, is, and will be existing throughout the time measured by the circles according to number, whereas the engendered world of becoming is characterized by birth and death. Here B. digresses into an 'Exkurs' on 'Plotins Auslegung von Platons Zeitlehre und die Idee des Lebens', showing the relevance in the summary: 'Die Zeit ist für Plotin die ohne Rückkehr in sich immer auf Neues fortgehende Tätigkeit der Seele. Er verkennt, welche Bedeutung für Platon die Ordnung und Periodizität dieser Tätigkeit hatte, und er verliert deshalb die Beziehung von Zeit und Zahl' (p. 92). Then, inPlato's representation of human ψυχή, B. draws out the paradoxes inherent in the concepts of'parts of time' (μέρη χρόνου) and its 'aspects' (εἴδη χρόνου) as applied to generation and 'becoming older and younger' (*Tim.* 38a; Plato tackled these paradoxes again in *Parmenides* 140e–141d, 151e–152e).

B. finishes with a shorter analysis of the rôle and systematic function of 'Zahl' (ἀριθμός) in human life, engaging first with Taylor's suggestion that the integers might be thought of as 'shadows' or 'projections' of the unit in much the same way as time is a 'projection' or 'aspect' of αἰών (cf. Taylor's commentary on the *Timaeus* [Oxford, 1928], p. 187). He then ranges widely through theories of ancient music and their emphasis on number-dominated proportions andintervals (with some insights here into the difficult sections of *Philebus* 16c–e, 24e–26b), and returns finally, in a detailed section on astronomy and the calculations of day, month, year, and

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

great year, to his starting point—the imitation by this cosmos of the perfection and eternal nature of its model.

A reasonable bibliography is appended; there is an index of passages cited from Plato, but for other ancient authors simply a list of page numbers in the brief 'Namenregister'. It would bemore useful here, especially for Aristotle, to be given some indication of the texts and topicscovered. In general the work is attractively presented with few misprints, and is to be recommended as an addition of merit and topical interest to the Philosophische Abhandlungen series.

University of Wales, Lampeter M. R. WRIGHT

O. J. SCHRIER: *The* Poetics *of Aristotle and the* Tractatus Coislinianus. *A Bibliography from about 900 to 1996.* Pp. 350. Leiden, etc.: E. J. Brill, 1998. Cased, $120.75. ISBN: 09-04-11132-8.

This very useful reference work consists of a bibliography of Aristotle's *Poetics*, which aims to incorporate all 'relevant material', from the first printed publication on the *Poetics*, the *editio princeps* of the Latin translation of Averroes' 'Middle Commentary' (1481), to the present day. Schrier includes publications relating to the *Tractatus Coislinianus*, having been persuaded bythe arguments of Richard Janko (*Aristotle on Comedy* [London, 1984]) that the treatise contains remnants of the lost second book of the *Poetics*, which dealt with comedy. In addition he provides a survey of all translations and commentaries that were written before the invention of printing, which shows that the treatise was already the subject of scholarly interest in the Middle Ages and early Renaissance, both in the Near East and in Europe.

The material included comprises (1) all editions, translations, and commentaries; (2) publications whose titles refer to the *Poetics* or to major concepts associated with it (e.g. Dorothy Sayers, 'Aristotle on Detective Fiction' [1935], P. Corneille, 'Discours des trois unités d'action, de jour, et de lieu' [1660]); and (3) publications which discuss aspects of the treatise, but without signalling the fact in their titles (e.g. E. R. Dodds, 'On Misunderstanding the *Oedipus Rex*' [1966]). S. points out that, though the two may overlap, a bibliography of a text is not the same thing as the history of its reception. Hence a work like Umberto Eco's *The Name of the Rose* does not feature in his catalogue.

The bulk of the book is a list of publications arranged chronologically and in alphabetical order of author within each year, with translations (into Chinese, Oriya, Pushtu, and Vietnamese, as well as into the more familiar languages) in a separate list. There are helpful indices, including an index of passages and an index of subjects (e.g. catharsis, hamartia, mimesis), which make thebook easy to use. The author modestly refers to deficiencies that will be found in his work, and invites suggestions for material which could be included in a supplementary list. But this isalready a thoroughly researched and well-organized bibliography, which will be of value to anyone working on the *Poetics*.

University of Warwick PENELOPE MURRAY

P. BORGEAUD: *La Mère des dieux: de Cybèle à la Vierge Marie* (Le libraire du XX^{e} siècle). Pp. 266, ills. Paris: Seuil, 1996. Paper, frs. 140. ISBN: 2-02-01903-4.

The usually anonymous figure of the Mother (*Mêtêr tôn Theôn*, *Magna Mater*) is a continuing presence in Graeco-Roman religion, and a continuing puzzle, at the same time ancestral and foreign. In this excellent study of the Mother of the Gods, B. starts by rejecting two 'modern myths': the idea that the Neolithic female figurines from Çatal Höyuk are evidence for an ancient matriarchal society, memories of which were preserved in the Anatolian cult of Cybele; and the idea that, with the rise of Christianity, the cult of the Virgin Mary (Mother of God, *Theotokos*) took over the functions of a pre-existing popular pagan cult of the Mother of the Gods.

In place of these oversimplifications, B. offers a careful exploration of the evidence for the cult of the Mother in the ancient Mediterranean. The seven chapters are 'Une Mère itinérante', examining the various Mother-cults in Anatolia in the sixth century; 'Sur l'Agora d'Athènes',

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which examines fifth- and fourth-century Greek accounts of the Mother, and in particular the interpretation of the Metroon in Athens; 'L'invention d'une mythologie', about the myths concerning Attis; 'L'entrée de la Mère dans la République romaine', which concentrates on the arrival of the image of Magna Mater in 204 B.C.; 'L'origine de la Mater Magna', which considers the significance of Pessinus as the source of the Roman cult; 'Attis à l'époque imperiale', which relates the cult of the Mother and the rôle of the Galli to notions in early Christian, Gnostic, and pagan Roman thought; and finally 'De la Mère des dieux à la Mère de Dieu', which examines the last survivals of the pagan cult, and the possibilities of confusion between aspects of the cults of the Mother and Christian cult practice.

B. brings out some important parallels in the way the Mother is understood in different communities. He suggests that the rôle of the Mother, to whom the Metroon in Athens is dedicated—a sanctuary which he suggests appears only with the building of the new Bouleuterion towards the end of the fifth century—as guardian of the city archive, emphasizes her ancestral aspect; but at the same time, he points out that a female presence at the heart of the patriarchal Athenian political system can be seen as problematic, and this is recognized by attributing to her aspects of cult borrowed from the distinctly non-Athenian cult of Cybele. The same ambivalence is present in the Roman cult. The goddess's full title, *Mater Magna Idaea Deum*, points to her ancestral link to Rome, through her supposed origins on Trojan Mount Ida, but the sacred stone that was her cult statue was brought not from Troy but from Pessinus in Galatia, and this link with Gaul, maintained in the names of her priests, the Galli, emphasizes her non-Roman aspect. In the course of his discussion of the origins of the Roman cult, B. discusses Celtic notions of the cult of the Mother, which would have helped those Gauls arriving in Galatia to make sense of and incorporate the Phrygian cult they found there.

The varying myths of Attis and the origins of ideas of castration as part of the cult are examined with great care. B. persuasively links Herodotus' story about Croesus' son Atys with myths about Attis and the Great Mother: elements in Herodotus' story, including Atys' early marriage, the sexual inversion caused by the removal of weapons from the men's rooms to the women's quarters, the crucial rôle of Adrastus (sc. *Adrasteia*), and the Phrygian location all find parallels in versions of the Attis story. The Attis–Mater pairing is also suggested by the crucial rôles of a young man (Scipio Nasica) and an older woman (Claudia Quinta) in the account of the arrival of the cult-statue of Magna Mater at Rome. Issues of chastity, of both the Mother and Attis, are a recurrent feature of the myths that evolved around these figures, and they are important in relations between Mother-cults and Christianity. B. examines the way in which ideas of chastity and virginity have grown up around Mary and her mother Anna, adding to the female aspects of Christian cult just as aspects of Sol Invictus, Mithras, and the Orphic Dionysus feed into the masculine parts. He ends with the 're-engineering' of the Cyzicene cult statue of the Mother of the Gods by Constantine to become the Fortune of Constantinople, set up in a temple next to St Sophia as protector of her successor the Mother of God.

Although short, this is altogether a rich and subtle book, and one hopes that, like B.'s work on Pan, it will soon be translated into English in order to reach a still wider audience.

King's College London HUGH BOWDEN

T. CONDOS: *Star Myths of the Greeks and Romans: a Sourcebook containing the* Constellations *of Pseudo-Eratosthenes and the Poetic* Astronomy *of Hyginus*. Pp. 287. Grand Rapids: Phanes Press, 1997. Paper, $18.95. ISBN: 1-890482-93-5.

This book has grown out of C.'s dissertation, 'The *Katasterismoi* of the Pseudo-Eratosthenes: a Mythological Commentary and English Translation'. The current book starts with an eleven-page introduction dealing with 'mythological explanations for the origin of constellations'. Here she sets aside the tradition of Hesiod's *Astronomy*, perhaps not wholly wisely (see Merkelbach–West's testimonia and fragments 288–93), and views the genre as distinctively Alexandrian and above all the product of Eratosthenes' systematizing.

The body of the book is arranged alphabetically by constellation. For each one a translation isgiven of the appropriate passage of Pseudo-Eratosthenes and also of the parallel passage in Hyginus *De Astronomia* (from Books 2 and 3). Thus both texts are reordered, from a literary perspective doing particular violence to the conception of Hyginus and making his text appear

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

even more jejune and limited than it normally would. Viewed a different way, this is a textbook of some ancient thought about constellations (obviously excluding the poetic tradition altogether). Hyginus is valued by C. as 'the only work of similar intent [to Ps.-Eratosthenes] by a classical author' and she offers the thought that Hyginus may preserve elements of the original genuine Eratosthenes (p. 20). That said, Hyginus is not much of an independent source and is often visibly dependent on the *Katasterisms* or something very similar, even to the extent of misreading 'goatherds' (*aipoloi*) as 'Aetolians' (Hyginus 2.1, also 2.4)!

C.'s emphasis on content is carried through to the identification of the particular stars mentioned by Eratosthenes, and also by Hyginus where he differs (though it is doubtful whether Hyginus' method of work justifies this attention). Thus Pegasus 'has two faint stars on the nostril [ϵ, ν?]' (p. 151). In accordance with this, the 'praise' topos on the back cover comes from experts in actual astronomy. Her translations are generally accurate though occasional details could be corrected (e.g. in *Katasterisms* 25), and she does not mark editors' supplements. There are other minor glitches too: e.g., Ps.-Eratosthenes clearly presupposes 'River' not 'Eridanos' as the name of that constellation, and unless one deletes a star with Olivieri (and Hyginus) the stars do not add up to what Olivieri puts in the text and C. translates.

Each pair of translations is followed by a page or two of commentary. These sections are rathermiscellaneous and do not exhibit much awareness of the methodological difficulties inapproaching Greek mythic material or of the history of Greek mythological scholarship. Thusshe tends to view scholarly interpretations uncritically as though they were in an eternal synchrony, as, for instance, in the gruesomely antique passage, 'Among modern scholars, Orpheus is generally held to be a mortal priestly figure of either the Dionysiac or the Apolline religion, andhis role to be that of a religious reformer. Harrison maintains [1908!]... Farnell believes [1921!]... Guthrie [1952!] considers...'. I would be the last to exclude such scholars from mention, but one does have to take account of the intellectual environment in which they are working. On the other hand, despite its patchiness, she has done a good amount of work and has turned up some interesting discussions. The fairly substantial endnotes are a useful starting point and contain references *inter alia* to unobvious primary texts.

So, overall, provided you can rest content with something that is in many respects incomplete—only Ps.-Eratosthenes and Hyginus, not in their original order, not the whole text of Hyginus, a limited and not wholly critical commentary—this is a useful enough tool to add to the university library and, in our modern days of teaching an enlarged range of classical material in translation, could be useful for some mythology sessions. This is the first translation of Ps.-Eratosthenes into English and there is no other available English edition of Hyginus (Mary Grant did Book 2 in *The Myths of Hyginus* [Lawrence, KA, 1960]).

The book has useful indices, a bibliography, and a couple of rather miniature star charts, and isdecorated with copies of woodcuts from the Ratdolt edition of Hyginus (Venice, 1482). The enterprising publishers allow you to see some of the book for yourself at an attractive site: http://www.cosmopolis.com/star-myths. Apparently, 'A bear figure has been connected with the constellation Ursa Maior since the Ice Ages'.

University of Birmingham KEN DOWDEN

P. Barceló (ed.): *Contra quis ferat arma deos? Vier Augsburger Vorträge zur Religionsgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit zum 60. Geburtstag von Gunther Gottlieb*. (Schriften der Philosophischen Fakultäten der Universität Augsburg, 53.) Pp. 111. Munich: Ernst Vögel, 1996. Paper, DM 32. ISBN: 3-89650-020-1.

This *Festschrift* for G. Gottlieb, professor of ancient history in the University of Augsburg, contains four papers that vary considerably in subject, scope, and quality. Since the first and fourth papers constitute the more significant contributions, I will note the others more briefly. The second paper, 'Der Historiker als Prophet: Tacitus und die Juden' by K. Rosen, examines Tacitus' ethnographic excursus on the Jews in *Histories* 5.2–13. R. argues that Tacitus' virulently anti-Jewish stance results from his conviction that the Jews would always pose a threat to the peace and order of the Roman empire; in this he proved to be prophetic, since shortly after hefinished the *Histories* the serious Diaspora revolt broke out. The third paper, '*Imperator barbatus*: Zur Geschichte der Barttracht in der Antike' by P. R. Franke, is a rather breathless

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

survey of some 1200 years of facial hair, from the Assyrians to the early Byzantine empire, illustrated by a number of crisp black-and-white photographs of coins. The treatment is necessarily superficial, although F. lays out the major developments quite clearly and manages to include several interesting observations.

In the first paper, 'Die Zerstörung Jerusalems durch Titus: Eine Strafe oder eine historische Notwendigkeit?', A. Giovannini begins by arguing, like others before him, that Titus' destruction of the Temple was not accidental but deliberate, and approved in advance by Vespasian. He then suggests that Vespasian's motivations were largely financial, a response to the economic crisis in the last years of Nero's reign that had caused widespread instability, including the Jewish revolt itself. Vespasian turned this to his advantage, using it as an excuse not only to appropriate the wealth of the Temple but also to redirect the Temple tax to Rome. In order to do this, however, he had to put an end to the Jewish cult: hence the destruction of the Temple was a political necessity. G. makes a very good case that financial considerations played a significant part in Vespasian's thinking, although I am not convinced that they represent the key to understanding Roman policy towards the Jews in the late first century C.E. The situation was more complex than that, and G. fails to take account of certain facts, such as Vespasian's closing of the Jewish temple at Leontopolis in Egypt, that do not fit so easily with his fiscal interpretation.

The final paper, 'Die Macht des Kaisers—Die Macht Gottes: Alleinherrschaft und Monotheismus in der römischen Kaiserzeit' by P. Barceló, is a wide-ranging survey of the varied connections between imperial authority and religious policy. B. begins by pointing out that just as the political position of emperor was fashioned from pre-existing elements of the constitution, so too in the religious sphere the emperor quickly became the focus for a variety of cult forms. Later, during the late second and third centuries, emperors from Commodus to Diocletian employed religion in various ways to redefine and legitimate their rôles. After Constantine's patronage of Christianity, emperors benefited from the parallel that was frequently drawn between the single God of heaven and the single ruler on earth. At the same time, however, they had to give up their position as the head of religion, which was now controlled by the independent hierarchy of the Christian clergy: this was the origin of the separation between the sacred and the secular, between Church and State. B. offers many stimulating and illuminating observations, but he does not explain clearly enough what he means by 'religion': as much recent work has demonstrated, this term does not have a self-evident application in the pre-Christian world. Consequently, B.'s paper seems somewhat lacking in focus.

The volume, then, is very much a grab-bag: there is little in the way of an overall theme. The individual papers, however, have considerable interest for those working on religion in the Roman empire.

York University, Toronto J. B. RIVES

H. Cancik, J. Rüpke (edd.): *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion.* Pp. x + 318. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997. Paper, DM 138. ISBN: 3-16-146760-4.

In September of 1996, a group of mostly young, mostly German-speaking, scholars attended a Conference at Bad Homburg on the theme of 'Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion'. This volume, including three contributions in English, is the result. Some effort was made to present a series of papers that harmonize as a group, or, more precisely, as a threefold collection. The three papers of the first section ('Systematische Versuche') attempt to lay theoretical groundwork for four papers on broader issues ('Querschnitte') and seven that treat specific geographic areas ('Lokal- und Regionalstudien'). Perhaps surprisingly for papers with oral origins, each is divided into small segments; to accommodate all these, the 'Inhaltsverzeichnis' runs to more than five pages. A 'Vorwort' and several indices complete the volume.

The papers in the first section attempt to establish some systematic underpinnings to the volume as a whole and are not particularly successful. Part of the problem is definition. In the 'Vorwort', the editors define 'Provinzialreligion' as Roman religion in its local manifestation in a province, or the totality of the religion(s) within a province. Similarly, 'Reichsreligion' can be the system that the religions of the Roman order bring together into a package, or any of the individual empire-wide religions, like Isis, Christianity, etc. While not inappropriate, this is, in effect, a convenient label, more inclusive of all possibilities than exclusive of some. In the first paper, J. Rüpke treats the history of scholarship on Roman religion, finds it unsatisfactory, and

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

claims, in closing, that the debate about the nature and boundaries of Roman religion has been reopened, as if it had been closed. G. Kehrer examines, with a negative conclusion, whether civilreligion, a term that derives from R. N. Bellah's essay on 'Civil Religion in America', is'Reichsreligion' in the first of its meanings. The third essay, by A. Bendlin, who actually treats the religion(s) of the empire, considers yet another broad perspective: does religion permit a centre–periphery model or preclude it because the centre does not fully control the periphery? Consequently, three straw men up, three straw men down, not surprisingly: even a widespread religion like Christianity or Mithraism is not easily systematized.

The second group of papers does not attempt to place all religion under a single defining umbrella. G. Woolf first examines *polis*-religion, treating its utility as a concept and its failures, then some alternatives to it. C. Frateantonio addresses the relationship between the autonomy of a city and centralizing religious administration. *Evocatio* and the migration of new gods to Rome are the subjects of the next paper, by A. Blomart. The final item in the section is I. Haynes's treatment of religion in the Roman army. Common to these papers is a consideration of some elements shared across geography, coupled with a recognition of local variations; because they deal with actual religious belief and practice and are not primarily abstract, they are more immediately accessible than those of the first group.

The third section begins with a treatment of the representation of the 'province' (*nationes*, *gentes*) at Rome itself; that this is multiplex in definition does not, by now, make an eyebrow twitch, especially in a paper by H. Cancik, one of the editors. Next, W. Spickermann discusses Rome's encounter of a new religion and the process of its interpretation in Roman Germany, Raetia, and Noricum. Examples of architecture and cult in Spain in the period of Romanization are the subject of A. Nünnerich-Asmus's paper. Equally local in scope is a treatment of the Bacchic cult at Apulum in Dacia, by A. Schäfer and A. Diaconescu. C. Auffarth uses Pausanias' discussion of Patrae in an attempt to cast that traveller as a sort of *ur*-Frazer (as he calls him), bypassing Roman Greece and retailing the religion of Greece before Rome. The relationship between imperial cult and local festivals in the Roman East occupies the attention of P. Herz, while the final paper is C. Markschies's examination of Christianity in Palestine, looking at Emmaus/Nicopolis, the Negev, and the Judaean desert to show how it spread and became part ofthe local culture. The papers in this section all have some interest to the student of religion, though they are variously successful and, as P. Herz remarks of his own effort, do not easily fit some schematic consideration of 'Provinzialreligion' or 'Reichsreligion'. That is, beyond doubt, to their benefit.

University of Calgary JOHN VANDERSPOEL

B. S. SPAETH: *The Roman Goddess Ceres*. Pp. xix + 256, 55 pls, 1 map. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995. Cased, $40 (Paper, $19.95). ISBN: 0-292-77692-6 (0-292-77693-4 pbk).

