useful comparative material drawn from later philosophers such as Proclus and Damascius.

The appendix offers a fresh translation and discussion of passages which have received a certain amount of recent study, both in the debate over the authorship of ps.-Simplicius and with the translation of part of the text by J. O. Urmson in the Duckworth series of translations of the Aristotelian commentators (London, 1995). Passage C offers 'the clearest account of I.'s idiosyncratic view of the soul' (p. 254). Passages F and G contain important evidence for I.'s view of imagination, while passages H and I, on light and the transparent, relate to Aristotle's use of the notion of the transparent in his account of perception in *DA* 2.7.418a26–419b3.

All in all, this edition makes I.'s *De anima* accessible as perhaps never before. In so doing, it makes an enormous contribution to our understanding of views of the soul in later Greek philosophy.

*Royal Holloway, University of London* ANNE SHEPPARD

doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni057

## HIMERIUS MADE ACCESSIBLE

H. VÖLKER: *Himerios: Reden und Fragmente*. Einführung, Übersetzung und Kommentar. (Serta Graeca: Beiträge zur Erforschung griechischer Texte 17.) Pp. x + 420, pls. Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2003. Cased, €69. ISBN: 3-89500-337-9.

When German *Altertumswissenschaft* blossomed before 1933, schoolteachers contributed to that success in an important way: they translated ancient texts and made them accessible to a wider readership. Harald Völker may be seen as a scion of this tradition. A retired schoolteacher, he has prepared a commented translation of Himerius, which will be useful also to specialists.

Himerius, the fourth-century rhetorician, has received some attention recently,[1] but still much less than Themistius or Libanius, who were his contemporaries and partially his rivals. After growing up in Prusa, Himerius went to Athens to study rhetoric. He taught at Constantinople and at Athens, leading a quiet life for most of the time. Once he had to enter into a rhetorical competition with Libanius in Nicomedia, which was won by the latter. Later, Julian called Himerius to his court; after some years of travelling, he returned to Athens in about 369, again to teach. He is last mentioned in 383.

Himerius was an abundantly fertile author. Seventy-four speeches are known, the bulk of them in fragments. There survive a certain number of other fragments which cannot be connected to single works, yet more must have been lost. The speeches seem to say nothing with many words; they contain very little precise information on the level of *histoire événementielle*. Nevertheless, their interest is not restricted to philologists who are willing to appreciate the style and the richness of metaphor. From the point of view of the ancient historian, several texts are important, namely those

[1]Most important is T. D. Barnes, 'Himerius and the Fourth Century', *CPh* 82 (1987), 206–25, whose prosopographical remarks V. sometimes receives with caution, but does not supersede.

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

speeches which praise governors, although their worth for reconstructing careers is limited: together with the relevant speeches of Libanius and the epigraphic epigrams on governors, they vividly illustrate the ideology of the traditionalist administrative élite. Himerius' speech for his son, who had died in childhood, is an excellent source for discussing emotional relations between father and son in late antiquity. His speeches for pupils show late antique schools at work. Not even the *meletai*, which focus on the history of classical Athens and are seemingly mere intellectual exercises, should be ignored. They can be interpreted as documents of the collective memory of the educated classes in late antiquity.

V.'s book contains all the extant works of Himerius. It gives an introduction of about seventy pages, which summarizes modern research on Himerius' life, his style, and the history of his reputation. There are some more in-depth reflections on his use of metaphors from music and mystery cults. After the translations a *zusammenfassende Würdigung* is given, which underlines the importance of Himerius as a historical source, in particular for Athenian history in the fourth century A.D. Several smaller appendices are added, such as a useful synoptical timetable comprising the careers of Himerius, Libanius, and Themistius, translated passages from Menander Rhetor which V. regards as relevant for Himerius (this part did not make sense to me), and a concordance of the numeration of the speeches. There is also a rich bibliography and an excellent index, the most detailed index to Himerius that exists.

The translation, the first into a modern language, is based on Colonna's edition (1951), but takes alternative readings into consideration. V. does not aim at rendering the stylistic complexity and sublimity of Himerius' speeches. This is an advantage, because the translation is fairly clear and should be intelligible to any scholar who is used to reading German.

In general, the translation seems to be reliable. There is also a certain tendency to paraphrase the Greek text. Thus, V. needs no less than thirteen German words to render the first five words of the fifty-ninth oration. His translation even tends to be a little more explicit than the Greek text; for example, 7.4: *προσήγαγον* (in relation to his son) is translated with *brachte ich hierher und stelle ihn euch nun vor*. In 12.20 *οἱ ἀπ' ἐκείνων τῶν γάμων ἀποβλαστήσαντες* is translated as *die Kinder des Flavianus*, so ambiguities can be blurred. Nevertheless the translation, debatable as it may be in some points, gives a good idea of the contents and arguments of Himerius' speeches.

The commentary breaks little new ground. It concentrates on the explanation of names and facts as well as textual problems; it is sparing with literary parallels. The remarks will be useful to anybody who wants to have the basic information at hand. There are some minor slips: for example, it is doubtful whether the *demes* operated in late-antique Athens in the same way as they had done in classical times (p. 139 n. 2); the comparison of a passage in Himerius with some lines in Caesar's Gallic Wars (p. 184 n. 60) is misleading.

No translation can be a substitute for the original, but it can make a work easier to use. V. has achieved this with his book; further research will profit from his efforts.

*Frankfurt am Main* HARTMUT LEPPIN
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni058

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni058 Published online by Cambridge University Press