

his repertory and attribute others to earlier scholars than to those to whom they have been assigned so far. More significantly, T. also reports a number of conjectures which are in fact found in Byzantine manuscripts, which he studied within the framework of a project on a new critical edition of this play.

T.'s work is a thorough contribution of permanent value. I noticed one omission from T.'s bibliography: P.J. Finglass, 'Unpublished Conjectures at Leiden on the Greek Dramatists', *GRBS* 49 (2009), 187–221, at 196. According to Finglass, ἐγγεγήθει at *PV* 157 and ἔννοιαν at *PV* 446 should be ascribed to Valckenaer (1715–1785), instead of Elmsley (1810) and Wakefield (1793) respectively. It is very possible that more corrections like these will become necessary and, indeed, a loose sheet in my copy of T.'s book lists sixteen 'Addenda and Corrigenda'. They mostly consist of conjectures which T. has now found to have been anticipated by medieval manuscripts. The editors of the *New Repertory of Conjectures on Aeschylus* may wish to consider publishing these databases in electronic format, which would facilitate regular updates, even by external contributors.

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

CHRISTOS SIMELIDIS
csimelid@lit.auth.gr

MENSCH (P.) (trans.), ROMM (J.) *Herodotus: Histories*. Pp. xxviii + 540, maps. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc, 2014. Paper, £11.95, US\$16 (Cased, £32.95, US\$47). ISBN: 978-1-62466-113-6 (978-1-62466-114-3 hbk).

doi:10.1017/S0009840X14002881

Fashions in Herodotean translation change with the social conventions of the translators. We no longer, like Rawlinson in 1882, expurgate the *Histories* in pursuit of 'purity of thought', or replace the names of Greek deities by their Roman equivalents, as he did, to avoid 'harshness and repulsiveness' [*sic*]; we are more likely to euphemise Herodotus' racial terms out of respect for political correctness. The habit of treating his use of Ionic dialect as a mark of archaic quaintness (rather than as the vehicle of cutting-edge scientific investigation), and of then attempting to reproduce that quaintness in English, has likewise, fortunately, been abandoned. But one characteristic that has stamped all literary versions of Herodotus remains as dominant as ever, and that is a resolute indifference to the demands of his enchanting style, the strung-along εἰρομένη λέξις disliked by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1409^a 29–32), which does so much to make him, more than any other ancient author, sound as though he is speaking directly to his readers rather than writing for them.

There have been various reasons for this. The current argument would seem to be that the hypothetical general reader is accustomed to short simple sentences, and must not be scared off by long ones. Here the standard was set half a century ago by A. de Sélincourt's durable Penguin version, of which D. Grene well remarked, in the introduction to his own version, that it 'sounds exactly as though new-minted by a twentieth-century journalist'. The danger attendant on simplification is always a lapse into populist or bureaucratic cliché.

This is the tradition in which M. works; and, given its limitations, she has done much better by Herodotus than might have been expected. Her prose is never dull, and on the whole avoids clichés. She does break up his longer sentences, but not radically; she avoids

glossing his text, leaving that job, where needed, to R.'s always concisely helpful notes; and, while working from Hude's text, she is ready, on occasion, to jettison some of the otiose emendations that survive there (e.g. ἐπτό for δῶν at 8.131.3). Though she can, rarely, lapse into archaisms – her 'showing-forth' in the proem for ἀπόδεξις is uncharacteristic – her Englishing of Herodotus is, overall, clear, straightforward and accurate, without any attempts at improving his style. It would be hard to produce a version of Herodotus that was not, for the most part, vivid narrative, and this M. does exceptionally well. But in her quiet understated way she also gives the reader at least some sense of her author's quasi-conversational rhetoric, and this is much rarer. Hackett has a tradition of valuable translations – most notably S. Lattimore's Thucydides – and the M.–R. Herodotus is at least as good as any of the competitive versions that have appeared in the last year or two.

The University of Iowa

PETER GREEN
peter-green-1@uiowa.edu

FLOWER (M. A.) *Xenophon's Anabasis, or The Expedition of Cyrus*. Pp. xvi + 242, map. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012. Paper, £12.99, US\$19.95 (Cased, £60, US\$99). ISBN: 978-0-19-518868-4 (978-0-19-518867-7 hbk).

doi:10.1017/S0009840X14002017

F.'s study of Xenophon's *Anabasis* uses literary criticism to argue that the book should be brought back to the college classroom. I was immediately drawn to his approach; although the *Anabasis* never left my classroom, I normally use it either to give students an exciting break between Herodotus and Thucydides, or to have students read behind the text to find the institutions of the Persian Empire. F. convinced me that I simply failed to give the book its full due.

As he acknowledges, F. takes an eclectic methodological approach to the book. The first chapter summarises its contents and places the work in the context of Xenophon's life. Chapter 2 puts Xenophon outside his work as author, narrator and (micro-)historian, while the third chapter addresses the age-old question of Xenophon's artistic licence in constructing the work (F. finds the account largely convincing, if fleshed out with narrative flair). The fourth chapter discusses the book's narrative structure and style – the vivid vignettes, the tight but shifting focalisation, the 'narrative economy' (which effectively deals with the loose ends, gaps and problems in the book), the speeches and the characterisation. He uses these to elucidate how the often overlooked Books 5–7 fit into the larger purpose of the *Anabasis*.

Chapter 5 tackles the difficult issue of Xenophon as both narrator and leader, here (among other things) dealing with the perplexing question of why Xenophon waits until the third book to take an active role in the narrative. Continuing with the perplexing questions, Chapter 6 addresses Xenophon's literally defensive posturing – why (especially in the second half of the work) does Xenophon so often recount his defences of his actions? Finally, in Chapters 7 and 8 F. mounts his own defence for why the *Anabasis* should be brought back to the college classroom. Chapter 7 discusses, in broad themes (e.g. differences between Greeks and Barbarians, images of Cyrus the Younger, reflections on Athens and Sparta), what the work might have meant to ancient readers, while Chapter 8 artfully deals with the thorny issue of religious agency in the work. There is, indeed,