There has been no monograph on Ceres since Henri Le Bonniec's *Le culte de Cérès à Rome* (1958). Reappraisal might therefore be thought due. Moreover, Le B.'s work, justly praised by Pierre Boyancé as 'un travail mûri et approfondi', continued only to the end of the Republic and (consequently) largely ignored iconography. The chief contribution of this book is to make good both omissions: Spaeth has made effective use of S. de Angeli's *LIMC* article, 'Ceres' (1988). Otherwise, her account of the goddess is heavily indebted to Le B., proceeding from an archaic Italic Ceres of plant/crop growth through the early Republican triad Ceres–Liber–Libera to the mid-Republican thesmophoric cult of Demeter and Persephone–Proserpina. But she plays down the aspects of natural and human fertility. Her Ceres is chiefly a 'liminal divinity', connected with rites of passage for individuals, and with collective rituals to transcend crises ('rites of intensification'). A second main concern is with Ceres considered specifically as a female divinity. S. claims that the institution, particularly of the thesmophoric cult, 'encouraged the control of the sexuality of [upper-class] women for the benefit of the ruling male élite'. Thirdly, she argues (cf. already *AJA* 98 [1994], 65–100) that the maternal figure depicted on the SE face of the Ara Pacis, traditionally identified as Tellus but also more recently as Italia or Pax, is primarily a representation of Ceres, with allusions to Venus and Tellus.

Clearly written and straightforwardly argued, the book is nevertheless something of a disappointment. The tone is unsettling: on the one hand, the intended audience seems to be very ignorant undergraduates—we learn that Horace was an Augustan poet, Cassius Dio an early

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

third-century historian (though these parentheses sometimes go awry: Festus and Macrobius were both 'scholars of the Early Empire', p. 63); on the other, the subject presumes considerable knowledge of Roman religion and institutions. Beyond that, the determination to write down exacts a steep price. One cannot, no doubt, expect of an American Ph.D. thesis, however reworked, the level of discussion ordinarily found in a French thèse d'État, but there is a routine flavour about S.'s commentaries on texts, as though she were ever apprehensively looking over her shoulder at Le B. It is symptomatic that she has nothing of her own to say even about the famous fox-ritual at the Cerealia. Moreover texts, particularly Varro's *Antiquitates* and Cic. *Nat. D.*, are deployed 'naively', regardless of Tendenz. The mediation between the diachronic and the analytic is clumsy: the basic scheme offers four well-rounded thematic sections—Fertility, Liminality, ThePlebs, and Women—yet a preceding diachronic section anticipates much of the material andvirtually all the arguments, so that whole passages and footnotes are irritatingly repeated (e.g.p. 26 ~ 47f., 56f.; 190 n. 104 + 191 n. 130 ~ 196 n. 39).

The traditional view, that of a Preller or a Wissowa, to say nothing of Varro or Augustine, was of Ceres as a divinity of agrarian fertility. Fr. Altheim insisted on her connection with the underworld, Le B. with marriage and human fertility. S. groups these latter features, and Ceres' supposed concern with the expiation of prodigies, under a single rubric, 'liminality'. The term is taken from a functionalist textbook in anthropology published in 1942 (S. is also a firm believer in Frazer's account of fertility rituals). In this perspective, sowing and harvest are social 'crises'; the meaning of rituals, in classic Durkheimian fashion, is given by their social function. Even peace provokes a crisis: 'The end of war creates a disequilibrium in the social order that is resolved through the rituals that establish peace' (p. 67). This kind of thing gives theory a bad name. The account of Ceres and the plebs is marred by excessive stress on the supposed contrast with 'patrician' Mater Magna, and a fanciful interpretation of the death of Ti. Gracchus (cf.*Historia* 39 [1990], 182–95), which includes the bizarre claim that iron was taboo at Roman sacrifices. As for Ceres and (imperial) women, S. labours a sound, but by now routine, point to death. One wishes she could have known the work of Susan Fischler, e.g. in *Women in Ancient Societies*, edd. L. J. Archer et al. (Basingstoke and London, 1994), pp. 115–33.

There have latterly been so many interpretations of the Ara Pacis—S. was unable to take account of D. Castriota's monograph (Princeton, 1995)—that a moratorium would be welcome. Like ancient *controversiae*, they are never better than their initial assumptions. At any rate, S. will convince few that Tellus is really Ceres, and that the two children on her lap are Liber and Libera. A key feature of her reading is the waterbird on the pot among the reeds below the left-hand by-figure (for S. a nymph of fresh waters), which she identifies as a crane. It would be more plausible to take it as an *ardeola*, egret, whose flight *solvi pericula et metus narrat* (Plin. *HN* 11.140). All in all, a well-meaning but rather artless book.

Ilmmünster RICHARD GORDON

I. Arnaoutoglou: *Ancient Greek Laws. A Sourcebook*. Pp. xxii + 164, 5 maps. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. Paper, £12.99. ISBN: 0-415-14985-1.

This book consists of 111 Greek legal texts, in translation, with brief accompanying commentary, a glossary, and a short preface explaining how the work is laid out. The texts date from Solon to the mid-second century B.C., with one from the mid-second century A.D., and come from as far east as Olbia and as far west as Kyparissia in the Peloponnese, with references to parallels in Italy and Sicily. With each text there is its reference, a date (of the original legislation rather than the text which contains it), usually an introductory paragraph, and then sections giving references to 'relevant texts' and 'further reading'. The texts are grouped thematically in three chapters entitled 'Oikos', 'Agora', and 'Polis' with subdivisions, so that, for example, the 'agora' chapter deals with 'collectives', trade, finances, leases, coinage, sale, and animals. Of the thirty-two texts in the 'oikos' chapter, all but two are from Athens and Gortyn, and laws have been chosen to show similarities and differences between the two communities. In the other chapters the variety is much greater.

The work is aimed at undergraduate and postgraduate students of ancient history, and makes accessible to Greekless readers a number of texts otherwise not available in translation. As he explains in his preface, A. has taken a fairly broad definition of 'ancient Greek laws', including a

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

number of one-off decrees, such as that concerning the foundation of Brea (*IG* I^3 46; no. 96 here), and the collection does provide a valuable overview of what he calls 'the normative world of the ancient Greek *poleis*' (p. xiii). There are, however, significant limitations. In particular, any Greekless student wishing to follow up the references to other 'relevant texts' is prevented from doing so by the fact that references are given only to the standard publication of the original text.Thus, to take an example at random, A.'s nos 64 and 65 are Athenian laws against tyranny (from Andocides 1.96–8 and *SEG* xii.87—the law of 336 B.C.). The seventy-seven relevant texts mentioned include the *Ath. Pol.*, Plutarch's life of Solon, various Attic orators (all of which should be easy to find in translation), and a series of inscriptions. Of these a number are available in translation, but A. does not point towards even the most well-known translations: *IG* I^2 10 is Fornara 71, and Tod ii.144 is Harding 56. The 'further reading' too could be more helpful: each item is introduced by a few words to explain precisely what aspect of the text it is relevant to, but no guidance is given as to what line is taken in the item. These sections read like endnotes to a chapter, but the authorial text which they would be supporting is not there.

This criticism points to the fundamental problem with the book as a whole: it is as if the author has published a set of footnotes to a potentially valuable work on the nature of legislation in the ancient Greek world, but has neglected to publish the work itself. The facts that the quoted texts are printed in a smaller font than the surrounding material does not improve the impression. Theintroductions to the quoted texts are brief, and, in quotations from the Attic orators, areoften more concerned with explaining why a law is being quoted in the particular case (something which may not always help our understanding of the law) than with making sense ofthe legislation. One final criticism must be made, given that the author is Assistant Editor forthe *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*: on p. 1 the writer of [Dem.] 46 is named twice as Appollondoros (*sic*) and then three times as Appollodoros, a misspelling that reappears on p. 16 before the correct form appears on p. 22.

King's College London HUGH BOWDEN

C. CAREY: *Trials from Classical Athens*. Pp. viii + 247. London andNew York: Routledge, 1997. Cased, £45.00 (Paper, £14.99). ISBN: 0-415-10760-1 (0-415-107-61-X pbk).

This book began life, Carey tells us modestly, as a set of 'workaday translations' for a course on Athenian law. It is a collection of seventeen lawcourt speeches, concentrating on the themes of homicide, assault and wounding, property, commerce, citizenship, and slander. The selection—reflecting, C. protests again, his own 'tastes, prejudices, and whims'—is in actual fact, like the decision not to excerpt any speeches, predictably sober and sensible. In addition to the texts themselves, C. provides an exemplarily clear introduction. All the main areas are covered: the variations from city to city, law as 'embedded' in political life, the background of jurors (termed 'judges'), 'access to the courts', legal procedure, speech-writers, as well as the style of argument employed by orators. There are also brief headnotes to the sections, to homicide, for example, or to slander, and to the individual cases, giving (where possible) the date of the case, the court in which it was tried, and some minimal scene-setting. Longer comment follows the speeches, elucidating the plot, and pointing out the ramifications and difficulties of the text as evidence for legal procedure.

Only rarely does C. lapse into legal jargon: an 'action for ejectment', for example (p. 11), jarred. Perhaps a glossary of terms (to match the collection of mini-biographies of orators) might have been useful for the student who comes upon a mention of 'logographic style' (p. 60) and fails to recall the introduction. A more developed 'further reading' section—perhaps annotated—might also be an improvement in any further edition. (I was also left wondering why the publishers didnot mark more clearly the breaks between commentary and text.) On a more general level, there was only one cause for disappointment. With only very few exceptions (e.g. pp. 83–4 on homosexuality), C.'s commentary focuses exclusively on matters of procedure. This reviewer longed for similar good sense from C. on the broader value of these texts—as evidence for Greek society.

University College London THOMAS HARRISON

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

P. B. COLERA, J. R. SOMOLINOS: *Repertorio bibliográfico de la lexicografia griega.* Pp. xix + 540. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 84-00-07722-9.

This volume is a by-product of work on the *Diccionario Griego-Español* (*DGE*). It comprises (i) a repertory of indexes, lexica, and concordances to supplement the *Repertorium lexicographicum graecum* of H. & Y. Riesenfeld (1954); (ii) a bibliography of books and articles on lexical matters used by the compilers of *DGE*; (iii) an alphabetical list of Greek words, each with a bibliography of relevant discussion; and (iv) an index of recent works dealing with technical vocabularies (architecture, botany, etymology, etc.). This will be a very useful book of reference for all who have cause to consult discussions of the meaning and formation of words.

Trinity College, Cambridge N. HOPKINSON

P. M. FRASER, E. MATTHEWS: *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. Volume IIIA. The Peloponnese, Western Greece, Sicily and Magna Graecia*. Pp. xxxi + 519. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Cased, £80. ISBN: 0-19-815229-9.

LGPN now needs little introduction: general parameters remain unchanged and there is no call to repeat the history of the project (cf. I) or the special explanations in II (largely prepared independently of the central *LGPN* operation), and the opening pages of III confine themselves to clarifying the source, completeness, and coverage of the regional data. The series now covers the Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica, Attica, Peloponnese, Aetolia, Acarnania, the Ionian Islands, Epirus, Illyria, Corinthian colonies in Dalmatia, Sicily, and Southern Italy (Bruttium, Lucania, Calabria, Apulia, and Campania to the forty-first parallel). Next come Locris, Phocis, Boeotia, Megara, and Thessaly (IIIB), then N. Africa, W. Europe (once envisaged for Volume III), Macedonia, Balkans, S. Russia, and coastal Anatolia—not to mention the rest of the East.

Ten years ago (*CR* 39 [1989], 301), I regretted the failure to quantify individual regional/civic onomastica. Here we are not even told how many individuals and names/name-forms appear inthe volume. The Reverse Index yields 11,033 distinct name-forms—between II (8,036) and I (16,254 names, 14,150 of them 'primary')—but the total population is less clear. II p. vi envisaged 75,000 persons in III; that may have increased (cf. the volume's division into two), but IIIA's page-format apparently contains fewer names than I's, and there may be no more than 50,000 individuals in the volume, compared with 66,486 and 62,360 in I–II. (Lacking certainty here, how does one assess the fact that only fifty-five of the 100 commonest names in I and IIIA are the same; and that thirty-seven of the 100 commonest names in IIIA do not appear within the first 180 commonest names in I? It sounds significant, but a substantial difference in size between the volumes' populations could skew the figures—though hardly enough to account for Leon coming seventh in IIIA and eighty-eighth in I.) Another regret is that cross-referencing between different forms of the same name, promised in II p. vi, is still absent, and no more than hope is expressed about its appearance in IIIB.

As before (*CR* l.c.), frivolity beckons. We find Onomastos, Onomostatos, Agonymos, Theonymos, Onomation, Onymon, Euonymos, Amphonymos, Euonyma, Agathonymos, Philonymos, but not Antonymos, Metonymos, Synonymos, Amphoteronymos, Pleistonymos. Pseudonymos and Anonymos are still missing, but the entry 'Agraptos. Elis? ?1 AD (RE [-])' issome consolation, as is Atekmartos of Orchomenos. Agrios appropriately denominates two Aetolians and a Claudius (and also an innocent Halaesan). Nemesis of Leuctra will appeal to fourth-century historians. Fans of *Red Dwarf* can enjoy Dorkos and Dweinias (but not Diblios), and Emporos and Elephas are on hand for up-market film-lovers. Those of still more intellectual persuasion will note Logos, Logismos, Skepsis, Dianoia, Epinoia, Episteme, Gnome, Noetos, Gnosis. In a changing world Emmenidas, son of Bebaios makes a stand; and while death claimed everyone, the Orchomenian Ateles' father did try to fend off the other great inevitable.

LGPN I provoked a desperate investigation of Persian onomastics. IIIA affords little such opportunity, for Iranian names are rare (one Pharnakes oddly gets in both as Pharnakes [2] andPheidias [8]!), the most interesting item being another royal name: Dareios of Pellene (FD III [4] 403 VI,1), born at or after the fall of the Empire. Failing Persia, what of Sparta? I note that

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(among the top 100 names in IIIA) over half those called Eudamos, Damokrates, and Nikokrates and substantial proportions of Philostratoi and Aristokrateis are Lakonian, while further down the scale one's eye is caught by clusters under e.g. Arion, Aristokratidas, Aristoteles, Brasidas, Damares, Damokratia, Damokratidas, Damolas, Damonikidas, Damonikos, Damostheneia, Deximakhos, Eudamidas, Eurukles, Harmonikos, Lysikrates, Pasikles, Pasikrates, Pratola(o)s, Pratomelidas, Pratonikos, Pratylos—though much of this is late and reflects the onomastic habits of single families. On the other hand, Apollodoros is unknown, and Xenophon's adversary is theonly Lakonian Aristarkhos. What did Spartans have against these commonplace names? (Theisolation of Dorieus may be thought explicable, given the circumstances surrounding that unhappy prince, while other notable singletons, e.g. Sperthias and Boulis, Kinadon, Dienekes, Epitadeus, Hetoimaridas, and Prothoos *could* reflect the name's genuine oddness.) But all this is statistically speaking anecdotal; and proceeding further is still largely impossible. For example, there are around 450 names which *LGPN* so far knows only as Laconian. This is perhaps 50% more than for e.g. Arcadia or Argolis, but one cannot even provisionally assess the observation's significance. When complete, *LGPN* will in principle allow us to see how far Spartan 'oddness' extended to onomastics—but only if technology helps: I p. xix already noted (what still needed explanation in 1987) that the electronic database outperformed the printed volumes in answering research questions; this is no reason for dispensing with printed books, but from a 1998 vantage point we are bound to look forward to '*LGPN*—the CD'. In the meantime we should merely express an *Aboundantia* (Syracuse: iii–v AD) of *Gaudentia* (ditto) that the editors' *Vigilantia* (ditto)is assuring the continuing *Soukkessos* (Nikopolis, Naples, and Taormina: imperial) of the enterprise.

University of Liverpool CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN

A. RIJKSBARON (ed.): *New Approaches to Greek Particles*. Proceedings of the Colloquium held in Amsterdam, 4–6 January 1996,to honour C. J. Ruijgh on the occasion of his retirement. Pp. 285. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1997. Cased, Hfl. 140. ISBN: 90-5063-097-9.

Denniston's *Greek Particles*, still in print nearly half a century after its second edition, stands onmany classical bookshelves like a talisman. If a reader or commentator is unfortunate enough to light upon a passage where, for example, ἀλλά cannot be translated 'but' or γάρ translated 'for', Denniston will frequently cite the very passage and give a detailed explanation of the sub-category of ἀλλά or γάρ involved. Despite the reassuring whiff of authority about Denniston's work, some may still feel unsatisfied; we may know the different possible translations of a particle, but feel that we do not really know why it has such a range of meanings, orhow it differs from other particles which have similar or the same translations. We may missguidance on particle usage in different registers and dialects—which particles were the 'neverthelesses', which the 'don't-ye-knows', and which the 'innits' of Athens and elsewhere. We get precious little information on the life cycle of particle usage, from Homeric and even earlier stages to late antique Greek and beyond. It is the great merit of the work under review that all of these possibilities for further research into particles are in some way explored.

As one might expect from proceedings of a conference on classical linguistics held in Amsterdam, a number of the contributors follow a similar line of research to Caroline Kroon in her 1995 work *Discourse Particles in Latin* (Amsterdam). The basic premise of the approach is that the diverse meanings of certain particles or particle combinations can be explained with reference to their functions not just in the sentence, but in the larger stretch of text to which they belong. Particles act as guides to the listener not just in showing how sentences connect to one another, but also by giving information on 'discourse levels'. To take an example used by Slings (pp. 105f.), the adversative 'but' could be used to replace one statement by another: 'The dress isnot red but green'; or to replace one topic of discourse by another: 'You look awful, but we'renot here to talk about your health'. English uses the same particle 'but' for both cases, but other languages may make a distinction reflecting the different discourse levels. This analysis ofGreek particles in a framework of modern theories in pragmatics and discourse analysis willundoubtedly pay dividends in time, but I confess that I found the articles in this volume lessilluminating than Kroon's work on Latin. This is no doubt a reflection of the fact that in a

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

volume of this type scholars are only able to present discussion limited to a single particle or a handful of particles in a single author or genre; I was certainly left hungry for more.

The two most interesting articles follow a different line of inquiry, and they show how fruitful studies of particles can be for our understanding of Greek as a whole. Yves Duhoux examines the question of whether particles are more a feature of spoken or written language, and shows how, for example, in Xenophon's *Symposium* the passages of dialogue actually contain fewer particles than the passages of narrative; there is also a marked difference in the type of particles employed in passages of narrative and dialogue. Anna Morpurgo Davies looks at the use of particles ininscriptions, and by comparing in particular Mycenaean, Arcadian, and Cypriot texts she is able to reach conclusions about the diachrony of particle usage and find strong evidence for borrowing of particles across different Greek dialects.

Limitations of space mean that I cannot do this volume full justice; for those who want a taste of more, Rijksbaron's introduction to the work is highly recommended. He provides an exemplary synopsis of the field and gives a very clear summary of all individual articles, which is recommended to all who want to know more about Greek (or about PUSH and POP).

Faculty of Classics, Cambridge JAMES CLACKSON

R. STRATI: *Ricerche sugli avverbi Latini in -tus*. (Testi e manuali per l'insegnamento universitario del Latino, 43.) Pp. 184. Bologna: Pàtron, 1996. Paper, L. 29,000. ISBN: 88-555-2402-X.

This volume comprises three chapters: (1) 'Tertulliano e gli avverbi in *-tus*', of which the first thirty pages in fact concern the category of adverbs in *-tus* in general, while only the last twenty are concerned with Tertullian; (2) '*Divinitus* tra Ennio e Virgilio'; and (3) '*Caelitus*: in margine ad Apul. *Plat*. 1, 12, p. 206'. There is also an appendix, which briefly sets out the varied and inconclusive conjectures of philologists concerning the etymological analysis of the suffix, and a full bibliography and indexes.

S. found herself presented with 'una scelta tra l'esame esaustivo, ma di necessità sfondato di approfondimenti e discussioni, e il sondaggio più approfondito di qualche esemplare...', and chose the latter. One knows well the kind of publication evidently referred to in the first category, and sympathizes. But the choice is an illusory one: there is no reason of principle why one should not have both, and one has to say that the immediate usefulness of the volume would have been enhanced by the addition of a complete list of *-tus* adverbs, however sketchily annotated, both in order to put the material in perspective and as a reference tool.

