et culcitas funibus chalant et illis obponunt locis, qua caedit aries, ut impetus machinae materia molliore fractus non destruat murum. The only other emendation is 25.6 *quorum pugna <non> esset profecto dirempta*, where the whole passage is so lacunose that it is hard even to guess at what might or might not have been written. (Klotz's *quorum <certamine> pugna* can hardly be as lightly dismissed as D. imagines.)

The finest writing in the whole work comes at the very end, where Caesar goes to Seville and berates the locals for their ingratitude and perfidy in a speech which still chills the blood. Clearly someone (the author himself possibly) was present and took careful notes. With such an elegant savagery, it is very hard to imagine that the great prose stylist could possibly have said what D. attributes to him (42.4): *Vos iure gentium et ciuiumque Romanorum institutis cognitis*. We should surely read either *gentium et ciuium* (with NV) or *gentium ciuiumque*. The speech breaks off with *Quarum laudibus et uirtute*, the last words transmitted by the surviving manuscripts. In the apparatus criticus D. observes *non nimis multa deesse uidentur.* No explanation is given for what seems to me to be a highly dubious assertion.

Overall this should prove a most useful edition of the *Bell. Hisp.*, even though there is clearly still much work to be done on the text itself. The book is attractively laid out, without the usual annoyance of modern Budé editions, where the notes are divided between the text-page and the back of the volume, while misprints are few—I noticed only 4.4 *propre* (*prope*); 8.4 *constitua* (*constituta*); 25.1 *eumdem* (presumably *eundem* is meant); 32.7 *lectitam* (*lecticam*); 38.3 *accesssus* (*accessus*).

Amherst College PETER K. MARSHALL

LOCALIZED LIVY

G. FORSYTHE: *Livy and Early Rome. A Study in Historical Method and Judgement*. Pp. 147. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999. Paper, DM 88. ISBN: 3-515-07495-3.

Readers of Livy will find here a regrettably atavistic publication from a scholar who has produced much better work (e.g. his commentary on Calpurnius Piso [Lanham, 1994] and his school edition of Livy 39 [in the Bryn Mawr series, 1994]). This monograph is focused on places in the first decade of Livy where L. in some way refers to or assesses his sources of information. Forsythe has an admirable aim: to move past Luce (*Livy. The Composition of His History* [Princeton, 1977]) and the primarily literary analyses indebted to Luce, to determine how to use L. as a source for early Rome. The result is disappointing.

F. first lays out his elaborate system of classifications: the places where L. discusses sources become 380 'records', sorted four different ways: by 'type', signifying three levels of complexity in the language characterizing the information given; by 'form', referring to outstanding verbal, semantic, or grammatical features; by 'method of resolution', meaning how L. decides what to believe about the information; and by 'subject matter', of which F. recognizes six possibilities. Each of these four areas has its own set of 'codes': for example, the 'type' of a passage can be S for simple, C for complex, or Cm for complex multiple, where 'simple' means the information is governed by a single word or phrase (e.g. 'ferunt', 'traditum est', 'satis constat'), 'complex' means that more than one of these occurs, and 'complex multiple' indicates multiple introductory or qualifying words (p. 14).

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.51 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There are over fifty codes in all, and their presentation in the resulting eighteen-page 'data base' necessitates constant flipping back and forth to determine what the abbreviations denote. For example, the first passage (1.1.1–4) has a TP of s, an FRM of u, an M-R of agr, and a S-M of ant. But even should one master the codes, their imprecision frequently renders them unhelpful. In the area of 'method of resolution' the abbreviation 'Nc' stands simultaneously for 'no comment', 'not critical', and 'noncommittal' (p. 19). If F. regards these words as interchangeable (as he seems to), the multiplicity is simply confusing; but they have distinct meanings, and so it is hard to see the point of having one abbreviation represent three designations that are not applied independently of one another. Furthermore, the codes can be slippery: even their progenitor confesses to having difficulty 'distinguishing between a personal opinion (po) and a minor personal remark (mp)' (p. 13).

F.'s attempt to quantify L. might be worth struggling through if it illuminated the text, but he repeatedly reaches familiar conclusions. For example, F. asserts that L. handles the early period cautiously (Chapter II), that (by modern standards) his historical reasoning is weak (Chapter III), that his narrative has a strong patriotic cast (Chapter IV), that speech figures variously but prominently (Chapter V), and that L. is more rational than not, but can incorporate divine material when it suits his purposes (Chapter VI). All of this is obvious if not explicit in L. and most of it, for better or worse, has been in the mainstream of Livian criticism since Walsh (*Livy. His Historical Aims and Methods* [Cambridge, 1961]). The final two chapters, dealing respectively with digressions (which F. does not define) and comparative material from Books 24 and 39 (with no reason given for the selection), have a slight edge, but not one sufficient to sharpen the axe F. seems to want to grind throughout, namely that post-Luce readers have paid insufficient attention to the tralatician nature of L.'s material and its implications for his value as a source.

While this position is valid, it does not justify omitting or dismissing the relevance of other ancient texts or recent secondary work. In Chapter II, the discussion of L.'s attitude towards his material cries out for comparison with Herodotus 7.152, but this passage is not mentioned until the beginning of the final chapter. Equally, a large part of Chapter III, devoted to L.'s methods for solving historical problems, centers on what F. calls 'probabilistic reasoning' and, although he notes that this was common practice in ancient historiography, there is no mention of εἰκός argumentation or Thucydides. When it comes to secondary literature, especially noticeable is the neglect of Miles (*Livy. Reconstructing Early Rome* [Cornell, 1995]), considering that F. cites his review of the book. Miles's discussion of L.'s choice of 'satis constat' to open his narrative bears directly on F.'s topic; his work merits more than a footnote reference.

Last but far from least, F. never explains how to extract reliable information about early Roman history. (What exactly constitutes the 'early Rome' of the title remains obscure. Given F.'s approach, this period appears to coincide with the years covered in the first decade, but only transmission, not authorial design, renders the centuries from Troy to Sentinum a unit.) Instead, contradictions run throughout the monograph. Though generally critical of L., F. nonetheless cites him as a source for 'historical' 'facts' (e.g. p. 82 n. 23 and p. 84) and concludes by suggesting that in him Cicero might have found 'a historian fully worthy of Rome's greatness' (p. 135). In short, apart from a more systematic arrangement of material, the monograph adds little to Steele's article of 1904 (*AJPh* 25), which F. cites but does not build on directly. The reader wishing to understand how contemporary 'literary' analyses of L. can help one to study the years covered in Livy 1–10 (especially the second pentad) will profit

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.51 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/51.1.51 Published online by Cambridge University Press