[Paris, 1998]). The third section, 'Lleyando Los *Fenómenos* de Arato', explores the poem's purpose, structure, reception, and exegesis, and it is here that the influence of M. Erren is felt (*Aratos Phainomena* [Munich 1971]; *Die Phainomena des Aratos von Soloi* [Wiesbaden, 1967]). T. Z. also includes, albeit with no claims to exactitude, a stemma, designed to supplement discussion in Martin and Kidd, despite the fact that, as T. Z. himself notes (p. XXIII), Kidd considers it unhelpful for selecting the best readings because of the extensive degree of contamination among the manuscripts (p. 60).

The verse translation is carefully rendered, with the Spanish word order generally mirroring that of the Greek as closely as possible. The line is made up of seventeen syllables divided into three cola: one of seven syllables and two of five. The verses feature a variety of accentuation schemes meant to approximate the rhythm of the hexameter, and avoid hiatus after the seventh and twelfth syllables, in imitation of the caesura and diaeresis. T. Z. has adopted Kidd's Greek text, but with twenty-seven alterations, more than half of which were necessitated by typographical errors (e.g. 540 ἀλλόθι has been corrected to ἄλλοθι; 1079 πρώιον to πρῴον). He observes in the preface that Kidd's edition appeared in print while he was working on his translation, and that he decided to adopt it in preference to Mair's 1955 text, a change that entailed extensive revision. As a result of this modification, the notes on the Greek text, which are by no means sufficiently full to rival Kidd or Martin, serve as a select apparatus of alternate forms and punctuation by Mair and Martin, and also provide comments on individual readings by numerous previous editors. The notes on the Spanish text offer literal translations, where warranted, and explore at greater length issues of syntax and interpretation. While methodologically justified by the translator, this division of the notes makes for tedious and rather unnecessary work on the part of the reader, who must cross-check each passage twice.

It is clear that T. Z.'s excellent verse translation is the central focus of the book, which aims primarily at a Spanish-speaking audience, students as well as scholars, who may not necessarily read Greek. The translation is intended to stand, as much as an astronomical poem can, on its own merits, with notes appended as a guide for the curious. Nevertheless, the philological emphasis of the supporting materials often fails to accommodate the kinds of questions that a general audience might actually have. Spanish readers interested in the mythological background as well as references to a broad range of ancient sources and secondary works are therefore advised to consult in addition Calderón Dorda's edition, which is unfortunately missing from the bibliographies of Kidd and Martin.

University of Missouri, Columbia ANATOLE MORI
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni043

DIODORUS 15

P. J. Stylianou: *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus Book 15*. Pp. xxii + 602. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 0-19-815239-6.

Based on a 1981 Oxford D.Phil. and eventually published in 1998 (though its bibliographical *terminus post quem non* is 1993), this volume eventually reaches *CR*

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni044 Published online by Cambridge University Press

well into a new millennium. For which delay, so far as it falls to my account, I apologize.

Six hundred pages on Diodorus may seem excessive, especially as the exercise is not a rehabilitation: S.'s Diodorus is a dull writer and incompetent epitomator, whose personal intrusions blight the product. But he is also an important author for historians of many periods and richly deserves quality time with a judicious and independent-minded interpreter such as S. The resulting volume is generally a pleasure to use (some may find the pages over-full), though the maps, from Hammond's *History of Greece*, have an antique feel, are not customized (e.g. Pharos/Hvar, discussed on p. 193, is missing on p. xx), and do not answer every need (a map of Boeotia would help).

Leaving bibliography and indexes aside, we have 140 pages of introduction and 410 of commentary. The introduction is dominated by sources, with special stress on the chronographer (Castor of Rhodes?)—whose significance for Diodorus' project is rightly stressed—and Ephorus, who, for S., is the dominant narrative source not only for Aegean events but for western ones too, except in the later fifth century, when Timaeus intervenes: the lengthy discussion of Ephorus, an author whose significance is ill-reflected in dedicated modern bibliography, is important in its own right. But Diodorus is rarely far from S.'s gaze, and the gaze is stern: 'a mixture of incompetence, lack of care, and ignorance is responsible for the vagaries which abound . . . . A complete list of Diodorus' blunders would be of very respectable length' (pp. 137–8). No surprise here, then, but sober catalogue and analysis are a real boon. Learning the acceptable limits of the use of Diodorus is a ticklish task for neophyte fourth-century historians (it is Murphy's law—or something ruder—when this must be accomplished alongside the challenge of Xenophon). S.'s book is a fine resource here. Note that 'neophyte' does not just mean fresh-faced PhD students but anyone venturing into the period: the behaviour of even established scholars, at home elsewhere, can leave something to be desired.

