that between equality and monarchy, that is dominant; and how the misuse or limited usefulness of constitutional concepts is frequently revealed. In Part II, L. explores the impact of Thuc.'s notion of human nature on his understanding of constitutions; his negative presentation of the masses; and his positive presentation of some élite leaders. In Part III, L. turns to analyse Thuc.'s narratorial claims about good forms of ordering within the state. Especially welcome here is the focus not just on the notorious remarks about the 5,000 at 8.97, but also on the praise of Sparta at 1.18 and of Chios at 8.24. In his conclusion, L. includes interesting remarks on the relation of Thuc.'s analysis to fourth-century developments.

It will be evident from this sketch that L. goes over some much-covered ground. But his comments are sane, and the work is valuable for its overall treatment of a large body of material. Of particular interest are his conclusions that Thuc. does not see the few as morally superior; that he sees some similarities between democracy and oligarchy (e.g. the problems of the masses are not confined to democracy); and that there are great limits to what even the best state can achieve. It is a not totally pessimistic Thuc. who emerges. But L. is himself perhaps too optimistic about what conclusions can be drawn from Thuc.'s narrative. L. stresses Themistocles, Pericles, and Hermocrates as examples of the sort of leaders that democracy can throw up (the forced nature of the Syracuse/Athens parallel could have been further explored). But Thuc.'s more extensive analysis of democratic leadership is governed by his explanatory needs: he has to explain how Athens could be so successful, and yet be undone by internal weakness. He did not need to subject the internal affairs of, say, Sparta to the same level of analysis. As for the weakness of oligarchy, the prime exhibit is 8.89.3; but this applies only to oligarchies in a given position (those that have been recently formed from democracies).

This is a book that deserves to be looked at by anyone interested in Greek political thought; perhaps, though, some of the more ambitious recent scholarship, such as that of Ober on mass and élite, deserved more detailed discussion (but note the remarks on Ober at e.g. pp. 53 and 186 n. 4). Thucydidean scholars will also find many interesting observations on recent scholarship (e.g. p. 117 n. 2 on Erbse on the Greek/barbarian dichotomy; p. 154 on Strasburger and Flashar on the portrayal of Pericles). The book is attractively produced, and has a good bibliography and excellent indexes.

St Hugh's College, Oxford TIM ROOD

JOSEPHUS AS HISTORIAN

G. MADER: *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography: Apologetic and Impression Management in the* Bellum Judaicum. Pp. X + 172. Leiden, etc.: Brill 2000. Cased, $65. ISBN: 90-04-11446-7.

Gottfried Mader's essay is representative of a new angle in Josephan studies taken by scholars recently. Rather than assume Josephus' Jewish background as more dominant and central to the understanding of his vast work, the evolving new approach tends to read and analyse his historical compositions as part of the Greco-Roman historiographical tradition, while acknowledging the unique character achieved by the fusion of the Jewish and the Greco-Roman elements.

Alongside the strong Jewish notes in Josephus, modern scholarship has traced influences, allusions, and rhetorical borrowings from Greco-Roman historiography,

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.242 Published online by Cambridge University Press

epic tradition, and drama, especially in the *Bellum Judaicum*. Most notable throughout the *BJ* are the Thucydidean and Polybian echoes, which appear, as M. too demonstrates, in many contexts, from the use of vocabulary, the structure of discrete episodes as well as of the work as a whole, the integration and function of speeches (from Agrippa in Book 2 to Eleazar's suicide speeches in Book 7), or the themes which underlie the account of the Jewish revolt of 66 C.E., such as the view, central to the *BJ*, of stasis as the worst vice.

Modern scholars usually assume those elements to be mostly formal, adorning the narrative, framing it, and endowing it with adequate Greco-Roman character (for, among other reasons, Josephus' audience is assumed to be mainly non-Jewish, as he himself states in the proem, and as is evident from his choice of language). However, M. goes one step further and asserts that the abundant classical elements in the *BJ* not only serve as a generic frame, but are also used to convey Josephus' subjective agenda concerning the causes of the Jewish revolt. In other words, the classical elements in the *BJ* are not mere form, they also have a crucial function in the understanding of both the narrative and the underlying perception of the historian.

The essay is divided into five chapters, three of which bring ample examples of the particular use Josephus makes of the Greco-Roman historiographical frame in order to convey his rather partial opinion regarding the causes of the revolt. M. examines thoroughly the Josephan use of rhetorical means such as speeches, the extended *stasis* account in Book 4, descriptions of exceptional courage in battle ('Aristeia', Chapter IV), and more abstract tendencies like the 'secularization' of the causes of the revolt, bringing them down from the high plains of separatist ideology to mundane political instincts (Chapter II).