That aside, the *sondaggi* of individual points are well done, and are to be recommended to philological specialists and to those concerned with the authors and texts in question. The general discussion at the beginning deals with the history of this category of adverbs and with questions of stylistic register. The section on Tertullian discusses *humanitus* at *Adv. Marc.* 3.9.5, the threeTertullianic innovations *nativitus*, *gentilitus*, and *passivitus*, and the textual problem of *planius*/*planitus* in *Pall*. 4.9; S. prefers the transmitted, though unparalleled, *planitus*. The secondchapter traces the history of *divinitus* from Ennius *Ann*. 8–10 Sk. via Lucretius to Virgil,*G*. 1.410. S. argues that *divinitus* must have its full meaning in Ennius (i.e. must be approximately equivalent to *divino numine*) in order to make sense of Lucretius' polemic; if *divinitus* meant simply 'from the sky', as Skutsch thought, Lucretius would have had little todisagree with. It is true, as S. also recognizes, that *-tus* in early Latin often apparently has an ablative meaning, like *-θεν* in Greek; but on the other hand, S.'s arguments against a weakened meaning for *divinitus* seem to me entirely persuasive, and the onus of proof is on those who wish to support Skutsch's view. The third chapter concerns *caelitus*, a common enough word in the fourth century, but attested earlier only as a manuscript correction in one passage of Apuleius' *De Platone* (where the uncorrected reading is plainly wrong). S. argues that it is a sound reading there, and that it is to be interpreted as a calque of *οὐρανόθεν*, on the analogy of *divinitus*/*θεόθεν*. This may well be right, but there may also be more to be said about the stylistic motives behind such a formation, which perhaps comes into the category of 'neoformazione arcaizzante' referred to on p. 35.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne J. G. F. POWELL

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

J. Luque Moreno: *De pedibus, de metris: Las unidades de medida en la rítmica y en la métrica antiguas*. (Biblioteca de las Estudios Clásicos, 5.) Pp. 357. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1995. Paper, Ptas 2000. ISBN: 84-338-2032-X.

During this century, the field of metrics has received a significant amount of attention from Spanish scholars—including notably Agustin Garcia-Calvo, who grounded much of his linguistic work on prosody and rhythm prior to the publication of *Del lenguaje* in 1979. Luque Moreno's remarkable book provides a full survey and history of ancient metrical systems based on feet ('la doctrina sobre la pie').

Hephaistion's *Peri Metron*, produced in the second century A.D., survives in epitome. That treatise is perhaps best known for introducing a system of metrics based on listing of feet, as opposed to other systems which used the Homeric hexameter as a kind of control against which other metres were set. However, L. M. takes the work of Aristoxenus, the theorist of music and pupil of Aristotle, as the point of departure for this study. The doctrine based on the foot first emerged in music: the study of metrics really derived from the divorce between *mousike* (music, poetry, and dance) and the concerns of philology. One of Aristoxenus' contributions to metrics was noticing that syllables cannot be valid units of measure because they are not equal to each other and that an underlying rhythm provides the best unit of time.

L. M.'s first chapter provides a clear reconstruction of the rôle of rhythm in the theory of Aristoxenus and his successors, including a short account (pp. 28–9) of the ethical values attached to rhythm, derived from Aristides' *De musica*. This discussion—as well as those to follow—alsoreveals a great deal about the development of modern scholarship on the subject. The two subsequent chapters review the development of the theory of poetic metre as it evolved from musical concerns, and examine its context in ancient and late antique discussions of metre, grammar, rhetoric, and poetics. The central chapters of the book then tackle definitions of the foot, its parts, systems of numbering, classifying, ordering, and labelling feet, according to ancient sources.

The bibliography of ancient material and modern literature on the subject has been admirably produced. There is a seven-page table of contents to serve as a general index, which will provide more than adequate service to specialists: titles of sections and subsections (up to thirty per chapter) are fully itemized. However, this book also contains a great deal of information useful tohistorians of ancient rhetoric and literary criticism. For this reason, an *Index Auctorum* and maybe a further subject index would be welcome supplements to any future edition.

University of Warwick ANDREW LAIRD

J. Thorley: *Documents in Medieval Latin*. Pp. 199. London: Duckworth, 1998. Paper, £12.95. ISBN: 0-7156-2817-8.

More and more universities find it necessary to teach Latin to postgraduate students before they can be allowed to commence research. To do this efficiently requires textbooks tailored to students' specific needs of both genre and period. This book is a welcome contribution to the growing number of readers of medieval Latin now available. It is hardly a book for classicists with a literary bent, for it focuses on the Latin of medieval documents from Britain. It also ventures briefly into the early modern period, with a short selection of intriguing items such as the dedicatory verses to Elizabeth I prefacing Christopher Saxton's 1579 maps of England and Wales, and the inscription from the tomb of Elizabeth Paterson of 1698 at Elgin. Such items are a reminder of the flexibility and wide range of uses to which Latin was put for many centuries, but it is students of English and Scottish medieval history who will derive the most value from this book. The selections of charters, inventories, extracts from manorial surveys, court rolls, and, of course, the Domesday Book make this a valuable introduction not only to the administrative Latin of the Middle Ages but also to types of documentation and their technicalities. Moreover, each text is accompanied by glosses on oddities of vocabulary and spelling and ontechnical terminology, and at the back of the volume translations of all the extracts are provided.

Welcome though this book is, it is not as easy to use as it ought to be. There is neither a table of contents nor an index listing all the extracts, and no cross-references to key in the pages of the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

English translations with those of the Latin documents. There is no choice between thorough perusal or the serendipity of lucky dip. And a word of warning about some of the translations is necessary, for there are several mistranslations, some arising from misunderstanding the Latin, others from lack of adequate familiarity with the historical context of the document in question. Two examples will serve as caution. Although the meaning of the brief but famous passage in Gildas describing the battle at Badon is much disputed, one point is not open to reinterpretation. The battle in the *quadragesimus quartus annus* is in the forty-fourth year, not, as Thorley translates, in the fortieth (pp. 31/156). The witnesses to the 1315 charter for Melrose do not include Thomas, son of Ranulph, grandson of Robert I, but should be corrected to Thomas Randolph, his nephew (pp. 59/166). As a collection of medieval documents, this book is to be warmly welcomed; in using it in my own teaching, I will give my students the helpful notes and glosses, but not the translations.

University of St Andrews JULIA M. H. SMITH

JAMES MORWOOD (ed.): *A Dictionary of Latin Words and Phrases*. Pp.xiv + 224. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Paper, £6.99. ISBN: 0-19-860109-3.

Shortly after this book arrived a copy-editor 'phoned to ask if 'felix culpa' was an acceptable Latin phrase. After assuring her it was, I checked M.'s dictionary, found that the phrase was there, and so recommended the book to my delighted interlocutor. I hope I have increased his royalties!

What should go into such a work nowadays is hard to assess, and M. seems to have got it about right. I have been keeping an eye open the last few months for Latin tags, and those in what may be reckoned current use he has identified. On the other hand, I have also been reading some of Hazlitt's essays, which are peppered with tags, and those who want to know the meaning of 'materiem superabat opus' (from Ovid), 'caput mortuum', or 'de non apparentibus...' are sent away empty by M. The work to consult for these is the old Bohn Library *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Quotations, Proverbs, Maxims and Mottos [*sic*], Classical and Medieval. Including Law Terms and Phrases* (London, 1856), which was compiled by the indefatigable H. T. Riley, B.A. (Late of Clare Hall, Cambridge). (The *Dictionary of National Biography*, 48.306b, says that he received the meagre payment of £50 for this work.) The book is well worth having, if you can find it in a second-hand bookshop. Riley's collection was very full indeed, and also more diligent inascription of tags to sources (well, to author's names at least). M., for instance, includes 'magnas inter opes inops', but does not trace it to Horace, *Carm.* 3.16.28; likewise 'in medias res' and 'zonam perdidit' are also Horatian, while 'ultima Thule' is Virgilian (and Senecan). M.'s discussion of the phrase 'disiecta membra' misses that it too is found in Seneca, at *Phaedra* 1256 (but then Riley did not give the phrase in that form, so M. scores on reliability). This matter ofattribution is not unimportant, since M. rightly draws attention in his introduction to the continuous use of Latin among the educated until the last century; thus the store of proverbial phrases was always being topped up. 'De non apparentibus...', for instance, is ascribed by Riley to Coke. We need to know that 'de gustibus...' cannot be classical, since the transferred sense of *gustus* was unknown to Latin antiquity.

My only serious complaint concerns M.'s *laissez-faire* attitude to pronunciation. We have in fact a dilemma in modern English. Some phrases, e.g. 'vice versa', are so Anglicized that use of the reformed pronunciation would provoke laughter, if not incomprehension ('wickeh wersah', forsooth!). Legal Latin, if still PC, must surely never be pronounced as anything but English, hence 'haybeeus corpus'. The poet Browning went to his grave in the belief that *gratia* rhymed with acacia, and M. himself provides some examples where rhyme shows that we must pronounce the Latin word as English, cf. his quotation from Swift where *infinitum* rhymes with 'bite 'em'. I think M. should face this fact squarely, and plainly deprecate use of the reformed pronunciation for certain phrases. On the other hand, a quotation from an ancient author poses a problem, touse reformed pronunciation or not. My guess is that we would only use such tags in fairly educated company, and since all of us have now been reared on the reformed use it would be best to stick to it. Those interested in the old pronunciation of Latin in England should consult the appendix in the second edition of W. Sidney Allen's *Vox Latina* (Cambridge, 1978).

Some statements deserve correction in reprintings. For example, Nero's *very* last words were not 'qualis artifex pereo'. 'Stat magni nominis umbra': the last word is marked and translated as

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an ablative, 'in the shadow', but it is surely nominative (and so treated in other references tothephrase, namely 'magni nominis umbra' and 'nominis umbra', all of which might more conveniently have been cross-referenced to one discussion—it would likewise be simpler to cross-reference from 'solitudinem faciunt' to the correct version, 'ubi solitudinem...'). 'Quid Romae faciam?' from Juvenal 3.41 surely needs the following words—'mentiri nescio'—if it is to make any sense. On 'spectatum veniunt...', Dryden's translation is capped by Cowper's 'spectatress both and spectacle' (*The Task* i.476).

King's College London ROLAND MAYER

P. GREEN: *The Greco-Persian Wars*. Pp. xxvii + 344, maps, ills. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998 (Cased edn published 1996). Paper, £12.95. ISBN: 0-520-20313-5.

'C. Hignett's *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece*', Arnaldo Momigliano wrote of a predecessor of PeterGreen's, 'is, next to *Zuleika Dobson*, the best book [ever written] about Oxford' (*Sesto Contributo* [Rome, 1980], pp. 696–7). It may not be a forgotten Oxford that this book recalls, but in its romantic identification with Greece and its landscape, in its will—determination even—to recreate a fluent and plausible narrative, and in its certainty that the past and its personalities can be recaptured, this reissue of G.'s 1970 *The Year of Salamis* is no less redolent of a former age. Commando raids, General Staff conferences, and an Athenian landed gentry take the placeof the now customary transliterated Greek. Feet shuffle and armour glints as battle opens. Andthe reader is confronted with a whole gallery of rounded characters: Themistocles, the 'ambitious young merchant-politician' (p. 26), Masistius, 'tall, dashing, handsome, and something of a dandy' (p. 245).

None of this devalues the detailed scholarly work that has taken place behind the scenes of thisbook. For anyone concerned with the topography or tactics of the Persian war battles, G.—though some readers may feel that the narratives preserved from antiquity are more theproduct of disparate ideological influences than he sometimes allows—is (with Pritchett, Lazenby, and indeed Hignett) without question essential reading. Where this book now mostclearly offends is in its triumphalist tone. In his new introduction, G. reveals a thorough knowledge of intervening scholarship: he notes, for example, the new emphasis on the 'Barbarian Other' and the recent revolution in Achaemenid history, in both cases with apparent approval. But by p. 5 (or indeed from the dedication page) of the original text—written, it should be remembered, under the shadow of the colonels—there is no doubt whose side we are on. Persian civilization is 'almost as alien to us as that of the Aztecs'. Persia—like Carthage, for good measure—'perpetuated a fundamentally static culture, geared to the maintenance of a theocratic *status quo*, and hostile (where not blindly indifferent) to original creativity in any form'. The struggle of Greece and Persia is throughout that of free men against slaves, the Greeks' victory a victory of the human spirit, one which 'continues to irradiate and quicken our whole western heritage, now and for ever' (p. 287). Not my heritage, I am tempted to reply.

University College London THOMAS HARRISON

W. EDER (ed.): *Die athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: Vollendung oder Verfall einer Verfassungsform?* (Akten eines Symposiums 3.–7. August 1992, Bellagio). Pp. 679. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1995. DM 144. ISBN: 3-515-06387-0.

Thanks to Kleisthenes, the early 1990s saw a series of conferences and symposia celebrating thebirth of Athenian democracy and the legacy left by the Athenians to the modern world. However, this collection is not concerned with the origins of Athenian democracy, nor with itseffects on modern democratic ideology. As indicated by the title, the contributors were askedto discuss the nature of fourth-century Athenian democracy, and also to what extent the constitution then differed from the democracy in the golden days of the Athenian Empire.

Inevitably, the question of a 'fourth-century crisis' arises in this connection, and several of the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contributors address the issue of decline of the democracy and of the *polis* as a whole. When read in its entirety, the volume presents a picture of a vivacious community and the surprising ability of the Athenian constitution to survive without losing the heart of Athenian democratic ideology. Most of the papers indicate that the answer to Eder's question is that while the fourth century definitely saw plenty of change and innovation, it would be wrong to characterize it as a period of decline.

As noted by P. J. Rhodes (p. 304), the assumption that there was a 'crisis of the democracy' in the fourth century has largely gone out of fashion; and in that respect the volume can be said tobe flogging if not a dead horse, then at least a dying one. But the existence of a wider 'crisis ofthe *polis*' in the fourth century still remains an issue in modern scholarship, and in regard tothat question the volume has plenty of new and interesting material to offer. Following E.'s introduction to the volume, in which the agenda for the symposion is set, a call for a more precise definition is made by J. K. Davies in 'The Fourth Century Crisis: What Crisis?'.

The rest of the volume contains twenty-one papers and is divided into six sections, each with a different theme: (1) Politics, (2) Literature, (3) Law and Philosophy of the State, (4) Religion, (5) Archaeology and the History of Settlements, and (6) Economy and Society. While some of the contributions cover very familiar ground indeed, others address the questions of crisis, change, and innovation from refreshingly new angles.

A small number of the papers, however, do not attempt to address the overall theme of the volume at all. One example is D. Cohen's 'The Rule of Law and Democratic Ideology in Classical Athens', most of which is repeated verbatim in his *Law, Violence, and Community in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1995), with no attempt to adapt what was obviously a part of Cohen's ongoing project to the particular context of the symposion. Given the bulk of the volume, the editor could perhaps have been stricter in his requirement that the contributions address the core questions and asked the contributors to revise their papers to suit the general theme.

It is obviously impossible to do justice to all the contributions in this review, so the following papers have been singled out only as examples of what is on offer. The contributions to the section on fourth-century literature all challenge the view that there was a cultural decline of the Athenian *polis*. B. Seidensticker offers a survey of the development of poetry, drama, and prose, while R. W. Wallace detects evidence for an increasing professionalization and specialization of authors, composers, and artists, mirroring the professionalization and specialization in other areas of Athenian cultural and political life.

In 'Söldner und Bürger als Soldaten für Athen', L. Burckhardt takes up the question of mercenaries, which is inextricably linked with the question of decline. B. argues *inter alia* that mercenary troops were used as a complement to the citizen army rather than as a replacement forit. Thus, the attested increase in the deployment of mercenary forces should not in itself be interpreted as an indication of decline. The paper includes a very useful survey of our source material, and B.'s conclusions certainly remove part of the foundations upon which the 'crisis of the *polis*' rests.

The same is true of G. A. Lehmann's 'Überlegungen zu den oligarchischen Machtergreifungen im Athen des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.', in which he compares and contrasts the oligarchic revolutions at the end of the fifth and fourth centuries. In this thoughtful and thought-provoking contribution, L. concludes that events after 322 should be interpreted as evidence for the vitality of the Athenian democratic constitution and its ability to survive even very turbulent periods. In particular, the period between 287 and the Chremonidean War indicates that the military defeat of Athens by the forces of Macedonia should not be regarded as the logical conclusion of a period of internal Athenian decline. Quite the contrary.

L.'s contribution is of paramount importance to the original question raised by E., and toacertain extent it suggests that the question ought to have been formulated in a slightly differentway. To present the contributors (and readers) with the alternatives of either Verfall or Vollendung is to deflect attention away from one of the most significant measures of the strength and durability of any political constitution: its capacity to adapt to different circumstances and to be subjected to significant innovation without compromising its fundamental values. Thus, a crucial part of the answer to the question of fourth-century decline, of democracy as well as ofthe *polis* as a whole, is to be found in the third and second centuries. Hopefully, we shall not have to wait too long for a symposion which attempts to tackle the crisis question from that perspective.

In its entirety, the present volume presents a rich and multifaceted picture of fourth-century Athens and confirms that the relative neglect of this period in older scholarship is unjustified. Fourth-century Athens deserves our attention, not only because of the attested stability of its democratic constitution but also because of the significant cultural development, innovation, and refinement which can be detected in the community as a whole.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Royal Holloway, London LENE RUBINSTEIN

M. H. HANSEN: *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes. Structure, Principles, and Ideology*. Pp. xvi + 447, maps, plans. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1999 (first published 1991). Paper, £9.95. ISBN: 1-85399-585-1.

When the first edition of this book was published, reviewers welcomed another product of Hansen's impressive ability to ask important questions, deploy evidence to answer them, and expound the results clearly, but regretted that on this occasion, in a work of consolidation forgeneral readers, H. tended to support his statements with references but not with arguments, and not to make it clear which of those statements would command general assent and which were controversial (see e.g. my review in *CR* 42 [1992], 365–7; S. Todd in *Polis* 11 [1992], 159–70). He had ended an earlier book, *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes* (Oxford, 1987), with thirty-five theses, listing the controversial views of his own and (distinguished by an asterisk) of other scholars which he had championed. Todd at the end of his review remarked that he 'had hoped to see a further 60 theses' at the end of this book; for this reissue H., never the man to shrink from a challenge, has added not sixty theses but 160, revised from an article which he published in *C&M* 48 (1997), 205–65.

The original text is unchanged. The theses follow the order of the original text, and are grouped under subject headings to facilitate cross-reference. Footnotes cite the pages in the original text to which each thesis refers, the previous work of H. or of other scholars in which the view he holds was argued, and a selection of work by other scholars in which alternative views are advocated. An appendix returns from the Hadrianic date for Pnyx III accepted in the original text to the Lycurgan date accepted in *The Athenian Assembly*. The bibliography has been revised to include all the items cited in the new material.

A good but frustrating book has now had its frustration alleviated, and this reissue is to be welcomed all the more warmly.

University of Durham P. J. RHODES

A. BILLAULT (ed.): *Héros et voyageurs grecs dans l'occident romain*. (Collection du Centres d'Études Romaines et Gallo-Romaines, 15.) Pp. 147. Lyons: Centre d'Études et de Recerches sur l'Occident Romain, Université Jean-Moulin, 1997. Paper, frs. 125. ISBN: 2-904974-14-8.

This volume gathers five papers loosely linked by a common theme of Greek figures, mythical or historical, who travelled, or were believed to have travelled, in the western Mediterranean: C.Maudit, 'De Lemnos à l'Italie: remarques sur le mythe de Philoctète'; V. Visa-Ondarçuhu, 'Milon de Crotone personnage exemplaire'; J. Schneider, 'Simonide et l'Occident grec et romain'; E. Foulon, 'Polybe et les Gaules'; and A. Billault, 'Apollonios de Tyane en Espagne d'après le récit de Philostrate'. Three pages of introduction and conclusion attempt to draw threads together in a Gallic way: some voyages are fictional, others are not, although mythical travellers are important in influencing the ways in which later Greeks approached the West; some people gather information to create literature, other narratives rely on literature to describe what has been seen. An index might have helped readers to follow up some of these alleged links. There is a bit more of diverse interest here than the desperate editorial overview might suggest.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

P. CARTLEDGE: *The Greeks. A Portrait of Self and Others* (Opus). Pp.xvi + 234. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997 (first published 1993). Paper, £8.99. ISBN: 0-19-289147-2.