The commentary is full, more leisurely than one might expect an English-language publisher to tolerate, but (consequently) always clear. Inevitably the will to pursue everything sometimes flags—e.g. 180 (Philistus' exile), 330 (the historical implications of dating the upheavals of 15.40 pre-Leuctra)—but this volume does not give short measure, and no one who cannot live with the certainty of failing to provide what *some* reader wants would ever write a commentary. By way of further comment I confine myself to noting some of S.'s conclusions. Those with an interest should test their views, if different, against S.'s exposition.

143–4: The Cypriot War fell in 385–380, with Citium in 384. (This involves a three-year siege of Salamis at 9.1–2, to accommodate 9.3–5 + 18.1–19.2 on Glos and the Spartans.) **164**: D. rightly called the King's Peace a *koine eirene* and the King participated (as in 375/4, 372/1, 366/5) sufficiently to be said to have sworn to it (*pace* Badian). **168–9**: postulated post-King's Peace Spartan pressure on Zacynthus, Boeotian cities, Thasos, Hestiaea, Sciathus, Peparethus, and Delos. **189, 225–6**: Agesipolis approved of the attacks on Mantinea and Olynthus. **211**: Amyntas III *was* twice expelled by the Illyrians. **218**: Phoebidas had secret orders to seize Thebes. **239**: the 'relay' cliché of Diodoran siege warfare is generally legitimately applied. **263**: Xenophon's explanation of Sphodrias' acquittal is 'nonsense'. **267**: Athens levied *syntaxis* all along, and the 200 triremes and 20,000 troops in 15.29.7 represent a (notional?) total strength of Athens plus the confederate allies. **273**: the Decree of Aristotle stele originally had room to list 75 allies. **322**: there is no doublet in the accounts of the peaces of 375 and 371, merely misconstruction of a 375 narrative in which Thebes wavered but eventually joined. 15.39 is the trashed remnant of Ephorus'

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni044 Published online by Cambridge University Press

anticipatory comments about Leuctra. **342**: Iphicrates' military reforms were (boots aside) purely for the Egyptian campaign. **363**: Jason only became *tagos* after Leuctra. **446**: a non-orthodox low chronology of 360s is preferred. **473**: D. has twenty communities synoecized into Megalopolis (contrast thirty-nine in Paus. 8.27.3–4) because he only counted Parrhasia and Maenalia. **485**: the 366/5 peace was a *koine eirene*. **495**: Boeotia did not aim to build 100 triremes in 364 but to accumulate an alliance whose combined fleet might total about 100. **522**: the 'Satraps' Revolt' was a coherent, if short-lived, enterprise, *pace* Weiskopf.

S. pays tribute to his supervisors Tony Andrewes and George Cawkwell. The influence of these two fine scholars is plain and, since I share with S. the privilege of being one of former's last doctoral students and owe my interest in the earlier fourth century and its historiographical challenges to the latter's lectures on Xenophon, it is a peculiar pleasure to salute this work.

University of Liverpool CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni044

ΛΑΘΕ ΒΙΩΣΑΣ

U. Berner, R. Feldmeier, B. Heininger, R. Hirsch-Luipold: *Plutarch: Ist 'Lebe im Verborgenen' eine gute Lebensregel? Eingeleitet, übersetzt und mit interpretierenden Essays versehen*. (SAPERE: Scripta Antiquitatis Posterioris ad Ethicam REligionemque pertinentia 1.) Pp. 176. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000. Cased, DM 49.90. ISBN: 3-534-14944-0.

This is the inaugural volume in a series designed to render the classical literature of later antiquity (here defined as the first four centuries of the Christian era) accessible to a broad readership that encompasses even the non-specialist. The works chosen for inclusion will deal with philosophical, ethical, and religious issues of abiding concern. Each volume will consist of the Greek or Latin text of a work such as *De latenter vivendo*, a German translation, a commentary, an introduction to both author and work, and a set of interpretive essays representing a variety of disciplinary perspectives. The purpose, format, and intended readership of this series are quite similar to those of the edition of Plutarch's *Conjugalia praecepta* and *Consolatio ad uxorem* edited by S. B. Pomeroy (New York and Oxford, 1999).

De lat. viv., by far the least of Plutarch's three surviving assaults on Epicureanism (the other two are the substantial dialogues *Adversus Colotem* and *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum*), takes issue with Epicurus' injunction to live in obscurity (λάθε βιώσας). The great Plutarchist Konrat Ziegler judged this short treatise (a mere 185 lines of Greek text) an unfinished sketch (*RE* 21 [1951], 766)—correctly, I think. This circumstance immediately raises the question whether the piece merits the elaborate attention it receives in the *Sapere* edition, a work of 176 pages: the scholarly quality of the edition, in a peculiarly indirect way, justifies an affirmative answer to this question, though the justification admittedly emanates not from the treatise itself, but

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni044 Published online by Cambridge University Press