

punctuation. Many of Cicero's habits he establishes himself by collecting examples from the philosophical works or the whole of the more formal corpus (pp. 7, 14, 61, 73–4, 77–9, 80, 85, 117, 124, 140–1, 143, 185–6, 197, 201–2, 255, 276, 300, 329, 363) or by looking in vain for examples (pp. 59–60, 66, 82, 83, 120, 131, 135, 139, 142, 153, 163, 325). The flames in which he then shoots Lundström and others down make an impressive spectacle.

Sometimes he offers a good defence of the transmitted text (pp. 123–4, 149, 168, 180), but usually he attacks it, often for the first time. He points out that it contains well over 1000 errors 'ammessi da tutti' (p. 339). Though he often disclaims for his own proposals anything more than suitability (unlike Lundström, who constantly declares that Cicero 'ohne Zweifel' wrote or did not write this or that), many of them are persuasive. For a sample see Shackleton Bailey's review of the edition, *Gnomon* 38 (1986), 735–6, or J. G. F. Powell's, *CR* 101 (1987), 29–31. 'Er hat wohl mehr als irgend ein anderer Herausgeber richtige Textänderungen beige-steuert'—words of Lundström's, no less (*Textkritik* p. 8). If I ever manage to edit the *Tusculans* for *O.C.T.*, I shall be better placed, I hope, to adjudicate on his proposals myself. Meanwhile, there are few that I can reject with any confidence. They include 5.107 *ignominiam* <, *damnum*> *nominis* (p. 68), where *nominis* can perfectly well be the word *exilium*; 2.109 *virtutis perfectae perfunctus est munere* (p. 184), where I cannot imagine why Cicero should have written *perfectae* instead of his usual *functus* (*perfectae perfecto functus* X: *perfecto* del. V²); 5.40 *parva* <vi> *metuit* (pp. 331–2), where the association of *vis* with *metuere* badly needed a parallel (for *parva* I should read *pauca* with Baiter, or *raro*); and 5.51 *illam boni*<s> *lancem* (pp. 333–4), which strains the word order.

Some years ago I had the experience of not believing what I read in the Teubner text of Censorinus and finding in the apparatus reasonable conjectures made by G., whose name meant nothing to me. When I investigated, he turned out to have published on philosophical doxography. I am glad to have met him again. If an Italian colleague was right to see in his edition of the *Tusculans* a 'terremoto testuale' (p. xv), then let us have more such earthquakes—even if not, alas, from G. himself, who at nearly 80 is entitled to a quieter life.

Pembroke College, Cambridge

M. D. REEVE

R. ONIGA: *Sallustio e l'etnografia*. (Biblioteca di Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi dei Testi Classici, 12.) Pp. lxxxiii + 97. Pisa: Giardini, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 88-427-0258-7.

The author aims to vindicate Sallust's ethnographical writing by setting it in the context of the Greek tradition which went back to Herodotus and was vividly represented in the generation before Sallust by Poseidonios. Of Latin writers, it is Cato in the *Origines* and Varro who, along with Sallust, represent that tradition, not Caesar, who wrote his ethnography with a more practical purpose and eschewed mythology and erudition in general.

After an analysis of the tradition Sallust inherited, the author examines in detail the digression on Africa and its peoples in the *Bellum Iugurthinum* Chapters 17–19. He then uses the characteristics uncovered there to analyse the significance of the considerable number of ethnographical fragments preserved from the *Historiae*. Finally, he turns to a vindication of Maurenbrecher's view that the third of his dubious or false fragments (p. 207 of his edition) does indeed belong after Chapter 19.6 of the *Bellum Iugurthinum* and goes on to make a reasonably strong case for its restoration in our text.

Sallust's claim to have used the *libri Punici* of King Hiempsal, even if 'interpretatum' here means 'translated', does not, according to O. (Chapter 4), mean that Sallust sought inspiration outside the Greek tradition. Hiempsal would probably have written on Punic subjects in Greek, so Hellenized was the Numidian as well as the Carthaginian élite at this time: along with other evidence, O. cites the first century B.C. inscription at Rhodes honouring King Hiempsal (*Ant. Class.* 44 [1975], 89ff.). However, O. eventually agrees with the theory that Sallust used a Greek work which merely claimed to rest on King Hiempsal's work (p. 62).