This revised edition updates bibliography, but still carries a 1993 publication date and essentially remains the volume which ought to have been reviewed when it first appeared—*mea maxima culpa*. (They have not even changed the statement [p. 46] that Cunaxa is near Nineveh—a display of positively Hellenic disdain for the distinction between Assyria and Babylonia.)

C. aims 'to interpret and understand the mindset or mentality of the Greeks, the underlying and often unconscious spiritual and cultural mechanisms that made them "tick" '—and to 'defamilarize Classical Greek civilization': for he feels a conflict between the Greek roots of our intellectual, civic, and cultural values and certain alien features in their outlook on the world. For these purposes the alien does not consist of the antiquarian bric-a-brac of social behaviour in which no self-respecting historical anthropologist should get enmeshed. What worries C. is that Greeks were nasty to foreigners, women, and outsiders, owned slaves, and had a polytheistic, anthropomorphic religious system which prompted weak-minded brethren (e.g. Xenophon) to attribute excessive importance to the influence of gods on human affairs.

Greek religion is certainly a rum business, but C. does not bring this out as strongly as onemight: he describes the contrast with Christianity, but does not try to conjure up the alienquality of its constituents (e.g. blood-sacrifice) and evinces little empathetic engagement with religious sensibility, ancient or modern: gods are things to think with, and any Greek oddityconsists in the way they did that thinking—even, one suspects, in their doing it all. If thissuspicion is justified, it devalues Greek 'otherness' here—modern humanist irreligiosity is historically the exception, so it is those who espouse it who are out of step and have forfeited the chance to comment on the undoubted gap between the Victorian in the pew and the classical manin the *temenos*. At any rate, this chapter is perhaps the least successful (and C. is simply insensitive in his interpretation of Xenophon). Being nasty to foreigners, women, and outsiders, by contrast, is something the modern world continues to be good at. But, in precisely those societies most likely to acknowledge Hellenic roots, it is anathema to admit it. That gives C. a better—if perfectly familiar—handle to get a hold of, and he parades the usual suspects with elegance and wit.

There are limitations. (1) The time-frame is strictly 500–300: fair enough, but the title is misleading. (2) C. cites G. E. R. Lloyd ('to study what passes for science in a society is to go tothecentre of the values of that society') but does not much follow the suggestion. (3) The mainsources are Aristotle, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. The virtual absence of Aristophanes is paradoxical and, if nothing else, reduces the gaiety of the discourse. (4) Speaking of gaiety, apart from the odd, sometimes gratuitous, references to buggery, homosexuality is glaringly absent. I cannot believe this is because C. thinks it an area of straightforward continuity between then and now. Of course, PC-wise it is (or was in 1993) still a trickier topic than women or foreigners. (5) The cover-blurb hails C.'s awareness of theoretical issues. But C.'s bark has always been more alarming than his bite: he remains the product of empirical Anglo-Saxon training, and there is little to frighten the horses, despite his passion for Hartog's *Mirror of Herodotus* (and he does concede it is overlong). (6) Linear argument is rather elusive throughout. For example, Chapter V asks whether politics really was unusually central for Greeks, reaches aninterim positive conclusion, and continues 'And yet, and yet...' as though about to enter a caveat. But what follows discusses citizenship qualifications, *stasis*, and the Athenian *epitaphios*—important matters, but none of them obviously substantively qualifies the interim conclusion. The chapter on slavery is a similar case of *dianoia eiromene*. (C. claims, incidentally, that Hdt. 4.1–4 enshrines pre-Aristotelian 'natural slave' thinking; but since the slaves involved are the children of slaves, they are liable to be regarded as inferior even by those who did not have a theory of the 'natural slave'. Still, since Aristotle's thesis is so ludicrously bogus—C. is not as rudeabout this as he should be—perhaps it hardly matters.) This is a book where the immediate vignette and the eventual sense of having been immersed in a view rather than driven towards it win out over logical analysis. But no matter: the experience is pleasurable, and any student who reads it closely, taking care to understand all its hints and allusions, will learn a lot.

University of Liverpool CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

T. MILLER: *Die griechische Kolonisation im Spiegel literarischer Zeugnisse*. Pp. x + 337. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1998. Paper, DM 96. ISBN: 3-8233-4873-6.

The last few years have seen a very welcome development in the study of Greek colonization, with more and more books appearing. Furthermore, this important phenomenon of ancient Greek history is being viewed from a variety of different perspectives. Once, monographs on the subject were written mainly by archaeologists and historians; today philologists have joined them, which is indeed a welcome step forward. First came C. Dougherty's book, *The Poetics ofColonisation* (Oxford, 1993). Whereas the aims and scale of this book were limited, M.'s coverage of ancient authors is broader, as is the chronology.

The book has eight chapters, a conclusion, and a bibliography. Each chapter is divided into sections, helpful in following both M.'s discussion and the reflections of ancient authors upon thehistory of Greek colonization. The chapters are arranged thematically: the beginnings of colonization; the reasons for it; the Delphic Oracle; the rôle of the Leader; and the relationship between mother-city and colony. No aspect of colonization escapes M.'s attention. Most chapters include a brief historiographical excursus summarizing modern scholarship and attitudes to the matter under discussion. Although these introductions are often very general and selective, nevertheless they form a useful prologue to the main discussion, especially for a student audience and the general reader.

The number of ancient authors studied is impressive; the coverage almost complete. M. presents a critical study of the information provided by Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Euripides, Hesiod, Homer, Isocrates, Pindar, Plato, Sophocles, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, etc. The conclusions M. reaches are interesting, and largely convincing; important for historians and archaeologists.

M. sometimes tries to make use of the writings of historians and archaeologists, and to combine literary, epigraphical, and archaeological evidence. Here lies the main weakness of the book. If she is more or less comfortable with epigraphy, she is much less so with archaeology. Moreover, she lacks the requisite knowledge of the archaeological literature. For example, when discussing the foundation and character of Pithekoussai, M. seems unaware of D. Ridgway's book, *The First Western Greeks* (Cambridge, 1992), let alone the fine first volume of the publication of graves from the necropolis at this site. More such examples could be given, but this is getting into detail and away from overall interpretation, and the intention of M. herself is to deal with literary evidence. An attempt to present a history of Greek colonization from every angle is in progress under the editorship of I. Malkin, with contributions from a large team of international experts (to be published by Brill).

This book is a very useful investigation by a classical philologist. It presents an important and detailed study of the reflections upon the process of Greek colonization to be found in Greek literature from Homer to Aristotle, thus revealing the Greeks' own thoughts about colonization. This approach is one much needed in contemporary scholarship, where modern concerns and attitudes frequently obtrude, but seldom illuminate.

Royal Holloway, London GOCHA R. TSETSKHLADZE

J. R. ASHLEY: *The Macedonian Empire. The Era of Warfare under Philip II and Alexander the Great, 359–323 B.C.* Pp. x + 486, 50 maps. Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland & Co., 1999. Cased, £49.50. ISBN: 0-7864-0407-8.

In size, shape, and colour of casing this volume resembles Bosworth's magisterial Arrian commentaries, but appearances deceive, since this is no more than a synthesis of some English-language scholarship compiled by an enthusiast for historical wargames. Fuller's *Generalship of Alexander* inspired A., who complains that scholars have not consolidated Fuller's work, since attention is now focused on political and cultural aspects of Alexander's reign, whereas warfare is paraphrased from Arrian. Fighting talk, but A. simply cannot deliver the goods. Part of the problem is A.'s misconception that military matters can be treated in isolation: the rôle of diplomacy in Philip's successes, the conflict between Alexander and the

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Parmenio family over credit for victories at the start of the Persian campaign, the connection between Macedonian military honour and the death of Clitus, and the effect on campaigning of Alexander's belief in his divinity are important issues which A. avoids. There is no indication that A. has visited the site of any of the major battles, which might have seemed essential preparation for a specifically military study, and he does not refer to specialist discussions of topography. Bibliographical knowledge is generally poor: Brunt's Arrian Loeb volumes are perhaps the most surprising omission (A. uses the 1966 reprint), but there is no Badian, and Bosworth's *Alexander and the East*, which would have suggested a much bleaker view of the Indian campaigns, as well as interesting thoughts on how Alexander acquired strategic information, is also absent. Instead A. turns to Theodore Dodge's 1890 study of Alexander or a wargamer's publication by Duncan Head (1982), with the result that he is bound to be suspect on points of detail, e.g. the discussion of Macedonian equipment (pp. 26–40), where disagreements over who used what are resolved by the assumption that units used different equipment on different occasions; he believes that the plural of taxis is taxies, a frequent error which reflects A.'s detachment from professional concerns. A. also fails to master the sources, both their particular distortions and the conflicts between them, so that uninitiated readers cannot rely on his reconstructions and suggestions: his first long note (p. 441 n. 7) gets into an extraordinary muddle over Alexander's city foundations and the Exiles Decree. Campaigns are presented in geographical order, which works reasonably well for Alexander, though it does mean that A., like Arrian, can ignore military problems that Alexander left in his wake (e.g. the sweeping successes of the Persian naval campaign in early 333), but it creates confusion when applied to the more complicated sequence of Philip's wars. The arrangement of information onassassination attempts against Alexander in Appendix B (pp. 365–8), part alphabetical and part chronological, defies logic. The index contributes to the confusion: a glance at five entries revealed the conflation of White and Black Clitus and of the god Dionysus with a human Dionysius.

I would have preferred to welcome the initiative of an amateur enthusisast on the basis that the interest of outsiders is good for the subject, but this volume claims far too much for itself and all readers must beware.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

J. LINDERSKI (ed.): *Imperium sine Fine: T. Robert S. Broughton and the Roman Republic*. (*Historia* Einzelschrift, 105.) Pp. x + 233, 10 figs. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. Paper, DM 76. ISBN: 3-515-06948-8.

The practice of, if not the approach to, the history of the Roman Republic changed for ever when T. R. S. Broughton provided for readers of English a reference work to its magistrates between the fall of the monarchy and the emergence of Augustan despotism. Linderski has here gathered biographical (from the pen of George W. Houston) and autobiographical material on B.'s career and on the genesis of *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, as well as seven contributions, including his own. It does not emerge from the documents published here whether B. was aware of or influenced by his illustrious predecessors, notably S. V. Pighius.

Alas, the volume is marred by the failure of the editor to edit or index. Too many of the articles are also excessively self-referential.

T. P. Wiseman offers a fascinating account of the interplay between written tradition and figured monument in relation to the Minucii, as part of his continuing investigation of Roman myth and history. C. F. Konrad provides a useful account of Roman 'also-rans', assuming that one could ever find what one wanted in it. R. T. Ridley lists the cases where B. took a different view to that of Münzer, explicitly or implicitly. I expect in the latter case B. just missed things, as everyone does. (There is an ostentatious little flourish for the cognoscenti in the reference to Drumann–Groebe.) J. Linderski constructs an elegant demonstration that Q. Metellus Scipio, *interrex* in 53 B.C., was 'really' a patrician, despite his adoption into a plebeian family, so that it was quite alright for him to be *interrex*. But that is to miss the wood for the trees: someone engraved in 53 B.C. a label combining a purely plebeian form of the name with the patrician office of *interrex*, a combination that entered the antiquarian tradition. The anomaly is glaring. (The article is alas in macaronic style, in places half in Latin: Mommsen knew something about how to write.) R. E. A. Palmer attempts a reconstruction of aspects of the cult of Saturn; but it is based on thin air, since he seems to think that the pluperfect *iussisset* in his text of Festus, 462–4 L, can

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be translated as if it was a perfect, 'ordered'; and the claim (p. 83) that Cato 'must have said "Already" (the Saturnalia were performed with a Greek ritual *vel sim.*)' is unjustified, since what now forms fr. 77 of Cato's speeches may perfectly well have continued 'antequam.. . (P. has decided to create barriers for his readers by using intermittently the curious term 'Dial flamen'. One also wonders why he works on this material at all, since he thinks much of it inane [p. 81].) E.Badian reflects on various aspects of the tribunate, arguing (p. 88) that colonies were alwaysdecided by the people. At least two other views are possible, one that the people were onlyexceptionally involved (so recently U. Laffi), another that the people sometimes came to be involved after the Second Punic War. I think the notion that there was conflict of laws at the time of the Twelve Tables (p. 211) to be very naive (see *Roman Statutes* [London, 1996], p. 721). E.S.Gruen compiles a list of uses of images by members of the Roman aristocracy. He does not know (p. 224) John North's demonstration that there were two attempts to build a stone theatre at Rome in the second century B.C. Overall, especially p. 189, the volume reminds one of Arnaldo Momigliano's gloomy reflection that, if one does prosopography and wants to do history, one has to start all over again. But if one must do prosopography, one must have an index. B. must be turning in his grave.

University College London M. H. CRAWFORD

O. Bounegru, M. Zahariade: *Les forces navales du Danube et de la Mer Noire aux I^er^–VI^e^ siècles.* (Colloquia Pontica, 2.) Pp. xii + 124, 2 maps, 30 figs. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1996. Paper, £18. ISBN: 1-900188-17-1.

The next time I find myself inclined to curse my luck on discovering that a particular volume is temporarily unavailable to me at the library of my choice, I will bite my tongue and spare a thought for the unfortunate authors of this study of Roman naval forces on the Lower Danube and the Black Sea. The two Romanian scholars clearly made great efforts to read anything which they thought might be relevant to their subject, yet, as they sadly admit (p. 5), they were unable to get hold of the most up-to-date and, in my view, the most important modern study of the Roman navy, Michel Reddé's, *Mare Nostrum. Les infrastructures, le dispositif et l'histoire de la marine militaire sous l'Empire Romain* (Rome, 1986). In writing this review I have, therefore, paid some attention to areas of disagreement between the authors and Reddé.

B. & Z. begin their book with a brief outline of the sources and a survey of previous scholarship stretching back as far as 1654 (pp. 3–6). The next chapter describes the origins and development of the Moesian fleet (*Classis Flavia Moesica*) and the various naval dispositions in the region from the fourth to the sixth century. There follow chapters on the organization of the fleet, its vessels, and its ports, the latter helpfully synthesizing information from a wide variety of publications. A narrative of the naval activities is provided in the final chapter, which places the events in their wider political context, and, in addition to the index of names and important technical terms, there is a useful appendix of epigraphic testimonia. There are some excellent maps, plans (some annotated in Russian or Romanian), line drawings, and photographs. The text is footnoted throughout.

The authors' approach to the sources is optimistic and at times even a little naive, in contrast to Reddé,who is cautious in his interpretation of such varied material as brick and tile stamps, the *Notitia Dignitatum*, and representations of warships on monuments like Trajan's Column. At times B. & Z. seem to have relied rather too much on the inferior work of H. D. L. Viereck, *Die römische Flotte. Classis Romana* (Herford, 1976). The following instances exemplify the way these two approaches can produce starkly differing results from the same material. B. & Z. take the view (pp. 8–9) that the *Classis Moesica* was created at about the same time as the province from which it took its name, an event which they ascribe to 15 B.C., principally on the basis of Appian, *Illyrikê* 30. They cannot cite any direct evidence to support this view, however, as the earliest mentions of the fleet by name occur in inscriptions from the 90s A.D., and no source describes any naval activity which could not be accounted for by smaller detachments taken from other fleets or belonging to the Roman legions. Instead they argue that it is logical for a province with a riverine border and a military communications system which depended upon navigation of that river to be equipped with its own fleet. They cite the provinces of Germany and Pannonia as parallels. Reddé (op. cit., pp. 495–6, 511–15), on the other hand, is adamant that the lack of evidence before

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Flavian era, coupled with the fact that both the Pannonian and Moesian fleets were officially called *Classis Flavia* right up to the third century A.D., indicates that they are Flavian creations, as was probably also the case with the *Classis Syriaca.*

Historians of late antiquity will be particularly interested in B. & Z.'s detailed interpretations of the rather confusing evidence for naval units in the late third and fourth centuries A.D., following the virtual extinction of the fleets of the principate. They are broadly in agreement with Reddé that the reorganization of the Danubian fleets was in two stages, one Tetrarchic and oneConstantinian, although they see the units assigned to the *Classis Histrica* in the *Notitia Dignitatum* as the result of a subdivision of the old *Classis Moesica* (p. 25), whereas Reddé prefers to explain its development by an initial amalgamation of all the Danubian fleets, followed by a reallocation of the units under the new ducal system (Reddé, op. cit., pp. 631–4).

B. & Z. have already made numerous contributions to the history and archaeology of Moesia, Thrace, and Scythia. The series editor, Gocha Tsetskhladze, and the publishers are to be congratulated for bringing this important work to a wide audience in an attractive and affordable publication.

St Mary's, Strawberry Hill PHILIP DE SOUZA

E. Frézouls, H. Jouffroy (edd.): *Les empereurs illyriens. Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (11–13 Octobre 1990).* Pp. 186, 14 figs. Strasbourg: Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg. Paper. ISBN: 2-0904337-21-0.

This volume presents fourteen papers from a conference in 1990 devoted to the so-called Illyrianemperors. The organizer and first editor, F., died, to be followed by his editorial replacement Chastagnol and another of the contributors, Velkov. The delay in publication is no surprise. The contents are as follows: F. Frézouls, 'L'accession au pouvoir des empereurs illyriens'; S. Mrozek, 'La répartition chronologique des inscriptions latines datées au III^{e} siècle ap. J.-C.'; T. Zawadzki, 'L'*Histoire Auguste* et les empereurs illyriens (249–282)'; A. Chastagnol, '*Dii immortales*: traces de Cicéron dans les *Vies* des empereurs illyriens'; L. Mrozewicz, 'Les villes de Dacie et de Germanie supérieure face à la chute du *limes* vers le milieu du III^{e} siècle ap. J.-C.'; X. Loriot, 'Un sénateur illyrien élevé à la pourpre: Trajan Dèce'; A. R. Birley, 'Decius Reconsidered'; T. Forgiarini, 'A propos de Claude II: les invasions gothiques de 267–270 et le role de l'empereur'; H. Huvelin, 'Le début du règne de Claude II empereur illyrien: apport de la numismatique'; S. Estiot, 'Aurélien: numismatique et épigraphie'; K. Strobel, '*Ulpia Severina Augusta*: eine Frau in der Reihe der illyrischen Kaiser'; V. Velkov, 'Aurélien et sa politique en Mésie et en Thrace'; N. Najdenova, 'Nouvelles évidences sur le culte de *Sol Augustus* à Novae'; M. Zaninovic, 'Dioclétien et le commerce du marbre en Dalmatie'. With the exception of Birley's traditional prosopographical study and Strobel's exhaustive review of the context for the operation of a powerful imperial lady, the papers are too short to do more than examine a detailed issue. As a result there is nothing to bind the collection together. It is also not apparent that all the participants at the colloquium listened to each other, since there are unresolved disagreements over the extent to which Decius can be considered an Illyrian emperor and whether Carus was born in Illyricum or Gaul; some editorial cross-referencing and an index would have helped here. Individual items will interest different scholars, but the collection does not hang together nor begin to explain why it might be useful to group the fighting emperors Claudius Gothicus, Aurelian, Probus, and Carus under the label 'Illyrian'.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

G. Greatrex: *Rome and Persia at War, 502–532.* Pp. xvi + 301, 13maps, 6 plans. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1998. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-905205-93-6.

The thirty-year conflict between Rome and Persia in the opening decades of the sixth century evokes for G. (p. 1) the protracted struggle between Athens and Sparta a millenium earlier: both

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fall into three phases with a central period of truce, and Procopius' narrative of the latter part of the war is ostentatiously cast in the mould of Thucydides (*Wars* i.1ff.). The comparison illuminates the Procopian 'problem' by recalling the limitations and biases of his coverage in *Wars*, but it cannot be pressed too far. This was an ancient conflict, traced back to Rome's clash with Parthia at Carrhae (p. 8), its magnitude far greater and conducted over a vast and harsh terrain; external pressure came not from the relatively familiar might of Persia but from new and volatile tribes—Transcaucasians, including Sabir Huns and Hephthalites (the latter with exacting financial demands), Tzani, Isaurians, and more, as well as Arab allies on either side.Above all, the powers were split by incompatible religions, a key factor in determining allegiance among Laz, Armenians, and Iberians.