M. agrees with other scholars that Josephus puts the blame for the revolt on the Zealot movement and the more extreme *Sicarii*, whose portrait throughout the *BJ* is far from flattering, and rightly suspected of considerable partiality. But the more innovative—and somewhat controversial—angle of his reading is the claim that Josephus was not operating under the stern maxims of the 'scientific', Thucydidean historiographical tradition (despite Josephus' statements in the proem of the work), but rather used them to create a unique, and not impartial, historical interpretation.

In other words, M. hints strongly that Josephus' personal opinion had overcome the desired objectivity of his stance as a historian. Josephus did not innocently adhere to the conventions of classical historiography. He meticulously and rather cunningly used them both to convey his particular interpretation and to conceal his partiality under the disguise of 'scientific history'. Josephus therefore becomes more a shrewd politician than a reliable historian.

The main problem with such a bold approach is that it seems almost too easy to detect and demonstrate, too convincing. M.'s hypothesis, which assumes that the main drive behind Josephus was not professional but personal, tends at times to overwhelm his sharp analysis (which is amply backed up by both the meticulous reading of the text and an impressive, wide-ranged bibliography), and to paint both the analysis itself and Josephus' work in somewhat unflattering colours. It occasionally seems as if M. has fallen into his own trap of excessive subjectivity.

While it is refreshing and important to encounter such approaches to an age-old subject-matter, and also to equip modern scholarship with new angles of research (both by giving due weight to the extensive Greco-Roman echoes in Josephus and by approaching him more as a man of his own time and less as a detached historian), Josephus should still be given some credit as a sincere historian, who, despite his

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.242 Published online by Cambridge University Press

subjectivity, adheres to the scholarly traditions which set the frame for his historical enterprise.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford TAMAR LANDAU

GALEN

R. J. HANKINSON (ed.): *Galen:* On Antecedent Causes. (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 35.) Pp. xv + 349. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-521-62250-6.

Galen's short treatise *On Antecedent Causes* deals with the so-called *αἰτίαι προκαταρκτικαί*, causal triggers of disease that are external and chronologically prior to the disease itself. The main factors he is concerned with are heat and cold. The nature, relevance, and, indeed, existence of these causes had become a contentious issue in Greek medicine. Hence it comes as no surprise that Galen's treatise is highly polemical, anecdotal, and unsystematic: Galen constantly takes issue with rival views (especially those of the Methodists and of Erasistratus and his followers), and he leaves no rhetorical technique unexploited to discredit his opponents and to defend his belief in the existence and therapeutic relevance of antecedent causes.

The Greek text of the treatise is lost, and it survives only in the fourteenth-century Latin translation of Niccolò da Reggio. The Latin text was first critically edited for the *CMG* by K. Bardong in 1937; Bardong also printed a tentative *Rückübersetzung* in Greek, but did not provide a commentary. R. J. Hankinson's recent edition of the work is therefore warmly to be welcomed. It contains a critical edition of the Latin text (for which H. could rely on one further witness of which Bardong was unaware); an English translation; a commentary (which also discusses reconstructions of the Greek original); and a lavish introduction which deals with Galen's life and intellectual background, the history of Greek thought on causation, the purpose of the treatise, and the transmission of the text. There is a glossary of Latin–Greek equivalences (though regrettably without references to page and line where the words occur), a bibliography, a general index, and an *index locorum*.

There is a certain disproportion between the introduction (which draws heavily on H.'s work on Greek causal theory) and Galen's text itself, which occupies only a marginal place in the history of Greek thought on causes (H. himself concedes that he has used Galen's text as a 'peg on which to hang discussion of material drawn from a wide variety of sources throughout later antiquity', p. 2). Thus not everything in the introduction—and occasionally also in the commentary—is equally relevant to the understanding of the text (e.g. the paragraph on the difference between preceding and antecedent causes, pp. 43–5, or the note on pp. 161–2). This is not in itself a problem, although it would have been useful if H. had provided a more detailed analysis of the structure of the treatise. Galen's argument wanders widely, and it is not always easy to see where we are coming from and where we are going; a synopsis with references to chapters and sections would also have been helpful in bringing out connections—or the lack of them—in Galen's argument (e.g. what is the relation between the general issue of antecedent causes and the specific discussion of heat and cold? And why is there hardly any consideration of other typical antecedent causes such as drunkenness, indigestion, fatigue, and eating of meat?).

The translation (where I checked it) is accurate, and the interpretation offered in the commentary—with helpful analysis, sometimes exposure, of Galen's reasoning

© Classical Association, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.2.242 Published online by Cambridge University Press