much more from the masterly work of Stephen Oakley (*A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X*, Vols 1–3 [Oxford, 1997–]).

Middlebury College JANE D. CHAPLIN

GERMANIA

H. W. BENARIO (ed., trans.): *Tacitus:* The Germany (Classical Texts). Pp. iv + 123, ills, map. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1999. Paper, £13.25. ISBN: 0-85668-717-0.

J. B. RIVES: *Tacitus'* Germania (Clarendon Ancient History Series). Pp. x + 346, maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 0-19-924000-0.

Though there has been no English commentary on the *Germania* since that of J. G. C. Anderson in 1938, there have been major editions in German from Much (rev. Lange and Jankuhn, Heidelberg, 1967), Lund (Heidelberg, 1988), and Perl (Berlin, 1990), and an immense corpus of secondary literature (surveyed by Lund in *ANRW* ii, 33.3 [1991]). Now, in 1999, come two editions in English by scholars from North America, but published in England.

Emeritus Professor Benario is best known for the bibliographical surveys on Tacitus that he has contributed to *Classical World* since 1964. In the present edition he has set himself a modest and restricted objective, to provide 'what an English-speaking reader might wish to know', and including 'numerous notes on Latin usage and style which help in untangling and appreciating Tacitus' often difficult and obtuse [*sic*] style'. The English translation is not new, but, with a few minor modifications, reproduces B.'s translation of the *Agricola*, *Germany*, and *Dialogue on Orators* (Indianapolis, etc., 1967); and much of the brief introduction is taken verbatim from the 1967 translation. For his Latin text B. uses Winterbottom's 1975 OCT, with ten or eleven alterations, which B. notes on p. 11. As B. neither quotes the Latin word(s) involved nor comments on them in the commentary, readers will have to locate them for themselves. In short, only the fifty pages of the commentary (pp. 63–112) are completely new. Here there is much that is sensible, e.g. at 33.3 on the notorious *urgentibus imperii fatis*, where B. summarizes what he has written about at greater length in *Historia* 17 (1968), 27–50 and *Festschrift . . . for Paul Lachlan Mackendrick* (Wauconda, 1997). But, despite the depth of B.'s own knowledge of Tacitus and Tacitean scholarship, this edition does little to bring the reader to grips with the complexities of the *Germania.* For that one will be better served by turning to Rives's edition.

R.'s volume appears in a series whose aim is 'to provide authoritative translations, introductions, and commentaries to . . . Greek and Latin texts studied by ancient historians'. It is directed at a readership of 'scholars, graduate students, and advanced undergraduates'. Though he does not offer a Latin text of the *Germania* R. bases his translation on Winterbottom's OCT of 1975 with a small number of deviations, which he tabulates on p. 76, and where the Latin text has significant implications for historical interpretation these are considered, sometimes at length, in the commentary. So, on the contentious 'Namensatz' at 2.3 R. considers the underlying issues on pp. 117–21, before accepting the emendation of Delz (*MH* 27 [1970], 227–30) 'a <uictis e> uictore'. Similarly at 13.2 R. accepts (and argues for) Lipsius' *ceteri*, where

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.53 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Winterbottom prints the manuscript *ceteris*, but adds 'ceteri *Lips., fort. recte*'; and at 33.2, where the manuscript reading 'urgentibus imperii fatis' is not in dispute, R. discusses the alternatives ('optimistic' or 'pessimistic'?) sensibly, before coming down on the side of qualified optimism.

Little comment is needed on R.'s translation, though occasional points may be queried. Does *animaduertere* at 7.1 mean simply 'punish' rather than 'punish with death'? At 7.2 *turmam* seems not to be translated—unless 'wedge' is intended to cover both *turmam* and *cuneum*. To translate *exigere* in the same section as 'examine' is highly dubious (though R. is not alone in so interpreting it). Is *simplex* (10.1) 'uniform' or 'simple', 'straightforward' (probably the latter, as R. takes it)? Are *tegulae* at 16.2 bricks, roof-tiles, or decorative wall-tiles? Tac. *Dial.* 20.7 is scarcely conclusive evidence for the latter meaning.

The heart of R.'s book lies in his introduction and in the commentary (74 and 230 pages respectively), and here a direct comparison is possible with Anderson's 1938 edition. The most obvious difference is indicated by R.'s bibliography of almost 300 entries, of which less than two dozen antedate 1938 and roughly half of the total are dated to 1980 or later. But there is also a difference of aim between the two editions. R. lays emphasis on providing guidance to those who wish to use the *Germania* as a historical source, whereas Anderson's goal was to provide 'an historical–archaeological *as well as linguistic* [my italics] commentary'. As a result the notes in R.'s commentary are often expansive, sometimes diffuse, whereas Anderson's are more focused on using non-linguistic material to illustrate Tacitus' Latin. That, however, is not to be seen as a criticism of what R. has done. If the commentary tends to open out to discuss broader historical and sociological issues, the nine sections of the introduction show how the various strands of scholarship cohere to deepen our understanding of Tacitus' monograph. The fundamental Section 8 ('The Reliability of the *Germania*') briefly, but judiciously, summarizes the various influences and themes that can be discerned in the *Germania*: *Wandermotive*, ethnological stereotypes, comparisons and contrasts between the Germans and the Romans, in which the Germans are set alongside an idealized Roman past 'as moral exemplars for contemporary Romans' (p. 62). Of the other sections in the Introduction, those on the ethnographic tradition (pp. 11–21) and the purpose of the *Germania* (pp. 48–56) are of particular interest.

In his preface R. states that he has not, for the most part, offered definitive answers to the *Germania*'s many and diverse problems, but put forward the relevant evidence and, where possible, plausible solutions. That must be the right course to pursue; for cases such as 15.1, where archaeological evidence supports the manuscripts' 'non multum uenatibus' against Lipsius' deletion of *non*, are extremely rare. A lengthy review article would be needed to do justice to the wealth of material that R.'s commentary provides, but his note on 'an open area' at 16.1 ('suam quisque domum spatio circumdat') shows him at his best. It begins 'Both archaeological and linguistic evidence points to a Germanic predilection for houses on separate lots' and ends by dismissing Tacitus' two explanations as mere guesses, the first inspired by the provisions for open spaces in Rome after the great fire of A.D. 64, the second invoking a stereotypically 'barbarian' trait.

University of Leeds R. H. MARTIN

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.53 Published online by Cambridge University Press