G.'s monograph, a revision of his 1994 Oxford doctoral thesis, is enhanced by recent scholarship which extends our perspective beyond purely Roman horizons, including Howard-Johnston's study of the two great powers (in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East* iii [Princeton, 1995]) and Shahid's extensive writings on Byzantium and the Arabs, together with unpublished translations (forthcoming in Translated Texts for Historians) of important source material—the Syriac chronicle of Joshua the Stylite and the Armenian history of Sebeos. It is organized in three parts, covering background (including a useful section on the Persian perspective, highlighting financial constraints and the nature of the army), the Anastasian war, and the conflict from 525 until the Eternal Peace; an appendix analyses the Roman initiative in Arabia.

G. is at his best in military narrative and in describing weaponry and tactics: so, for the 502–3 siege of Amida rich evidence from three sources (Ps.-Zachariah of Mytilene, Procopius, and Joshua the Stylite) is reconciled in a convincing narrative (pp. 82–94). Handling of problematical or fragmentary material is less sure, and the reader may feel unease that underlying difficulties remain. The contribution of Eustathius of Epiphania, for example, deserves a fuller single discussion in the text, as opposed to several scattered references with the weight of material in notes (pp. 61f., 66, 74f., 80n.). Some suggestions seem misguided: Procopius' scanty narrative of the Anastasian campaigns is exonerated with the remark that his chapters on the pre-Justinianic war aimed merely to entertain (p. 74), an ideal surely unworthy of a latter-day Thucydides?

Overall, however, this is a well-informed and workmanlike book which will be valued for itslucid, well-organized narrative, underpinned by extensive footnote documentation and illuminated by thirteen clear, aptly located maps and six battle-plans drawn by Maurice Clayton. Bibliography and indices are full, as one would anticipate from G.'s excellent work on the Mango–Scott Theophanes volume.

Royal Holloway, London MARY WHITBY

W. TREADGOLD: *Byzantium and its Army 284–1081.* Pp. xii + 250, 13 tables, 10 maps. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998 (Cased edn published 1995). Paper, £12.95. ISBN: 0-8047-3163-2.

T. is known to Byzantinists for his work on the eighth and ninth centuries, especially attempts totabulate detailed imperial budgets, including military costs. This is now extended back to Diocletian's accession in 284, and on to the establishment of the Comneni in 1081; I will confine my remarks to late antiquity, where, to be fair, T. is operating outside his specialist area. T.firstsurveys the empire's fluctuating military history; chapters on numbers and pay sandwich a review of organizational changes; finally he discusses recruitment, logistics, and the imperial budget. His polemical style (e.g. pp. 3–6) soon alerts readers to the merits of alternative interpretations. T. loves his figures, never more so when independent totals can be made to corroborate each other: 'the closeness is almost uncanny' (p. 128); however, his presentation of evidence is inaccurate. Justinian's Vandal expedition sailed in 500 transport ships crewed by three myriads of sailors (Procopius *Wars* 3.11.13); these were probably hired for the voyage, and do not represent 'nearly the navy's full strength' (p. 63). John Lydus' military figures need not relate to Diocletian's sole rule in 285 (p. 45), a hypothesis which rapidly becomes fact. T. tackles Agathias (pp. 59–63) without recognizing that his figures are offered in a highly rhetorical context in which the Justinianic military establishment was likely to be understated.

I would not disagree with T.'s thesis of a large military establishment throughout late antiquity, especially if one disregards his traditional relegation of the *limitanei* to second-class status: this was the Jonesian orthodoxy, but debate has moved on and T. does not engage with those currently

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

working on the late Roman army—Hugh Elton, Peter Heather, Doug Lee do not feature in the bibliography; Liebeschuetz's *Barbarians and Bishops* is absent; and T. is also unaware of the discussions at the 1992 London Late Antiquity and Early Islam Workshop on 'States, Resources, Armies' (edited by Averil Cameron, 1995). T. might have been more cautious in discussing the domination of 'barbarians' in the eastern armies (p. 13), which was allegedly rectified by a purge under Zeno (pp. 14, 95; another supposition to become fact). He could also have questioned the shift towards a cavalry army in the fourth century (p. 57), especially as later he accepts a relatively low percentage of cavalry in the central forces (p. 93).

T. is often wayward on detail. He ignores the cessation of Isaurian payments in the 490s whenspeculating about Anastasius' finances and a hypothetical generous increase in pay (pp. 15, 153–4; implausible). A more nuanced treatment of legal evidence on recruitment (e.g. when, andto whom, laws were issued) would have dented confidence in general difficulties before Anastasius (p. 154). Justinian's creation of the *quaestura exercitus* may have been connected with a naval reorganization (p. 16), but the view that it was designed to tackle problems of military supply in the Lower Danube has more to commend it; T.'s suggestion requires justification. The connection between bubonic plague and difficulties in financing foreign campaigns (pp. 17, 205) is plausible, but the hypothesis is weakened by T.'s failure to realize that the plague recurred repeatedly after 542; 558 is only one outbreak among many, and the military problems of that year may need a different, or additional explanation. Theophanes' notice (251.24–7, de Boor) of Tiberius' recruitment of troops states that these were *ethnikoi* ('aliens' in the Mango–Scott translation p. 373 is not quite right; foreigners or tribesmen would be better), who were placed under the command of the *comes foederatorum* (a minor problem: see *PLRE* III.857–8; 1237) and called after the emperor, i.e. 'Tiberiani'; some may have been drawn from the empire's European territories, but most probably came from beyond the Danube or Alps (Evagrius 5.14). But, T. insists that these soldiers were called federates, a title which was no longer restricted to foreigners, and that they were raised in the Balkans (pp. 17, 70, 205). The rôle of the Heraclian revolt in exacerbating the empire's military problems in 609–10 is ignored (p. 19). Heraclius' introductionof the hexagram is dated to 615 (*Chronicon Paschale* 706) not 616, and was a rather more complex financial change than a straight 50% cut in military pay (p. 20).

Readers must be alert. But T.'s numerical analyses have some value, and he correctly stresses the difference between the imperial military establishment and the small armies which could be deployed (pp. 58, 86). He will doubtless return for another bash at this evidence before long.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

D. Braund: *Ruling Roman Britain: Kings, Queens, Governors and Emperors from Julius Caesar to Agricola.* Pp. xiv + 217, 35 figs. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-415-00804-2.

This is not a book about Roman Britain. Rather, it is about how Britain was seen from Rome and how the province was presented to Roman readers by Roman writers. B. is thus principally concerned with how these writers made use of the 'otherness' of Britain for their own literary and political purposes. Although some attention is paid to poetical references to Britain, and a number of pages (pp. 80–9) are devoted to Strabo, the focus is firmly upon Caesar and Tacitus. B. seeks to offer a new way to approach Roman Britain which 'largely eschews archaeology in order to maintain a sharp focus upon the literary evidence and to subject it to the rigorous method that has more often been applied to the material record alone' (p. 180). The statement is frankly unfair to generations of historians and archaeologists who have worked on Roman Britain, while B. himself frequently draws conclusions well beyond what either the literary or archaeological evidence will bear.

The introduction lays out the scope and thesis of the book, signaling B.'s approach in the subtitle 'Reading Roman Britain', and is followed by a first chapter in which he draws attention tothe importance of Ocean and the special nature of Britain as being in and beyond it. This is not a new observation, but B. pushes it to the limit, and his claim that 'Roman attitudes towards Ocean coalesced with those of the indigenous population' is not substantiated by the evidence adduced (pp. 12–15). B. is keen to underline Britain's unique geographical situation in Roman eyes partly in order to explain the propaganda value of Caesar's visits in 55 and 54 B.C. The self-serving nature of Caesar's supposedly unvarnished account of events in the *Commentarii* has also been well recognized by historians of Roman Britain, but B. again takes it too far. Having

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

demonstrated Caesar's literary manipulation of his dealings with Ariovistus in Gaul (pp. 55–9), he then accuses him of outright deceit in stressing the unknown nature of Britain. B. asserts that 'there can be no doubt that Caesar had available to him a great mass of first-hand information' (p.61), yet Caesar's ignorance is confirmed by his own account (unless one treats it as a total fiction) of Commius' arrest despite his supposed links with Britain, Caesar's own failure to find a harbour despite the existence of Richborough a few miles along the coast, and the destruction of his fleet by what we know to be an annual spring tide.

B. is particularly scathing on the use made by earlier historians of coins to reconstruct the political history of southern Britain between Caesar and Claudius (pp. 67–8). Yet he himself does exactly what he complains of, drawing unwarranted conclusions about British diplomatic relations with Rome, and even about the possibility of formal recognition of native rulers by Augustus and Tiberius, from the use of the word *rex* and Roman-style heads on coinage. In this, moreover, the pre-conquest coinage of Cunobelinus is discussed indiscriminately alongside the post-conquest coins of Prasutagus.

The most interesting part of the book is that devoted to the Tacitean accounts of the two queens, Cartimandua and Boudicca, and to his biography of his father-in-law, Agricola. B. argues that Tacitus uses the queens and the contrast between Agricola's rule in Britain and Domitian's rule over the empire to explore the issue of slavery and freedom under a monarchy at Rome. He shows how Cartimandua is depicted as treacherous to her own people and servile to the Romans, while Boudicca, who is not named a queen at all by Tacitus, is noble, brave, and independent. The treatment of the *Agricola* is prepared for by an earlier chapter in which B. uses the writings of Cicero to demonstrate how a Roman governor was expected to act like a 'good king' within his province. He argues that it is the characteristics of the 'good king' which are attributed by Tacitus to Agricola, who thus acts as an explicit counterpoint to the 'bad' emperor Domitian.

These are valuable insights into how to 'read' Tacitus, although B.'s view of the *Agricola* is not in fact incompatible with the more traditional view that it presents a paradigm of how senators should behave under 'bad' emperors, and an implied defence of how Tacitus and others did behave under Domitian. It is a disappointment therefore to find B. once again polemicizing at the end of the book and declaring that 'the literary sources which contain treatments of Britain are too often used as mines from which particular passages are hacked out for consideration by students of Roman Britain' (p. 179). No guidance is offered as to how, once they have taken account of B.'s reading, students of Roman Britain can make use of these texts, and one is left with the impression that for B. that does not really matter.

Royal Holloway, London BORIS RANKOV

D. SHOTTER: *Roman Britain* (Lancaster Pamphlets). Pp. xiv + 98, 5 maps. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. Paper, £6.99. ISBN: 0-415-16579-2.

There was a time when survey books on Roman Britain seemed destined to become ever thicker with every new addition to an already well-stocked subject, a reflection perhaps of the growing store of information available and the increasing diversity in its interpretation. More recently, however, this trend has seen something of a reverse with the appearance of works more manageable in their proportions and specifically designed for students new to the topic at school and university. The latest offering certainly aims at brevity, with seventy-nine pages of text dealing with the period before the Claudian invasion, the conquest itself, the evolution of the northern frontier, administration, economy and society, religion, and finally the later period of the province from the third to the fifth centuries.

Attempting to encompass so much within such circumscribed boundaries is no easy task (*expertus loquor*). It requires a style that is devoid of prolixity and repetition, while at the same time avoiding either a density of expression that is impenetrably cryptic or one so general as to mislead to the point of overt inaccuracy. Almost inevitably within such constraints S.'s volume is something of a curate's egg. His chapter on the northern frontier, for instance, is packed with a clear and precise analysis of developments, a treatment that benefits greatly from his book on the subject published in 1996. No less informative are the sections on administration and religion, which, while of necessity characterized by a more discursive treatment, nevertheless provide clear introductions to their topics. Perhaps the least successful aspect of the volume on the other hand is exemplified by those chapters surveying contacts between Rome and Britain before the invasion

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of A.D. 43 and the actual conquest down to the end of the first century. Here the treatment of events at times proves distinctly misleading—the extension of the twenty-day thanksgiving that marked Caesar's 55 B.C. invasion to both expeditions, for example. Indeed, the whole topic of Caesar's invasions receives so meagre and generalized a treatment that the reader is left with very little hard information by which to distinguish two distinctly different episodes. So too, in contrast to other, more successful, sections, there is often little attempt here to investigate problems of interpretation. Was there, for instance, only one landfall for the 43 invasion or three, as some have suggested on the basis of Dio Cassius? Was the motivation for Caesar's incursions simply reconnaissance in 55 B.C. and invasion in 54 (and by 'invasion' does S. mean conquest)? Brevity of treatment also leads at times to a certain filling-in of details. What evidence is there, for instance, that Caratacus retreated to Wales 'after his defeat at Maiden Castle'?

S. prefaces his text with a series of five maps, the first on the tribes of Britain, followed byothers on the early stages of expansion, Hadrian's Wall, the chief towns, and finally the late-Roman coastal defences. Students might have found it useful to have the Antonine Wall and the outlying stations of both walls similarly represented, while the total absence of town names from map four and of any means of identifying the Saxon-Shore forts south of Burgh Castle on map five seriously undermine their usefulness. Rounding off the volume are appendices giving aselective list of Romano-British dates, and the main emperors and governors of the period, together with a guide to the ancient sources (both literary and numismatic) and to further secondary sources, this last item very useful in terms of targeting and its sensibly moderate proportions.

It is easy for a reviewer of a work such as this, which aims to deal with an enormous subject within so small a compass, to concentrate upon its deficiencies. These do exist (more indeed than I have drawn attention to), but overall they are outweighed by S.'s ability to inject sense into topics that have often suffered in the past from an overly inflexible line of interpretation.

University of Warwick STANLEY IRELAND

U. FELLMETH, H. SONNABEND (edd.): *Alte Geschichte: Wege–Einsichten–Horizonte. Festschrift für Eckart Olshausen zum 60. Geburtstag.* (Spudasmata, 69.) Pp. vii + 224, 6 ills. Hildesheim, etc.: George Olms, 1998. Paper, DM 58. ISBN: 3-487-10725-2.

The contents of this volume are as follows: I. von Bredow, 'Karer im Pontos?'; J. Burian, 'Die Raumauffassung in der Historia Augusta'; G. Daverio Rocchi, 'Criteri di appartenenza etnica e controllo del territorio. Considerazioni in merito a rapporto tra etnicità e confini istituzionali'; U. Fellmeth, ' "Adsumo te in consilium rei familiaris...". Ein Brief des jüngeren Plinius als Quelle für das ökonomische Denken der römischen Großgrundbesitzer bei Standortabwägungen'; P. Guyot, 'Chaos in Pontos: Der "Kanonische Brief" des Gregorios Thaumaturgos alsDokument der politischen Geschichte'; C. Heucke, 'Mit dem Unrecht leben. Die "zeitgenössische Verantwortung des Historikers" und die römische Politik gegenüber Karthago im Jahre 149 v. Chr.'; G. Kahl, *Αὐχήν* als topographischer Begriff. (Zu Strab. 12,39)'; E. Lefèvre, 'Vom Pontos nach Bethlehem (Catull 4)'; G. Manganaro, 'Homonoia dei Kimissaioi, Eunomia dei Geloi e la ninfa (termitana) Sardó'; A. Mehl, 'Stadt–Staat–Begegnung von Kulturen. Grundsätzliche Gedanken, ausgehend vom hellenistischen Zypern'; J. Schäfer, '*Ποντιακόν*: Eine neue Übersetzung des "Dareios" des Konstantin P. Kavafis'; E. Simon, 'Nachwirkungen von Romanen in der antiken Bildkunst'; H. Sonnabend, 'Ein Hannibal aus dem Osten? Die "letzten Pläne" des Mithradates VI. von Pontos'.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

A. A. LUND: *Die ersten Germanen. Ethnizität und Ethnogenese*. Pp.181. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1998. Paper, DM 48. ISBN: 3-8253-0685-2.

Lund has been writing about classical descriptions of Germans for two decades and this work follows the same pattern. It covers the topic by dividing itself into four brief chapters, on 'The

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Academic Construction of the Germans', 'Caesar and the Germans', 'German Racial Origins' (Ethnogonien), and 'The Ethnic Organization of Northwest Europe'. Nominally, there are 181pages, but the book reads very quickly; the bibliography starts at p. 126 and there are copious notes. There is no index. Greek and Latin quotations are always translated, except at the beginning of Chapter III. Here, the passages of Tacitus discussed are left untranslated until the end of the chapter, an odd approach. Moreover, Latin and Greek terms are widely used in the text itself without glossing, making it a difficult book for the non-classicist to use.

There is no introduction. Instead, L. starts his first chapter with a snappy sentence, noting that among the 'unsolved mysteries' of Germanic archaeology is 'the question of the origin of the Germans', followed by a short history of scholarship on the Germans and their origins, and some very long footnotes. This chapter is entirely historiographical, and it is only at the end that the question of whether 'Germani' was an internally or externally founded concept is raised (p. 35). This leads into the second chapter, discussing Caesar and Tacitus, and their descriptions of the Germans, suggesting that Caesar created the concept of Germans (p. 49). Chapter III, on German racial origins, begins by analysing Tacitus' account of the birth of the Germans, showing how this is derived from a classical, not a native, perspective. This account is then compared with other references to Germans in other authors. L. attempts to distinguish between 'Germani' as the name of a people (Ethnonym) and 'germani' as an appellation added to the name of a particular tribe (Cognomen) (pp. 84–5). The fourth chapter begins confidently by stating that Europe was 'not a relevant geographical concept' for the ancients (p. 86). Then definitions of Celts and Gauls are discussed, showing how these categories were employed by Caesar and other authors, providing a context for the earlier discussion of descriptions of Germans.

This is a book about modern and ancient views on who the Germans were and what the word 'Germani' meant. This concentrates our attention on what we do know, the outsiders' accounts, rather than on any false reconstruction of a Germanic identity. But as an analysis of the ideas of Caesar and Tacitus, it does run counter to the expectations raised by the title, telling us nothing about the peoples inhabiting central Europe when the Romans began to occupy the area.

Florida International University HUGH ELTON

E. Olshausen, H. Sonnabend (edd.): *Stuttgarter Kolloquium zurhistorischen Geographie des Altertums.* (Geographica historica, 10.) Pp.485, ills. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998. Paper, DM 198. ISBN: 3-515-07252-7.

In May 1996 the sixth International Colloquium on Ancient Historical Geography was held in Stuttgart on the subject of Natural Disasters in the Ancient World with three main general themes: the alleged impact of specific natural disasters; the political, economic, or social consequences in the medium and long term of natural disasters; and the understanding, perception, and explanation of such disasters. The majority of the conference papers came forward for publication, which is where problems began: these thirty-nine offerings show the disadvantages, as well as the advantages, of this type of enterprise when scholars have been tempted to participate in an international gathering and speaking helps to pay the way. Tight editorial control might have overcome some of the drawbacks of what must inevitably be a fragmented approach, but such direction seems to have been non-existent: there is no obvious logic to the sequence of published papers, in terms of either the main themes, geography, or chronology, and this weakness is highlighted in quite extraordinary fashion at the end of the volume, where the editors provide a thematic arrangement of the contents (pp. 471–3). Why this 'virtual' solution was not adopted in the volume itself beats me.

Other signs of weakness of conception are evident in the contributors' varied perception of what counts as a disaster. For the majority a disaster is an earthquake, and the etymology of catastrophe lends support to the notion that events which lead to the overthrow of structures should be the central theme; as a result Gunther begins her paper on the destructive flood at Helenopolis in Justinian's reign with the stark question 'Is a flood-disaster a natural disaster?' (p.105). A few have no such qualms and include flood, fire, famine, plague, and even military destruction (Sonnabend, Bintliff). However interesting papers on the seismicity of individual areas of Greece may be, the broad approach is surely preferable when investigating the impact of disasters and of responses to them. Another area of weakness is in terms of coverage. From

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

thesixth century A.D. there are numerous examples of natural disasters which are described in considerable detail: the most precise narrative of an ancient famine in Joshua the Stylite (the assessment of P. Garnsey, *Famine and Food Supply* [Cambridge, 1988]); long accounts of the massive earthquake at Antioch in 525 in the offshoots of the *Chronicle* of Malalas; eyewitness reports of the arrival of bubonic plague in 542 in Procopius, John of Ephesus, and Evagrius, who was a lucky survivor; records of flood damage in Procopius' *Buildings* which focuses on the imperial response. Few of the contributors seem to know of the existence of late antiquity, and only Bintliff (pp. 417–38) is even vaguely aware of the richness of this evidence; but his paper operates at an extremely general theoretical level and is marred by some breathtaking misinterpretations of the evidence and incorrect reporting of expert scholarly views. A better informed or more determined editor might have tried to rectify this deficiency. One of the most interesting aspects of natural disasters is their rhetoric, and here Barceló's paper (pp. 99–104) stands out as the solitary attempt to investigate critically the literary phenomenon of the disaster. We are familiar with the rhetoric of famine or earthquake in modern media coverage, which turns each new disaster into theatre for the masses, and with the conventions of disaster movies, but insights from these presentations need to be applied more regularly to ancient accounts. We can recognize the emotive distortions of siege narratives in ancient historians, but this awareness needs to be extended to the narratives of fires or floods.