In accordance with this ethnographic tradition, Sallust's excursuses include mythological, aetiological, and etymological explanations for the location and customs of peoples. They also contain standard contrasts between the civilized and the barbarian, and assume, or even make explicit (as in Fr. III.74 M = 54 McGushin), that environment determines human characteristics. Sallust's readers, familiar with this tradition, will see that the geography of Numidia, with its fertile soil, treeless landscape, and dry climate (*Iug.* 17.5–6), ensures that these opponents of

Rome are formidable, warlike, and swift, but they will also understand how Sallust can later reveal (54.4, 74.3) their lack of discipline and steadfastness in battle (pp. 45–8).

Though this treatment cannot answer criticisms from those who wish that Sallust had been more like Caesar and made more use of his first-hand experience in Africa, it does provide a way of making sense of the sequence of Sallust's works. Thus, from an ethnographical point of view, Sallust's interest in Africa was preceded by a study of Rome and Italy in the *Bellum Catilinae* and succeeded by a study of the whole Mediterranean basin in the *Histories*. It is also good to be reminded (p. 334) that the Roman attitude to grants of citizenship had a theoretical underpinning in the Hellenistic and Roman belief that human differences were dictated by environment and culture, not heredity, and that there were no racial barriers to equality.

Somerville College

MIRIAM GRIFFIN

D. S. LEVENE: *Religion in Livy*. (Mnemosyne Supplements, 127.) Pp. xii + 257. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993. Cased. ISBN: 90-04-09617-5 (ISSN: 0169-8958).

L.'s Oxford DPhil. thesis (1989) was quickly into print, but is only reviewed here after some delay, not altogether due to the reviewer's indolence. In the meantime, Livian studies expand at a prodigious rate—a book by Miles (Ithaca, 1995) and two commentaries on Book 6 (Kraus, Oakley), the latter but the first volume in a massive treatment of the second pentad. Cf., for the latest score and shrewd comments on the state of play, C. S. Kraus and A. J. Woodman, *GRNSC* 27 (1997), 51–81. L. approaches his topic very much from the historiographical viewpoint, restricts observations on questions of ritual and religious language to the bare minimum (or even less; the void not filled by F. V. Hickson, *Roman Prayer Language: Livy* [Stuttgart, 1993], of which my notice appears in *Vergilius* [forthcoming] and pares with no less excessive severity his reading on (e.g.) the stories of Aeneas and Romulus. The topic of ritual acts and prayer language is not mere sterile antiquarianism; J. Linderski has demonstrated that amply, *passim*. I grumble particularly because, looking over to Livy from Virgil and from ancient writing about Virgil, you realize that there are degrees of technicality in Latin writing on religious matters (as H. D. Jocelyn showed there were likewise in agriculture), much as in the case of (Anglo-)Catholic ritual: Livy and Virgil both eschew arcane detail and specialist language and L. should, I suspect, have done more to set his author in a distinctively historical and non-antiquarian mode of writing on religious matters (p. 43, for example, is not enough). And I offer one other methodological complaint: rather a lot of Livy survives and clearly L. has read it all, repeatedly, along with the parallel material. His exegesis, meticulously expository and rarely analytical, is very heavy going, at least for relative non-specialists (thirty years of trying to understand ritual acts in the *Aen.* leaves the reviewer in that category!). L. does let himself go, just sometimes (e.g. on p. 125) and then offers the chalcenic reader isolated sharp and perceptive remarks on very large issues of structure and of fundamental differences inherent in the historian's material between the various pentads and decades. Yet, for the rest, L. chews steadily through the text book by book, essential for the thesis but sticky going for the reader of the published opus.

Well-hidden in this book lurks a topic of prime importance: about a year ago, the author kindly confirmed *viva voce* that the reviewer was right to suspect its latent presence. And it could be turned into a more exciting and more important next book.

As L. patiently disentangles the interplay of drama, structure, characterization, ideological emphasis, and the dominance exercised by material upon authors, we glimpse occasionally traces of a disturbing consideration: while there are historians on the grandest scale—from Herodotus to Shelby Foote—who retain an essentially firm and unitary grasp of their material at a moral, emotional, and organizational level, varying pace and intensity with a steady rein, it becomes clearer that Livy was not among them. Even if we leave aside the special case of Book 5 (where L. well shows that Livy's consistent development of the religious material does not simply derive from an emphasis already widely present, though rather less aggressively so, in his sources), it emerges that Livy really does not have the reins firmly in hand, nor an overall conception clear in his mind from the prologue on of the importance of the religious element in Rome's history or in his history of Rome. That is an issue of the greatest moment and one could wish it had received the detailed treatment it deserved. Do great historians have to know what they are doing? It is much to L.'s credit that he raised the issue; as a thesis writer, he was perhaps prudent to let it slip