The longest part of G.'s introductory material in taken up with a discussion of the sources which Appian used for his work (pp. XLIV–CXXII). A scrupulous examination of the account Appian gives of the end of the second Punic war, compared with that of Dio Cassius and of the epitome of Dio in Zonaras, leads G. to conclude that both used a serious and well-informed source, whom he names tentatively as Coelius Antipater, but that both also had other sources, and that in Appian's case, this was a historian (or perhaps a biographer) very favourable to Scipio Africanus (pp. XLVI–LXXIII). A similar examination of the fragment preserved in *Rylands Papyrus* III.491 suggests to G. that this is from the annalistic history, written in Greek by Postumius Albinus in the second century B.C., and that this too was a source for Appian (pp. LXXIII–LXXIX). Similarities with Diodorus' account of the same period indicate the use of yet another annalist, Cincius Alimentus, who had been a captive of Hannibal (pp. LXXIX–LXXXVII). A further exploration, conducted in great detail, of the various versions of the final attack on Carthage at the end of the third Punic war provide evidence for Appian's reading of Polybius, Fannius, and Livy, or the sources Livy himself used. The value of these analyses is not so much that G. attempts to identify Appian's sources by name as that he displays clearly the richness of the historical record on which he was able to draw, the complexity of the way in which he used these resources, and the skill with which he constructed from them a new history. This is a major contribution to the re-evaluation of Appian as historian.

The text and translation are supplemented (as is usual in the Budé series) with complementary notes by Serge Lancel, well known for his work on Carthage and Carthaginian history. These are a valuable contribution, and the use of a specialist historian far outweighs the perhaps inevitable discrepancies of view that occasionally occur between Lancel and G. (notably over the topography of the final attack on Carthage in 146 B.C., to which attention is drawn in the introduction at p. CXXXIII). Indeed, this is an excellent volume, and the pleasure of its use is only slightly diminished by the irritation caused by the awkward layout of the complementary notes (to be found partly on the page of text concerned and partly at the back of the book) and with discrepancies in typography (chapter numbers are given in Roman figures in the text, but are always represented in bold Arabic numbers in the introduction and notes; and the careful numeration of headings in the introduction is confused by the use of the wrong type-style for a heading on p. LXXXVII). These are minor matters, however, and the volume is a fine addition to other earlier editions of Appian in the series, and promises well for its successors.

University of Edinburgh JOHN RICHARDSON

APPIAN ON THE MITHRIDATIC WAR

P. GOUKOWSKY: *Appien:* Histoire romaine. *Tome vii, livre xii. La guerre de Mithridate* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. clxxxvi + 254, maps. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2001. Cased, frs. 420. ISBN: 2-251-00491-2.

This is a big Budé, not just the text, translation, and few additional notes we often associate with the series: indeed, the text and translation of Appian's *Mithridateios* take up a mere 124 pages, while there are 186 pages of introduction and another 130

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of 'complementary notes'. There is a great deal of wisdom housed under the one roof, so to speak, and for anyone interested in Mithradatic affairs, this is a useful volume; but it also represents a rather uneasy compromise between a traditional Budé and a fully fledged commentary. The strategy seems to be that the introduction should deal mostly with literary aspects of the work, and the complementary notes with specific points in the text. There is, however, much in the introduction that might belong more naturally in a commentary, especially on pages that are swamped by footnotes. I cite p. 19 as an example—it has three lines of main text and forty of notes containing full bibliography on the Diophantus inscription—but there are many others where the notes far outweigh the text and represent the sort of material that might be more helpful in commentary form. And Section V, 'Les origines de la guerre mithridatique et la chronologie', while dealing briefly with Appian's chronological vagueness, concerns problems of dating largely extraneous to the *Mithridateios* and better suited to a commentary. If you are tempted to treat the complementary notes as a sort of optional extra, it is worth noting that they do contain many bibliographical references that you would not want to miss: in a volume that has so much in it, it is disappointing not to have a consolidated bibliography somewhere (that on pp. 17–18 has only a selection of major works).

G. has clearly devoted much attention and research to the text and its reception. I enjoyed his account of the story of Appianic translations (pp. 151–78), although it is limited almost entirely to France (it is a bit churlish not to mention the Loeb). It provides an interesting chapter in the transmission of the classical authors to the modern world, but perhaps of more practical value for ancient historians is G.'s exposition of the manuscript situation (pp. 125–51). I found this very helpful. The use of L and P in particular make this now our most thoroughly grounded text of Appian's *Mith.*, but it does open with a shock for those familiar with the work: G. has restored to the beginning, where the manuscripts place them, Chapters CXVIII–CXIX, transposed to the end of the work by Schweighäuser, on what G. regards as inadequate grounds. He makes a case (set out in Section I of the introduction, 'L'originalité du livre') that such an unusual opening is necessary, as the *Mith.* is itself an unusual book, but I do not buy his arguments. The *Mith.* is not all that unusual. It starts out quite normally, treating another part of the world that is going to come under Roman control; it is really only at the end, with the far-flung campaigns of Lucullus and Pompeius, that it all becomes too complicated to write *κατὰ ἔθνος*. This is not enough to make it fundamentally different from Appian's other books. While it is true to say that there is no standard form of introduction, the prefaces of the other books are recognizably similar (geography, foundation stories, names, early history); if you put these disputed chapters where Schweighäuser suggested, the *Mith.* falls nicely into line. Indeed its opening, *Θρᾷκας Ἕλληνες ἡγοῦνται*, echoes exactly that of the *Illyrike*, *Ἰλλυριοὺς Ἕλληνες ἡγοῦνται*; and, placed at the end, the sort of final summary contained in these chapters is very similar to what you find at the end of other books. Perhaps most important of all, G.'s text now opens with the word *ὧδε*. He weakly claims 'l'adverbe *ὧδε* renvoie souvent à ce qui suit'. It occurs 209 times in the works of Appian, and in the vast majority of cases it refers backwards or to an existing situation. There is no doubt it can look forward, mostly to introduce a speech ('he spoke in the following manner'), or very occasionally a short section of narrative (e.g. *BC* I, 34: the Social War 'began in the following way'— *ἤρξατο δὲ ὧδε*). We are now asked to believe that it can refer forward to a whole book. I just do not think that is possible: Appian simply does not use the word in this way. The matter perhaps needs more detailed argument, but I think Schweighäuser got it right.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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

Trinity College Dublin BRIAN McGING

PLUTARCH'S MORALIA

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

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

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

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

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.319 Published online by Cambridge University Press