This collection ranges broadly, and readers, especially earthquake enthusiasts, will probably find something of interest in some of the papers. But, overall, this was a missed opportunity to tackle a challenging subject in an authoritative way. Time for another international conference!

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

A. Masaracchia: *Riflessioni sull'antico. Studi sulla cultura greca.* pp. xx + 608. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-010-1.

Agostino Masaracchia's *Scritti Minori* give ample evidence of a wide-ranging and committed engagement with Greek literary culture; the studies included in this collection stretch in modefrom 'hardline philology' to the most general of lectures, and in subject from Homer to Plutarch, and then on into Italian philology, crises in Italian education (which sound all too familiar...) and the classical heritage in its broadest sense. Appropriately enough, tragedy (especially Sophocles) gets the largest space: what emerges most strongly throughout this collection is M.'s persistent concern to relate 'literature' to central questions of cultural and intellectual history, and tragedy is perhaps the most privileged locus for such concerns. Even inhis most narrowly philological mode, M. manages to keep his eye on the bigger picture whileremaining focused on textual detail. There is much to admire in the style of these forty-three essays, even where the argument fails to persuade. I cannot help also noting that M.'s apparently easy familiarity with American, English, French, and German scholarship, aswell of course as the Italian hub, forced me to reflect on the increasing rarity of such internationalism in literary scholarship. We may all be Europeans now, but a retreat from the shared pursuit is surely one opt-out too many.

Pembroke College, Cambridge RICHARD HUNTER

J. F. Martos Montiel: *Desde Lesbos con Amor: Homosexualidad femenina en la antigüedad.* (Supplementa Mediterránea, 1.) Pp. 167. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas, 1966. Paper. ISBN: 84-7882-242-9.

This is a brief, general introduction, as much on classical women generally as on female homosexuality. The coverage of sources both ancient and modern is fairly predictable for specialists, so the market will lie in Spanish-reading laymen. Modern controversies are discussed briefly and clearly, but little can be determined definitely on this subject, so the author often concludes with resignation and the occasional acknowledgedly personal impression. Thecoverage is selective, dictated by our few sources: a general introduction on problems of method, chapters on Sappho and her classical reception (very summary), Plato and other

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

classical texts that discuss Greek female homosexuality, iconography that more often than not depicts male heterosexual fantasy rather than actual female homosexual acts (as M. admits), the *tribas* in Roman society, and Christianity's attitude. Perhaps the most original section is Chapter VIII, only ten pages long, on female homosexuality as treated in ancient science, especially medical writers. The bibliography is quite satisfactory, but certainly not full. The quality of the photoreproduction is occasionally poor. All in all, good for its target market.

Royal Holloway, London RICHARD HAWLEY

R. Rafaelli: *Vicende e Figure Femminili in Grecia e a Roma: atti del Convegno Pesaro 28–30 aprile 1994.* Pp. 536, ills. Ancona: Commissione per le pari opportunita tra uomo e donna della Regione Marche, 1995. Paper.

This publication represents the Acts of the first of a series of conferences planned to examine the lives and images of women through time. This volume focuses on ancient Greece and Rome and offers a wide spectrum of topics, figures, and time periods, from Homer to Galla Placidia. A review of this scale can only offer an outline of the contents of the thirty-five essays included. Many familiar names are here, such as Eva Cantarella, Gian Biagio Conte, and Maurizio Bettini. Such a wide-ranging collection almost necessarily lacks a unifying theme, and as such the essays therefore rely on readers who will dip into various sections, rather than those who will read this large volume cover-to-cover.

Classical literature and history dominate, with art and archaeology rarely getting any more than a tangential appearance. This is disappointing, as so much exciting new research on gender is being inspired from that quarter. Nevertheless we find solid essays on the Aeschylean Clytemnestra, women and seduction from Homer to Aristophanes, Penelope, women as monsters, Greek sexual hubris, priestesses in Aristophanes as well as his Amazons. The volume's editor offers a veryinteresting article on the feminine way to die with beauty from Greek to Roman periods. WithGiulio Guidorizzi's brief essay on female madness we enter Ruth Padel country but from a more medical perspective. The next batch of essays cover women at theatrical performances in Hellenistic times (a valuable contribution to this perennial controversy), supernatural women, nurses, and Berenice II. From Hellenistic times we then venture into the Roman world, with contributions on Cato and Marcia, 'virile' women, Cloelia, Vestal Virgins, and a few brief articles on aspects of women in Roman poetry, particularly Propertius and his elegiac 'domina'.

The history of sex and sexuality is addressed in four essays that, in varying depth, tackle subjects ranging from the sexual connotations of the iambic to Latin words for prostitute to women at gladiatorial shows. Messalina as 'meretrix augusta' is then analysed at some rewarding length by Cesare Questa. The final essays cover witches in Latin poetry (chiefly Lucan), Jerome on women (useful), Hypatia's position in the history of feminism (very interesting for those working in the growing area of the reception of classical women), empresses as saints, and three overviews of more general concerns: women and literacy, women as advocates and agents in Roman law, and the alleged prohibitions on Roman women and wine-drinking. The essays by Guglielmo Cavallo on literacy and Eva Cantarella on female advocacy are both valuable, if extremely short.

The overall impression gained from so large a collection is that which one usually experiences when reading conference proceedings where no specific theme has been predetermined. Some essays are unneccessarily wordy, others succinct to the point of making one wonder why no editorial control was (apparently) exerted to allow contributors relatively equal space in print. The bibliography cited by the contributors is expectedly thorough and up-to-date. There are some illustrations which are reproduced satisfactorily, including an amusing selection of pictures from the conference itself, with two photos of an audience listening and writing with suitable intensity and admiration. Unfortunately there is no general index, which such a disparate volume surely requires.

In conclusion, the essays offer fair and interesting surveys of many familiar topics, some better and more original than others. Scholars with a special interest in gender will need to consult the volume for completeness. Its main readership will clearly lie in Italy itself, where it is to be hoped that it and its 'daughter' conferences will encourage more research into women's rôles in history.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rather paradoxically given the sponsors and publishers, few essays really addressed equal opportunities for ancient women: cue for another conference perhaps?

Royal Holloway, London RICHARD HAWLEY

B. BÄBLER: *Fleissige Thrakerinnen und wehrhafte Skythen. Nichtgriechen im klassischen Athen und ihre archäologische Hinterlassenschaft*. Pp. xviii + 306, 21 ills. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 3-519-07657-8.

B.'s title and subtitle provide quite a clear description of what the book is about. This is not intended to be study of ethnic representation *per se*—hence the modification of the basic categories, 'industrious Thracian women' and '(sabre rattling? defensive?) Scythians'. The choice of evaluative rather than analytical terms is suggestive of how the author visualizes her subject matter. B. examines non-Greeks in Classical Athens from grave reliefs, using as a backdrop the literary and figurative metaphors of different ethnic identities.

The text falls into three parts. A general section on 'Barbarians in Classical Athens' looksbriefly at an extensive range of topics: slaves—their origins, functions, and appearance in literarycontexts, as well as philosophical theories about slavery; 'free barbarians' as metics and mercenaries; and the physical characteristics of 'barbarian' grave monuments. The middle section takes each ethnic group in turn, trawls through the historical and literary evidence on that group, mainly in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., then summarizes the features of grave monuments which can be identified on etymological or epigraphic grounds as belonging to a said group. The categories B. identifies (in alphabetical order) are Egyptians and Ethiopians, Jews, Carians, Lydians and Mysians, Paphlagonians, Persians, Phoenicians, Phrygians, Scythians, Syrians, andThracians. The final section is a referenced catalogue of 146 grave *stelai*, followed by a concordance to the relevant epigraphic *corpora* and index.

The text is said to be a slightly abbreviated and edited version of a doctoral dissertation submitted at Bern in winter 1996–7. A firmer editorial hand at this stage would have made this a much more effective and useful book. The first and second sections should have been somewhat recast. The first positively bristles with references, many of which repeat in full what is already provided in an opening list of abbreviations. It covers an enormous amount of ground. Much of this is pertinent information, particularly on the location of the catalogued *stelai* (many from cemeteries near Piraeus harbour and the Laurion region, but others from within the city walls as well as beyond: pp. 53–7); and on name formulae (pp. 60–8). Some maps and graphs would have been helpful here. The second section contains the main commentaries on individual monuments, but these are interspersed with introductory paragraphs entitled '*Literarische Quellen*' which are uneven in scope and quality. Some are potted histories based on scraps of poetry and narrative prose (Carians: pp. 80–4; Paphlagonians: pp. 93–4); others are more extensive accounts of a socio-economic nature (Egyptians: pp. 69–75; Phoenician bankers and traders: pp. 119–30); Scythians and Thracians fall unhappily somewhere between fiction and reality (pp. 163–74, 183–96). There is a section on the Jews but no corresponding monuments. Did popular views of different groups of people affect the way they behaved in Athens or the manner in which they sought to present themselves on tombstones? B. does not make clear the relevance of these kinds of data to the monuments themselves.

The *stelai* are at once fascinating and frustrating. Many carry one or more sculptured or painted figures and an inscription, even if only a single name. The common incidence of ethnic signifiers shows that many indubitably 'foreign' *stelai* were those of slaves. Some were unmistakably erected to favourite nannies or nurses and occasionally teachers (pp. 282–95), though '*titthe chreste*' is sometimes reduced simply to '*titthe*' only. B. claims that 'barbarian' monuments are more individualized than Attic ones (p. 204). Individuality was often deliberately suppressed with a noncommital '*Aigyptia*' (cat. no. 4) or '*Asia*' (cat. no. 9). The latter is at best a contradiction—the impersonality of the name contrasts with the deep sentiment apparent in the fine relief of a woman pulling towards her a small boy with outstretched, longing arms. The majority of slabs in the catalogue are anonymous save their ethnicity. But there are exceptions. The most interesting group are Phoenician monuments with bilingual texts, including that of Antipatros with its curious image of the corpse between a lion and a ship's prow, the theme spelt out in six lines of Greek verse below (pp. 131–42; cat. no. 51). What these stones have in common is some explicit ethnic reference. The reader would like to know more about the shadowy

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

communities which such monuments point to. There are sculptured dedications and inscriptions, of similar cultural background and location in Attica, which might fruitfully have been brought into account here, had the monuments formed the starting point of the text.

University of Liverpool ZOFIA HALINA ARCHIBALD

P. Y. FORSYTH: *Thera in the Bronze Age*. Pp. xv + 189, 11 pls, 30 figs. New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 1997. Cased, £27. ISBN: 0-8204-3788-3.

Since Marinatos's discoveries in the 1960s and 1970s at the site of Akrotiri on the island of Thera (or Santorini), we have grown accustomed to a high standard of production for publications associated with that site, particularly its frescoes (e.g. C. Doumas, *The Wall-Paintings of Thera* [Athens, 1992]) and, thanks to the Thera Foundation, the series of three congresses (*Thera and the Aegean World* [London, 1978, 1980, 1990]), published in large format with extensive illustrations. It is somewhat surprising, therefore, to see a book on Thera in the relatively unassuming livery of Peter Lang's American University Studies series. Weighing in at just over 200 pages and in standard format (although costing £27), *Thera in the Bronze Age* 'attempts to synthesize and interpret the work that has been done in many fields and reported in specialized journals or in conference proceedings' (p. xv). Its pages contain no colour illustrations and the eleven plates atthe end are rather murky versions of fresco paintings (and a pair of 'Cycladic' figurines) reproduced in colour in other Thera publications. But we should certainly not judge a book merely by its appearance.

Forsyth summarizes the present 'state of play' in Theran scholarship, drawing heavily on the three volumes (over 1200 pages) of *Thera and the Aegean World III*, published in 1990. F.'s book is more than a summary of the Thera congress, however, for it offers a history of the island from geological time to its recolonization after the catastrophic eruption of the Late Minoan IA period. This she achieves in six chapters. The first, 'Genesis: Birth of an Island', charts the complex geology surrounding the island's formation to the end of the Aegean Neolithic when humans first permanently settled there. In the second chapter, 'Thera and the Emergence of the Cyclades', we get an account of Thera in the Early and Middle Bronze Ages and how it related to the other Cycladic islands. Chapter III, 'Thera and Crete in the Late Bronze Age', examines the relationship (trade, colonization, or political domination?) between the island and its powerful neighbour to the south, together with a valuable summary of settlement throughout the island prior to the volcanic cataclysm. The heart of the book is Chapter IV, 'The Late Bronze Age City at Akrotiri', almost forty pages long, in which F. gives us a building-by-building account of theexcavated areas of the settlement, fleshed out with helpful 'thumbnail' plans. Chapter V, 'TheLate Bronze Age Society of Thera', is a social history of the island, with an emphasis on trade, agriculture, and religion. A final chapter, 'Apocalypse', recounts the phases of the final destruction in Late Minoan IA, their effects throughout the east Mediterranean, and the still controversial chronology, closing with the island's recolonization in Late Cycladic III, perhaps two centuries after the eruption. Nearly forty pages of endnotes plus a thirty-page bibliography support the text, and navigation is facilitated by a short index.

Since F. explicitly sets out to synthesize and interpret for a general audience, we should not look to this book for new information or novel interpretation. Nevertheless, F.'s summaries are useful and the discussion is well balanced. For example, she distils a vast and complex literature on the geological development of the island down to a coherent nine-page account, illustrated with a series of line-drawings (pp. 2–11); she uses her 'tour' of the settlement to discuss key interpretative issues ad loc., such as the nature (narrative or not?) of the famous miniature fresco in the West House (pp.76–9) and to present new information (such as the unpublished finds of Linear A tablets [p. 69]); and her discussion of the controversy surrounding the eruption's dating is balanced and fairly up to date (pp. 106–13), although this area of Theran studies is likely to 'date' most quickly. F.'s grasp seems less secure when dealing with broader issues, such as Neolithic activity in the Cyclades and their colonization (pp. 12–18), and a certain naivety is apparent in the conclusion of the section on society: '[e]ven when all the evidence is found and studied there may still be no absolute certainties' (p. 102).

This modest volume offers a useful introduction to Bronze Age Thera and a valuable guide to an extensive literature. It is unlikely to remain current for long, however. As F. herself notes (pp.51–2), perhaps only one-twentieth of Akrotiri has been excavated to date, indicating a vast

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

potential for new discoveries that are likely to transform our understanding of the site and its interrelations within the Mediterranean.

Institute of Archaeology, University of Oxford JOHN BENNET

G. WIPLINGER, G. WLACH: *Ephesos: 100 Jahre österrechische Forschungen*. Pp. 187, ills. Vienna, etc.: Böhlau, 1995. DM 58. ISBN: 3-205-98454-4.

This volume stands or falls on its illustrations, and since they are consistently of the highest quality and lavish in terms of both reproduction and number, it stands as a worthy tribute to a century of Austrian research at Ephesus. There is very little text and what there is is mainly descriptive narrative, serving to amplify the captions. The story in fact goes back beyond the hundred years identified in the title in order to give proper acknowledgement to the work of John Turtle Wood (though not his foreman Corporal Trotman) at the Artemisium, and to cast a brief glimpse in the direction of Austrian fieldwork in Lycia and Caria. In this section too the illustrations are superb, but no explanation is offered for why the Turkish man in front of the City Gate at Patara (Pl. 10) appears to be holding a didgeridoo.

From Pl. 11 onwards, and there are 237 black and white plates (plus twelve colour plates), the volume inexorably pursues its theme, and like the site of Ephesus impresses by its sheer size. Remarkable photographs are too numerous to list, but one cannot pass over without comment the staggering catalogue of major monuments, any one of which any other country would have been proud to claim to have excavated and restored. They range from the Artemisium itself to such well-known and familiar landmarks as the Temple of Hadrian and the Library of Celsus. The black and white photographs are, almost without exception, of stunning quality; the colour plates, which are of indifferent quality, fail to gild the lily.

For me the most fascinating aspect of the volume was its documentation of the development of archaeological techniques. The 1895 step trench in the Artemisium (Pl. 24) was matched in grandeur only by the expedition house (Pl. 18) with its equally grand incumbents. These were the days when archaeology was a heroic endeavour with giants directing the labours of armies to unearth pyramids and temples of Aphrodite. On such sites narrow-gauge railways were a must and a fine example was to be seen running through the Library of Celsus in 1903 (Pl. 39); its successor was still going strong in the Nymphaeum of Trajan (Pl. 87) and the temple of Hadrian (Pl. 88) in the 1950s. The great names of Austrian archaeology appear at regular intervals in team photographs. The book is essential reading for anyone wishing to find out how archaeological methods and dress codes have developed over the last 100 years.

Some aspects of archaeology never change. Spoil heaps then and now are equally impressive, and other recurrent themes of this Cyclopean approach to archaeology include monumental lifting tackles and massive pumps to deal with the perennial problems of flooding. But the increasingly sophisticated and careful approaches to conservation and restoration can be tracked through the volume, culminating in the exemplary work in the Ephesian peristyle houses.

The book is a tribute to a grand and persisting obsession, and I recommend it unreservedly. The British, however, have eschewed such gargantuan and single-minded undertakings, in Asia Minor at least, in favour of more broad-ranging fieldwork across the length and breadth of Turkey, and they have made a virtue of doing so. From the British standpoint, then, this book documents an achievement which we can only admire from a distance.

University of Warwick STEPHEN HILL

I. K. RAUBITSCHEK: *Isthmia: Excavations by the University of Chicago under the Auspices of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Vol. VII. The Metal Objects (1952–1989)*. Pp. xxxv + 200, 8plans, 96 pls. Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1998. Cased, $150. ISBN: 0-87661-937-5.

This volume, the seventh in the series of final reports on the excavations conducted at Isthmia

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, is a tribute to its author, Isabelle Raubitschek, who died a decade before the appearance of the volume. It was completed with the help of family and friends. *Isthmia VII* publishes the metal objects from the site (bronze, lead, iron, silver, gold, and, perhaps, copper), with the exception of the armour, arms, and coins. The material comes primarily from the central part of the sanctuary around the temple of Poseidon, and the ridge at the south side of the *temenos*, known as the Rachi. A few objects derive from wash-levels that accumulated in the theatre, and from the later stadium and 'Sacred Glen'. An important collection of strigils, chariot and horse trappings, and other metal objects is published from a cenotaph of the fourth century B.C. to the west of the sanctuary. This material was excavated over a period of almost forty years, from 1952 to 1989, under various directors, beginning with Oscar Broneer, and spans the eighth to fourth centuries B.C., with some later—Hellenisitic and Roman—material.

Presented as a traditional catalogue, the nine chapters incorporate some 616 individual entries, arranged according to the following categories: sculptures; vases; jewellery; tripods; horse trappings and chariot fixures; household articles; tools; metal fixtures; and lead (though some lead objects are published in earlier chapters). Almost 900 additional items are listed in Appendices A–N. There is a concordance and index, as well as eight site plans. The volume is very well illustrated and both the photographs and drawings (with some inconsistency in style and quality), arranged together on ninety-six plates, with an additional thirty-five figures in the text, are of generally good quality. A greater problem, however, is that the illustrations are not at a consistent scale and the reader is forced constantly to refer to the dimensions given in the catalogue.

The finds themselves are of great interest and Raubitschek's various introductions, explanatory paragraphs, and notes are remarkably meticulous and judicious for an incomplete work published posthumously. She addresses problems of origin, date, style, and other topics, and throughout the volume is mindful to discuss the problems associated with the definition of a local (Corinthian/Isthmian) style. Raubitschek's presentation of such a large and important array of material has laid the foundations for all future studies of metal objects from the sanctuary and the region. The volume will be of great value to anyone working on ancient metal objects, especially Archaic votive bronzes in Greece and Magna Graecia. The volume will quickly take its place alongside such illustrious neighbours and standard works of reference as *Perachora I* and *II* and *Corinth XII: The Minor Objects.*

The J. Paul Getty Museum JOHN K. PAPADOPOULOS

KENNETH A. SHEEDY (ed.): *Archaeology in the Peloponnese: New Excavations and Research*. (Oxbow Monographs, 48.) Pp. viii + 117, 29 b&w pls, 13 b&w figs. Athens: Australian Archaeological Institute at Athens/Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1994. Paper. ISBN: 0-946897-77-8.

This useful volume—sent for review in 1997—presents reports on work in progress in Peloponnesian archaeology and history, originally delivered in 1993 as seminars at the Australian Institute in Athens. They cover a range of periods from neolithic to Hellenistic.

In 1986 P. Themelis resumed the excavations of ancient Messene on behalf of the Greek Archaeological Society (for later work see *AR* 44 [1997–8], 52, etc.). Here (pp. 1–37) he presents new evidence for the sculptor Damophon of Messene, whose works were seen in the Asklepieion by Pausanias. In a generously illustrated study, he assembles a catalogue of thirty-three fragments from five identifiable statues or groups. On the basis of a new inscription from Messene (not illustrated) containing seven honorific decrees (from cities outside the Peloponnese as well as local) to Damophon, he dates his period of activity to between 223 and 190 B.C. (possibly extending into the 180s), somewhat earlier than previously thought. The construction of the Asklepieion gave Damophon his opportunity to shine, and he emerges as an important classicizing sculptor.

One of the threads running through the volume is the enormous contribution now being made by the smaller foreign institutes in Athens to fieldwork and archaeological study in Greece. E. Østby (pp. 39–63) reports on the first four seasons of the Norwegian re-excavation of the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea, carried out in collaboration with other foreign schools, particularly the Swedish Institute (later work in *AR* 43 [1996–7], 36, etc.). The main discoveries include a late Hellenistic or early Roman draped female statue, blocks from a stadium, and the foundations of

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the preceding temple burnt in 395 B.C. The main interest lies, however, in two successive early cult buildings of wattle and daub, situated directly under the Athena temple and on exactly the same alignment, which push cult architecture at the site back to the Middle Geometric period.

N. Fields (pp. 95–113) reconsiders Apollo as the patron of soldiers, specifically mercenaries, through an examination of statues and votives, particularly of less than life-size armour. He convincingly revives Wade-Gery's suggestion that the epithet 'Epikourios' of Apollo at Bassai is to be explained, not in connection with the plague of Athens, but by the Arkadian tradition of hoplite service as *epikouroi*, mercenaries. Apollo Epikourios, he argues, 'defined the mental frontier between a man of the polis and a soldier-of-fortune'.

B. Wells (pp. 65–76) reports briefly on the results of a Swedish survey in the Argolid, at Berbati–Limnes, as far as they concern the neolithic and Early Helladic periods. She posits a collapse of settlement after EH II, caused by erosion resulting from land clearance. This interpretation owes much to the pessimistic picture painted by Van Andel and others for the southern Argolid, and one wonders whether the association of agriculture and erosion is necessarily so close. (For more up-to-date discussion of the data, see the final survey publication, B. Wells with C. Runnels [edd.], *The Berbati–Limnes Archaeological Survey 1988–1990* [Stockholm, 1996].)

C. A. Salowey (pp. 77–94) re-examines Herakles' 'potamocracy': those of his labours that have to do with manipulating water and rivers, such as the Stymphalian birds and the Augean stables. The author relates them to the evidence of Pausanias, the probable ancient hydrology of the central Peloponnese, and possible Bronze Age engineering projects. One stimulus to this work hasbeen the investigations by J. Knauss, particularly his demonstration that the waters of the Stymphalos basin do re-emerge as the river Erasinos in the Argolid, as ancient writers believed. The hydrological Herakles is an important aspect of the hero.

The typography of the book is rather unimaginative, and there are rather too many misprints for comfort (e.g. Navis for Nabis, p. 27; except for accept, p. 28 n. 46; absidal, p. 55 and elsewhere; Dio Laertius, p. 92; *Απόλλων*, p. 112). Some, like intrusive hyphens, are clearly the result of unchecked translation from disk files. The lack of even a short index is regrettable.

Nevertheless, this is a commendable (and commendably swift) production. Though intrinsically unconnected, the subjects of the papers illustrate the increasingly active and important work being done on different aspects of the Peloponnese, and point up the need for collaboration between specialists from different countries in unravelling the secrets of this fascinating geographical environment.

University of Leicester/British School at Athens GRAHAM SHIPLEY

O. PALAGIA (ed.): *Greek Offerings: Essays on Greek Art in Honour of John Boardman.* Pp. 241, ills. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1997. Cased, £45. ISBN: 1-900188-44-9.

The cover photographs for this *Festschrift* were clearly chosen with intent: on the front, Peitho, a fierce lady in a peplos standing in the shade of a palmette, and on the back, the honorand, looking like a contented cat, leaning against a wall in the Kerameikos in the sun. They set thetone of what follows, an affectionate tribute from John Boardman's Greek pupils and friendswhich gives an accurate sense of what it is like to be taught by or to collaborate with him. Itisan extremely personal volume, as Olga Palagia's perceptive introduction shows: its contributions mirror the wide frame of reference to which his pupils have always felt indebted.

Boardman's early publications show us not only the excavator and the meticulous analyst of artefacts, but the seeds of many later interests. The excavation at Emporio ensured a continuing link with Chios, to which A. Lemos pays tribute in her essay on the Rizari cemetery, adding to her work on Chian pottery as she goes. Chios also fed the interest in architecture picked up by M. Korres's clever expansion of an Ionic capital fragment into evidence for a whole Kekropion.

E. Zimi and N. Kourou perhaps mirror the artefact interpreter most directly: a brave and beautifully illustrated typology of Greek spoons, a minutely detailed discussion of an MGI amphora in the Benaki Museum which allows a relationship with other known examples from the same workshop, and a case for a specialized Attic dynamic represented by its pattern repertoire. The influence exerted by pottery is acknowledged in B. Sapouna-Sakellaraki's study of a Geometric gold band from Skyros which echoes Athenian painting in some detail. E. Yalouris offers a catalogue commentary on East Greek and related pottery at Harvard; some of the items are fineFikellura and Wild Goat, others allow the reader to identify shapes mentioned in passing in

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

handbooks, but rarely seen. The illustrations suggest a relationship between the lydion and the unguentarium, far from obvious without multiple examples. M. Pipili reconstructs an attractive black-figure skyphos by the Affecter, from fragments dispersed between the Benaki Museum, the Metropolitan Museum, and the American School of Classical Studies in Athens; her discussion of the shape allows her to relate it to other examples of his potting, original and archaizing, like his painting. S. Korti-Konti looks at the Orientalizing period to which Boardman has recently returned, manifested in a view of a Macedonia then, as later, as receptive to eastern influence as it was to that of central Europe.

Iconographic and technical interpretation figured early in the Boardman bibliography: cult, myth, and visual messages later. His pupils have often associated him with Herakles, here, appropriately, in the protective rôle explored by M. Carabatea, and as one of the heroes who make their way into the Hellenizing Cypriot culture described by V. Karageorghis. Dionysiac cult and symposion surface on the South Italian and late Attic vases discussed by M.-C. Tzannes andT. Sini, presenting aspects of their subjects unfamiliar because of their geographical origin or the grandiose aspirations of the painter. M. Tiverios picks up some of the same themes and personnel in an exploration of the increase in Eleusinian cult scenes in the fourth century: acalculated Athenian recognition of the importance of cultivation after losing hegemony elsewhere. A. Dipla's Helen turns out not to be a seductress, but may be a victim of established visual codes. C. Sourvinou-Inwood, abandoning visual material, though not the feel for detail common to all these essays, argues for plurality and ambivalence in Greek mythology, and for thepossibility of reconstructing ancient assumptions about it, through a close reading of the Hesiodic myth of the Five Races.

Sculpture, broadly defined, large and small, provides a strong connecting thread: O. Palagia's own contribution is a valuable exploration of the Piraeus bronzes as a group find, reflecting the circumstances in which they were cached and alternative interpretations of individual items: the Apollo as pastiche. A. Delivorrias' talents as a collagiste reassemble a possible Judgement of Paris as Aphrodite witnessing the delivery of Erichthonios. Y. Sakellarakis, S. Iakovidis, and D. Plantzos look at gems from Crete, Gla, and Babylonia, Bronze Age and Hellenistic, broadening from the minutiae of a group of votives to a discussion of the mechanics of diffusion of Greek culture.

Peitho evidently smiled on the volume, and on the honorand's nine lives and curiosity manifested in the gifts borne by his Greeks.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

A. FARRINGTON: *The Roman Baths of Lycia: an Architectural Study (Likya' dakı Roma Hamamları: Mimari Araştırmaları)*. (British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, Monograph 20.) Pp. xxv + 176, 202 ills. London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1995. ISBN: 1-898249-04-0.

There is so much useful and fascinating material in this volume, which presents the results of the author's fieldwork on the Roman bath buildings of Lycia, that it is a pity that it is somewhat difficult to navigate one's way around. We are not, even in the catalogue (pp. 149–73), told when the fieldwork was carried out, but the book has the feel of being a publication which was based on a doctoral thesis, and one senses that the thesis has only partially been transformed for presentation to a wider public. There is, as befits a thesis, a strong line of argument, pleading forthe view that Lycia had an independent style of bath building in 'imperial' (the author's termforRoman from the time of Augustus) times. The argument is well made and doubtless true (though the term 'imperial baths' is a little confusing), but the evidence used to support it occasionally heads towards being somewhat tendentious or, at least, special pleading. Much is made, for instance, of the Lycian use of close-jointed polygonal masonry. It is indeed a very characteristic feature of these buildings, as Farrington abundantly demonstrates, but it is by no means unknown elsewhere. F. is somewhat dismissive, for instance, of the extent of usage of close-jointed polygonal masonry in Rough Cilicia, though he admits (especially in n. 158) that itwas present in the region. Greater familiarity with Rough Cilicia, however, especially with themonuments inland from Silifke and in the Lamos valley, might have led him to the view presented by the late Michael Gough (*Anatolian Studies* 22 [1972]), that such polygonal masonry is a normal feature of Rough Cilician and Isaurian architecture.

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The incomplete development from thesis form is manifest in several areas of detailed presentation. Given that the catalogue has rather skimpy entries, and that the rest of the volume, including the plans and illustrations, is not arranged in alphabetical order, it would have been useful to have an accessible and extended index. There is instead a minimalist index, running to1½ pages only and listing merely place names; it is sandwiched inaccessibly between the index and the illustrations. Typographical errors are not infrequent, especially in the early parts of the volume (thus p. xix 'restreicted'; p. xx 'polygonalas', etc.). Plate 114 appears to be upside-down. The tables could have been much better presented in order to improve their usability. Thus in Table 1 (pp. 9–10) it is not easy to follow which ticks fall in which rows, and the running over of the entry for Xanthos and the key on to a second page seems inexplicable. Maps are indispensable in a volume such as this, but the two which are presented (pp. xxiv–v) are distinctly rough and ready, with captions barely legible and imperfectly horizontal.

For the archaeologist and the architectural historian there is here a full and useful account of these interesting buildings in all their considerable variety. The numerous tables present breakdowns of their assorted plans and features, and strive to set out a chronology for them. Whilst thetables could have been presented more intelligibly, they contain a wealth of significant comparative material which demonstrates the story of the development of the bath-house in a provincial context in the eastern empire. The monograph ends with a study of baths and bathing in the social and cultural life of Lycia: this stands alone in terms of the argumentation of the work as a whole, but is a valuable and useful adjunct to it which helps to place the monuments in their local context. Overall the volume has its problems, but it represents a valuable addition to our knowledge of the building type and, finally, to the study of provincial Lycia.

University of Warwick STEPHEN HILL

S. MITCHELL: *Cremna in Pisidia: an Ancient City in Peace and in War.* Pp. xv + 239, ills. London: Duckworth, Classical Press of Wales, 1996. £48. ISBN: 0-7156-2696-5.

This is an unusual volume since in a real sense it represents a very extended preliminary report on a major archaeological survey. There is promise of more to follow, presumably the sort of comprehensive final report which we would expect for an extended survey of a minor classical city, but this is a very readable advance substitute which more than adequately fills the expected gap before the appearance of the full academic account. One is used to waiting some time for the final report and then seeing a second, more readable publication follow it. Mitchell and histeam have done something innovatory by providing an accessible but fully referenced volume before the final publication. The preliminary nature does emerge strongly, perhaps too strongly on occasions—thus one feels the (pencil or biro?) sketches of the propylon which are reproduced as Figs 3, however informative, serve more to whet the appetite than feed it. The maps (e.g. Fig. 197) provided for the fascinating and highly important chapter on the siege of Cremna needed either a bigger font for the captions or to be reproduced on foldout pages. The illustrations, too, are somewhat washed out. These deficiencies will presumably be resolved at a later date and are excusable given the circumstances, whilst other decisions which were taken to expedite the production of the volume actually serve to make it much easier to follow.

The illustrations may sometimes be murky, but they are reproduced exactly where they are needed, and the reader similarly finds references where they are needed rather than lost as endnotes.

Apart from occasional lapses into catalogue form (Chapter VII, Christian Cremna) or notes (p.170 on towers in the west city wall), the style is extremely lively and readable. There are (M.'s term) 'unexpected pleasures and surprises': amongst these may be included the account of the accounts of Seiff and Davis (p. 13), and discussion of 'rolling missiles' (one complete with traces of bead and reel and ovolo decoration). 'The defenders were also much more likely than the attackers to have had an opportunity to transform a decorated architrave...' Then again, I have Austrian friends who, like me, find Hans Rott's early twentieth-century German impenetrable; it came as a charming surprise, therefore, to see him described as a 'true child of the German romantic movement'. Insightful observations come thick and fast, with the text regularly crossing the boundary from analysis of the city of Cremna in particular to broader discussion which adds significantly to our understanding of the workings of the Roman empire. The volume deserves accolades both as a serious piece of research and as a brilliant teaching aid. The former aspect

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

may be seen, for instance, in the long section relating the archaeology of the siege of Cremna to the primary historical sources for other Roman sieges, notably Josephus' first-hand account of the siege of Iotapata (pp. 206–7). The introduction, with its discussion of how the team set about surveying Cremna, would be very useful reading for any undergraduate wondering how archaeologists do things or any graduate student wondering how to begin practical fieldwork.

This is an instructive and enjoyable volume which fills part of the huge void of stories of forgotten minor classical cities. It is all the more important, as the title reveals, because this isanaccount of Cremna in peace and in war. The discovery, which is honestly admitted to be more or less unplanned, of the city's siege works is very significant indeed, and the fascinating account and analysis of them lifts the book from being another useful account of a minor urban foundation to status as a 'must' in the bibliographies of ancient cities.

University of Warwick STEPHEN HILL

J. A. FRANCH (ed.): *Diccionario de arqueologia*. Pp. 957, ills, 15 maps. Madrid: Alianza, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 84-206-5255-5.

This dictionary aims, in its own words, to be a 'vade mecum for the new archaeologist and an indispensable reference work for the lover of antiquities'. The geographical scope of the work is worldwide. In terms of chronology, the European entries stop with the end of classical antiquity and in other areas the cut-off date is essentially the arrival of European culture. One curious feature here is the deliberate exclusion of any palaeochristian entries, although oddly there is anentry on 'Christian Archaeology' itself. While one can see why the inclusion of medieval material would make the volume unmanageable, it cannot be right to see Christianity as having no rôle in the study of the archaeology of the late Roman world. As well as entries on sites, there are a further thirteen categories covering such diverse fields as biographical notes (some on ancient figures, the majority on archaeologists), conceptual approaches to archaeology, andzoology. The Iberian peninsula and Latin America are covered in depth, but this is not at the expense of other areas. There are, for example, entries on Stonehenge, Biskupin, and Dura-Europos. The entries are, in general, short, running to 100–300 words. All have suggestions for further reading and a large bibliography which takes account of scholarship around the world is provided at the rear of the book. The volume is profusely illustrated with good-quality black-and-white photographs and line drawings. Inevitably in a book of this form some problems will arise for readers. There is, for example, no mention of the 1628 B.C. date for the eruption at Thera, and many readers might wish to query the statement that there is 'no doubt' that the ancient Macedonians were ancient Greeks and their language a dialect of Greek. The entries onanimals are a welcome feature of the dictionary, but editorial policy here seems to have favoured the exotic over the mundane. There are items on the llama and guanaco, but none for the more homely, but perhaps more important, sheep, pig, or horse. The dictionary fits the task it has set for itself admirably and as a general guide to archaeology in all its guises would, for readers of Spanish, make a useful addition to a library. However, given the very broad scope ofthe work, the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* and similar works will provide a more focused coverage for areas of interest to readers of *Classical Review.*

University of Keele A. T. FEAR

D. FRENCH (ed.): *Studies in the History and Topography of Lycia and Pisidia: In Memoriam A. S. Hall*. (British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, Monograph 19.) Pp. x + 119, ills. London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1995. £25. ISBN: 1-898249-03-2.

This is a difficult volume to categorize. It has a theme, the history and topography of Roman Lycia, which is seen mainly through the medium of epigraphy, but the fabric is loosely woven and at times this reads less like a volume of connected essays and more like a journal, especially since it includes a lengthy review. The monograph is dedicated to the memory of Alan Hall, long-standing Honorary Secretary of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara. It serves as an appropriate testimony to his interests and achievements, as well as presenting the final

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

results of his fieldwork and his last writings, both finished and unfinished (worked up by Nicholas Milner). I should say at this point that one striking feature of this volume, which is allthe more remarkable given its mixed authorship, is the quality of the writing, which raises what is relatively technical material to clear but distinguished prose. Furthermore, the quality of proof-reading is excellent. Put simply, the book is a pleasure to read.

The down side of the collective nature of the publication is that it is sometimes difficult to find things. The bibliography, for instance, is not exhaustive. Thus the omission from the bibliography of Hall and Coulton 1990 on the allotment list from Balboura (referred to on p. 52) seems inexplicable, though it may be tracked down in the list of Alan Hall's publications. It requires considerable ingenuity to work out that various of the maps presented at the back of the volume join together or even overlap substantially. The full and clear index, however, does much to help the reader through the somewhat disparate content of the volume as a whole, and there are leitmotifs which serve as convenient bridges linking the various articles in the text. References to Zgusta follow the review of his contribution to the study of Asia Minor. There is the obvious counterpoint of Sinda and Isinda. The route of Cn. Manlius Vulso can be followed through both the texts and the maps at the end of the book.

The individual pieces offer considerable variety in terms of content and approach. The decision to include Alan Hall's review article on Ladislav Zgusta's publications on the personal names of Asia Minor was well justified. It not only secures the publication of a piece of mature writing by Alan Hall which could so easily have been lost in an archive, but is also particularly appropriate because of the autobiographical elements which Hall chose to include in it. The Hall *Nachlass* is also well served by the appearance of the complete article in which he argued convincingly for positioning Sinda at Lake Gölhisar, and, as if this were not enough to resolve the long-term 'confusion of Sinda with the better known "Isinda" ', David French thoroughly ends the discussion in his compelling account of 'Isinda and Lagbe'. Nicholas Milner is to be congratulated for bringing into shape Hall's 'rough draft' of an article which appears as an authoritative account ofinscriptions relating to the festivals of Oenoanda, where Hall recorded the inscriptions apart from the philosophical inscription of Diogenes. Mitchell's piece on Termessos and Amyntas presents a major inscription and casts useful light on an aspect of provincial history.

Taken overall, the volume has much of interest and much that is original. It fully achieves its aim of providing an appropriate and lasting memorial to Alan Hall.

University of Warwick STEPHEN HILL

A. PAPATHOMAS (ed.): *Fünfundzwanzig griechische Papyri aus denSammlungen von Heidelberg, Wien und Kairo (P. Heid. VII)*. (Veröffenflichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung, neue Folge, philosophisch-historische Klasse, 8.) Pp. xv + 258, 24 pls. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1996. DM 138. ISBN: 3-8253-0400-0.

The seventh volume of the Heidelburg Papyri is a lightly revised doctoral thesis containing a miscellany of twenty-five Greek documents from the Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine periods in Egypt from the University of Heidelberg, the Austrian National Library, and the Egyptian Museum in Cairo.

The Ptolemaic texts derive primarily from mummy cartonnage. Items **387–9** from the Arsinoite Nome around Lake Moeris, the modern Fayum in central Egypt, belong to the small archive of Automedon the *sitologos* (keeper of the public granary) in 212 B.C. Their date is determined bythe identification of Zephyrus the *oikonomos*, who sends **387**. He is known from Greek and Demotic sources. **390–2** are a series of Ptolemaic registrations of land and houses again from the Arsinoite nome of the late third to early second centuries B.C. Though fragmentary, they add toour knowledge of the formulae of registration at this period. **393–4** are both addressed to Dicaeus, the chief of police of Moithymis in the Memphite Nome in the late third century B.C. Heis also known from *P. Köln* V 216. They are respectively an *Order to Arrest* and a *Complaint against Graziers.*

From the Roman Period **396** is written in a clear official hand, being a copy of the prescript ofan Edict of the Emperor Hadrian of A.D. 136 granting tax relief after a low inundation of theNile. This text is already known from three other papyrus copies, *P. Cair.* inv. 49359 and 49360, and *P. Oslo* III 78. The purpose of this document was well discussed by the late Danielle

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bonneau, *Le fisc et le Nil—Incidences de irrégularités du Nil sur la fiscalité foncière dans l'Égypte grecque et romaine* (Paris, 1971), pp. 180ff. Since almost no rain falls in Egypt, the rise of the Nile in September each year, as measured on the Nilometer at Elephantine, allowed the Ptolemaic King or Roman governor to estimate with precision in advance the corn crop for the coming year in lower Egypt. A low Nile means inadequate supplies of grain for the corn dole in Rome two years later and provision may have to be made to alleviate famine in Egypt itself. In l. 10 of **396** it supplies in the aside—σὺν] θεῷ δὲ γ[ενέ]σθω—the word γένεσθω where the two Cairo papyri have εἰρήσθω.

In **406**, an account of clothing of the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. lists the items which are in the hands of Dorotheus the fuller for cleaning. They include a number of Latin names for garments in Greek transliteration, as καμάσιον = *camis(i)a* = Fr. *chemise*; κερβικάριον = *ceruical*; φαινόλιον = *paenula*. κολόβιον is a reminder that one of the garments worn by Queen Elizabeth II at her coronation on 2 June 1953 is the *Colobion sindonis*, a half-sleeved tunic of muslin.

The remaining texts are a series of Byzantine letters. The volume ends with eight pages of corrections proposed in papyri previously published.

The volume is well printed and bound, and the twenty-four plates are of excellent quality. The commentaries to the texts would have benefited from severe editorial pruning: though accurate, they are far more extended than the individual pieces deserve.

University College London W. E. H. COCKLE

J. LONGRIGG: *Greek Medicine From the Heroic to the Hellenistic Age. A Source Book*. Pp. vii + 244. London: Duckworth, 1998. Paper, £14.95. ISBN: 0-7156-2771-6.

A sourcebook cannot avoid certain shortcomings inherent to the genre. By selecting short extracts one must remove them from their context, while their subsequent arrangement may convey a message above and beyond that intended by the compiler. Nevertheless, those who teach ancient medicine, those who would like to introduce it into broader courses on ancient society, and those whose own background in medical history does not extend back to the classical period will want to explore the collection L. has assembled here. The first seven sections trace a chronological path from Near Eastern cultures and Homeric poetry to the practice of anatomy in third-century Alexandria; these sections are followed by nine more thematic chapters covering topics which include deontology, epidemic disease, and prognosis. In addition to a brief comment introducing each extract, every chapter ends with a 'synopsis' in which L. weaves together the sources used and links them to the material in other sections. The supporting material consists of a chronological table, glossary of technical terms, bibliography, concordance of passages cited, and very full index.

L. is fully aware of the main criticisms a reader will raise. In particular, in his brief Introduction he notes that the arrangement of material into the topics chosen here 'may not be to the taste of every reader'. Here, however, I would argue that it is not just a matter of taste. Although L. claims in his own defence to have used plenty of cross-references 'as reminders of the more unitary nature of Greek medicine', the presence of separate chapters headed 'Pharmacology', 'Surgery', 'Anatomy', and 'Gynaecology' can convey a highly misleading impression. One need only consider the very different effect conveyed by calling pharmacology 'Drug Lore'; this would act to suppress any image of a laboratory scientist holding up a test-tube, and instead suggest a wider social tradition of buying and using drugs, and perhaps also of making associations between substances used as medicaments and their uses in myth and ritual. Some of the modernizing vocabulary can also be disconcerting; for example, Helen's *pharmakon* in *Odyssey* 4 is described as 'a powerful Egyptian tranquilliser' (p. 157).

More generally, however, this never ceases to be a sourcebook with a message. The Introduction opens with the sentence 'One of the most impressive contributions of the ancient Greeks to Western culture was their invention of rational medicine' (p. 1). If this seems familiar, it is because it is also the opening sentence of L.'s monograph, *Greek Rational Medicine: Philosophy and Medicine from Alcmaeon to the Alexandrians* (London, 1993). The sentiment governs L.'s choice of materials and, in particular, his lack of interest in what he calls the 'social and practical aspects of Greek medicine', in favour of 'that aspect of Greek medicine that set it apart from other medical systems—its rational and theoretical nature' (p. 1). The problem with this approach is that, without knowledge of the social context of Greek medicine, it is difficult

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

toappreciate its distinctive features. For example, as Geoffrey Lloyd's work has shown, the Hippocratic emphasis on persuasion can be understood as a means of gaining the patient's confidence in the absence of formal medical training or professional licensing.

Among L.'s achievements at Newcastle was the development of the first undergraduate option in ancient medicine to have been set up in this country, and I assume this experience lies behind his interest in producing a sourcebook. While the 'synopsis' sections will be useful for scholars in Classics and elsewhere who want to find out about ancient medicine, they diminish the value of the book for teaching purposes by giving the impression that these interpretations are the only ones possible. Although it is useful to have these sources available in one volume, those who teach ancient medicine may have preferred a more 'open' approach, in which students were left to read the materials and then think for themselves.

University of Reading HELEN KING

D. GUTAS: *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture. The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early Abbasid Society (2nd–4th/ 8th–10th Centuries)*. Pp. xvii + 230. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. Paper, £14.99. ISBN: 0-415-06133-4.

In the first part of this highly readable book Gutas (one of the most respected interpreters ofClassical Arabic culture) charts the reasons why Greek science and thought came to be translated into Arabic. In the second part he places the personnel of the translation movement in their social context. The basic argument is that social and political changes internal to the Abbasid state fostered the translations which then continued naturally in tandem with Arabic science and philosophy. Byzantine awareness of Arabic achievements in the sciences may even have been a factor in the revival of learning at Constantinople in the ninth century.

The enormity of the translation movement must be recognized: almost all non-literary and non-historical secular Greek books were translated between 750 and 950 A.D. Many of these do not survive in the original. Thus we are not dealing with the eccentric whim of a few enlightened grandees (as has been assumed) but witness a phenomenon that was supported by the entire élite of Abbasid society. It was also conducted according to the highest philological standards. A limited number of translations had been made under the Ummayads (661–750). More important than these were translations from Persian Zoroastrian culture, especially in the formative years ofthe Abbasid revolution (*c.* 720–54), for the Abbasid powerbase was in the Persian cultural domain and Zoroastrian influences quickly became important in the new court at Baghdad. Zoroastrianism promoted the idea that all knowledge came from the Avesta, including the charge that Greek learning was purloined from the Persians by Alexander. It also made astrology central to imperial politics. The second Abbasid Caliph, Al-Manṣûr (754–75), took care to co-opt Zoroastrianism to his own purposes. And there is good, but neglected, evidence to show that he was the first to promote systematically the translation of Greek sciences, including astronomy and astrology.

The next caliph, Al-Mahdî (775–85), was faced with a problem of his father's making: the creation of a universalizing, proselytizing Islam. This caused a backlash of apologetic from other religions. To counter this Al-Mahdî commanded an Islamic dialectic beginning with a translation of Aristotle's *Topics*. The theological disputants' need to clarify the workings of the universe alsocalled forth a series of Arabized *Physics*. It is in the age of Al-Ma'mûn (813–33) and his centralizing theological policies that Greek thought was particulary harnessed to Islamic needs. Anti-Byzantine propaganda beginning in this period portrayed the Byzantines as uncultured andunworthy heirs of the ancient Greeks, whose mythical ancestor, Yûnân, was optimistically presented as a brother to Qaḥṭân, father of the Arabs. Greek learning was coming home. The rest of the ninth century marked the apogee of the translation movement. Its decline and end towards the millennium reflects the maturity of Islamic culture and the absence of a need for further work.

G.'s work is important for any classicist interested in the legacy and transmission of Greek culture and provides excellent comparative material for those working on the interaction of all ancient cultures, including especially the development of Greek thought at Rome.

University of Warwick SIMON SWAIN

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

H. JONES: *Master Tully. Cicero in Tudor England*. Pp. viii + 316. Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1998. Cased, frs. 120. ISBN: 90-6004-443-6.

In this book J. intends to describe Cicero's influence upon English intellectual and cultural life during the sixteenth century. J. acknowledges that the book is largely a synthesis of the work ofearlier scholars (p. viii). Chapter I offers a brief summary of Cicero's life and public career based on familiar secondary sources and with citations of Cicero's letters. Chapter II provides two- to three-page outlines of Cicero's principal philosophical works. Chapter III sketches the *fortuna* of Cicero's works from medieval florilegia and commentaries, via textual rediscoveries, to Bruni, Petrarch, and Salutati in Renaissance Italy. Largely on the basis of Roberto Weiss's *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 1967), Chapter IV provides an account of Italians who visited England and English scholars in Italy in the fifteenth century, culminating in Linacre, Grocyn, and Colet.

Chapter V is devoted to printing history. Drawing on the British Library Incunabula Short-Title Catalogue, S. presents comparative tables to show that Cicero (324 editions) was printed twice as often in the incunabular period as Virgil (161 editions), the next most popular classical author, that Italy produced 65% of Cicero incunables (almost half of them from Venice), and thatEngland produced only one edition. Owing to the easy availability of superior continental imports, there were only seven English editions of Cicero between 1501 and 1550, followed by a slightly more respectable sixty editions in the second half of the century. J. shows that some sixteenth-century English translations are best regarded as glosses to Cicero's vocabulary (pp.133–7, 143–6), distinguishing Nicholas Grimald's seven times printed translation of *De officiis* for higher praise (pp. 139–42).

Chapter VI uses extracts from Brinsley's *Ludus Literarius* (1612) and lists of texts studied toprovide an unimaginative and uncritical description of Tudor grammar school education. Chapter VII considers the relationship between the printing of grammar school texts and the development of early forms of copyright. Chapter VIII discusses the texts required by university statutes, the holdings of college and university libraries, and, making good use of the excellent indices in Elizabeth Leedham-Green's *Books in Cambridge Inventories* (Cambridge, 1986), the inventories of personal libraries of students and teachers at Oxford and Cambridge. Chapter IX describes theories of Ciceronian imitation in Italian Renaissance writers, and in Roger Ascham and Gabriel Harvey. The usefulness of the book is enhanced by S.'s bibliographies of basic primary and secondary texts for each chapter (pp. 281–306).

At its best, J.'s book is a clear, readable guide to the texts and primary evidence which a student of sixteenth-century English classical education needs to master, though it is curious that J. makes no reference to J. W. Binns's magisterial *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England* (Leeds, 1990) or to J. K. McConica's excellent chapters in his *History of the University of Oxford, III, The Collegiate University* (Oxford, 1986). The book touches on a range of subjects, such as Tudor printing history, imitation, grammar school statutes, and university booklists, which have been surveyed before, without originality but also without being misleading. It is a pity that J. did not choose to press some of his observations a little harder. For example, he shows that *De officiis* was by some distance the most studied of Cicero's philosophical works in Tudor England, but he does not go on to ask what impact the work had on English writing and thought. Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Book Named the Governor*, William Baldwin's twenty-four times printed *A Treatise of Moral Philosophy*, Lyly's *Euphues*, and the parliamentary speeches of Sir Nicholas Bacon would have provided ample evidence. This book does not succeed in its ambitious objective. However, treated as an annotated reading list, it will be useful to students who want an introduction to the place of classical texts in sixteenth-century English education.

University of Warwick PETER MACK

W. M. CALDER III: *Men in Their Books. Studies in the Modern History of Classical Scholarship* (edd. J. P. Harris, R. C. Smith). Pp. xlvi + 324. Hildesheim, etc.: Georg Olms, 1998. Paper, DM 88. ISBN: 3-487-10686-8.

ln a biographical sketch of Werner Jaeger, included in this volume, Calder records the following

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

anecdote: 'He told me once that the Rector ordered his pupils to memorize the names of Horace's friends. When the boy Jaeger asked why, the Rector snapped, "When you are as old as I am, you will know why." Jaeger continued, "I am older than he was and I still do not know why" ' (p. 130). I must confess that this collection of articles has left me equally mystified; not as to why we should study the history of classical scholarship (there are plenty of reasons why *Wissenschaftsgeschichte* is important), but as to why C. himself thinks it is worth studying.

In an article of 1981 (*Classical World* 74.5), C. suggested that this kind of research is attractive above all because, unlike in mainstream classics, it is easy to find something new to say. I havesearched his new collection for any evidence that this remark was made with tongue in cheek, largely in vain. C. firmly dissociates himself from the history of ideas, praising Wilamowitz precisely for being out of step with the *Zeitgeist* (p. 83). His concern is explicitly biographical; great men (and one woman) are of interest in their own right, and because they aregreat the merest details of their professional lives must be of interest. There is no denying that this approach has indeed provided C. with ample material for publication (over 600 items in the bibliography so far); but, divorced from either a comprehensive biography of Wilamowitz or a clear agenda for research, these detailed studies of academic politics in late nineteenth-century Göttingen and the like seem painfully trivial.

The most disconcerting piece here is a scathing critique of the Columbia Classics Department in 1938 by William Abbott Oldfather, with introduction and notes by C. Quite what is to be achieved by publishing this document, other than giving academics nightmares about what might be said about *them* behind their backs, is not explained until the end: having praised Oldfather for his courage in making such comments about his colleagues, C. notes that some of the problems discussed are still hotly debated in contemporary American Classics. He does not take this point very far—after all, Oldfather's *ad hominem* remarks are hardly a sound basis for a reasoned debate on the subject—but it is at least a hint that the history of classical scholarship might have something to offer classicists who have not yet despaired of finding something new to say about ancient literature.

University of Bristol NEVILLE MORLEY

J. P. Bews, I. C. Storey, M. R. Boyne (edd.): *Celebratio: Thirtieth Anniversary Essays at Trent University*. Pp. v + 174. Peterborough, Ontario: Trent University, 1998. Paper, Can$15. ISBN: 0-9683602-0-3.

This volume brings together seventeen disparate papers to mark the thirtieth anniversary ofthecreation of the Department of Classics and Ancient History at the University of Trent:K.Raaflaub, 'Reflections on Strategies of Change: Classics in a Modern University'; D.J. Connacher, '*Nomos* and *Physis* in Euripides'; B. Levettt, 'A Pair of Mirror Scenes in *Trachiniae*'; S. R. Cavan, 'The "Potiphar's Wife Motif" in Euripidean Drama'; K. MacFarlane, 'Bacchylides Absolvens: The Defeat of Alexidamus in Bacchylides 11'; R. Faber, 'Callimachus *Hecale* Fr. 42 and the Language of Poetic Ekphrasis'; D. J. I. Begg, 'Inventing Bronze-Age Traditions'; B. Reardon, 'Apographs and Atticists: Adventures of a Text'; H. R. Pontes, 'Cracking the Stateliest Measure: Vergil's Broken Cadence in *Aeneid* I & IV'; C. W. Marshall, 'In Seneca's Wings'; H. Leclerc, 'Prosopography and the Roman Republic'; D. F. R. Page, 'Two Things Which Occupied Domitian'; J. Tinson, 'Roman Jeopardy'; M. Boyne, 'Old and New Directions: "Translating" Euripides on a Modern Stage'; K. S. Whettet, 'The Tragedy's the Thing: Achilles and Cú Chulainn as Models of the Consummate Hero'; J. P. Bews, 'Virgilian Motifs in Dante's *Purgatorio*'; I. C. Storey, 'Between Myth and Reality: C. S. Lewis' *Till We Have Faces* as Historical Fiction'.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press

G. SCHMELING, J. D. MIKALSON (edd.): *Qui Miscuit Utile Dulci. Festschrift Essays for Paul Lachlan MacKendrick*. Pp. xvi + 400. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1998. Paper, $50. ISBN: 0-86516-406-1.

This collection of twenty-five disparate papers, of which the majority are short (3–4,000 words),can most usefully be represented by a list of contents: I. J. & E. C. Baade, 'Porphyry Discs in the Pavements of Roman Churches'; H. W. Benario, 'Tacitus *Germania* 33.2'; F.E.Brenk, 'Caesar and the Evil Eye or What to Do with "*καὶ σὺ τέκνον*" '; E. L. Brown, 'Linear A on Trojan Spindlewhorls'; J. L. Buller, 'From *Clementia Caesaris* to *La Clemenza di Tito*'; W. M. Calder, 'William Abbott Oldfather on the Limits of Research'; R. Cromey, 'Some Names on aCup by Macron: Etymology and Louvre G 148'; J. de Luce, 'Reconsidering the Riddle of theSphinx in *Oedipus at Colonus* and *I'm Not Rappaport*'; H. A. Darke, 'Firmicus Maternus and the Politics of Conversion'; A. R. Dyck, 'Cicero the Dramaturge'; J. L. Franklin, 'Aulus Vettius Caprasius Felix of Ancient Pompeii'; E. A. Fredricksmeyer, 'Alexander and Olympias'; K. A. Geffcken, 'Crawford's *Cecilia*'; J. King, '*Iucunda Voluptas* in Lucretius 2.3 and Propertius 1.10.3'; A. G. McKay, 'Domitianic Construction at Cumae'; R. W. Mathisen, 'Papal Subscriptions Written *Sua Manu* in Late Antiquity'; J. D. Mikalson, 'The Heracleotai of Athens'; H. F. North, 'The Dacian Walls Speak: Plato in Moldavia'; J. Reynolds, 'An Ordinary Aphrodisian Family'; L. Richardson, 'Cicero, Bibulus, and Caesar's Agrarian Bills of 59 B.C.E.'; R. J. Rowland & S. L. Dyson, 'Survey Archaeology around Fordongianus, Sardinia'; H. C. Rutledge, 'What is a Classic? Answering Mr Eliot's Question, Fifty Years Later'; G. Schmeling, 'Aphrodite and Satyrica'; D. F. Sutton, 'Milton's *in Quintum Novembris, anno aetatis 17* (1626)'; T. P. Wiseman, 'E. S. Beesly and the Roman Revolution'.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

I. TAR, G. WOJTILLA (edd.): *Speculum Regis*. Pp. 83, ills. Szeged: Acta Univ. Attila Jósef Nom., 1994. Paper. ISBN: 963-482-045-X.

This collection of ten short papers by Hungarian scholars presents the contributions to a seminar at the University of Szeged in October 1993: G. Wojtilla, 'The Royal Diary in Ancient India and its Criticism'; I. Borzsák, 'Die Kehrseite der römischen Fürstenspiegel'; L. Havas, 'Ilritratto de Augusto nella storiografia in lingua latina del primo periodo Antonino'; T Adamik, 'The Figure of Julian in Ammianus' History'; I. Tar, 'Das Bild des idealen Fürsten inder Kaiserzeit'; A. Timonen, 'Stilicho—The Soldier of Rome (Claudian's *De Consulatu Stilichonis*)'; T. Viljamma, 'A Traitor to Rome (Rutilius Namatianus 2.41–60)'; I. Kapitánffy, 'Justinian and Agapetus'; M. Maróth, 'Ein arabischer Fürstenspiegel und seine platonische Wurzel'; Z. Kádár, '*ΜΙΜΗΣΙΣ* del Cristo-Re: I simboli delle virtù sulla corona di Constantino IX Monomaco in aspetto dei testi biblici'. The range would have been even wider if three conference papers on Mycenaean kingship, Augustine, and tenth-century royal rituals had been available for publication. There is no introduction or index, but these probably would not have been of much use for such disparate studies. Only the pair on Stilicho as hero and traitor could have had much common ground, but this opportunity is not exploited. No one has the space to develop ideas at any length, a pity in the case of Kapitánffy's piece, which sets out to place the *Ekthesis* of Agapetus in the wider context of the representation of Justinian, and points to some interesting links with the legislation.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

© Oxford University Press, 1999

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/49.2.550 Published online by Cambridge University Press