

Isabelle Cogitore to state the stronger case for change. Giua's account of 'il Tacito incompiuto di Arnaldo Momigliano' is an engaging biography within a biography, tracing Momigliano's developing views of Tacitus as he prepared the book he never wrote. Both historians were essentially formed by their experiences of despotism; each became progressively disenchanted, Tacitus with Trajan, Momigliano with Tacitus, whose historical judgement he came to see as not only shaped, but actually distorted, by his Domitianic trauma.

Significant here, given the volume's title, is the theory of Tacitean *Verdüsterung*, a 'darkening' in his view of the present régime once routinely diagnosed (for Momigliano the shadows lengthened already in *Germania*), now rarely broached outright. (Syme, *Tacitus* (1958), 219–20, debunked it — on the basis that Tacitus saw few rays to start with.) Giua avoids committing herself, and D. himself is sceptical (29); the thought recurs, however, in Isabelle Cogitore's synchronic of Agricola and Germanicus, where contrasts are taken to reflect a new political disillusionment by the time of *Annals* (161–2). It is bold geometry to trace an arc between two points, and there are plenty of variables to complicate the trajectory; nor does Cogitore note the possibility that Hadrian's accession intervened. Still, Tacitus patently did evolve across two decades or more (think only of his style; and *le style, c'est ...*): quite how his political outlook developed over that time is a large and difficult question, but no less important for that.

If the burden of D.'s volume is to justify continued attention to the *opera minora*, it succeeds: novel juxtapositions and engaging responses amply prove the worth of these 'lesser' siblings. Inherited hierarchies remain, though: *Germania* stays bottom of the pile, and the sovereign polarity of *minora* and *maiora* — in which the axes of size, chronology and value are so easily collapsed into one — is inscribed into the project right from the title. It is good to be reminded what sway those handy but banal tags hold over us all.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge
clw36@cam.ac.uk

CHRISTOPHER WHITTON

doi:10.1017/S0075435815001215

B. T. LEE, E. FINKELPEARL and L. GRAVERINI (EDS), *APULEIUS AND AFRICA* (Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies 18). New York/London: Routledge, 2014. Pp. xvi + 344, illus. ISBN 9780415533099. £85.00.

This book of a 2010 conference explores the interaction of Ap[uleius]' literary output with his African background (he was born in Madauros in Africa Proconsularis in the mid-120s C.E. and spent much of his professional life in Carthage), and to provide some corrective to the previous generation of scholarship (e.g. by James Tatum, Gerald Sandy and the reviewer) which sought to stress Ap.'s strong links with the Roman archaizing literary culture of the second century C.E. and the contemporary Greek 'Second Sophistic'.

After the useful orientation of the introduction, contextualizing it within theories of Romanization and post-colonial discourse, and stressing complex cultural identity and cultural hybridity, the book's first section looks at historical contexts. Here Keith Bradley's chapter (24–34) rightly emphasizes that Ap.'s *Apologia* must record a real occasion (I would say with Cicero-style *ex post facto* editing), and shows how the archaeology and the mixed culture of the trial-location of Sabathra, and especially the evidence of the Greek magical papyri, can contribute to the work's interpretation. Carlos Noreña (35–51) points to the detailed Roman legal colour of the speech, suggesting (rightly) that the more forensic second part has received less attention than the more epideictic first part, and (more contestably) that Ap.'s intellectual virtuosity is, in the end, subordinated to his rôle as a good Roman imperial subject. Julia Gaisser (52–65) demonstrates the rôle of Africa in the transmission of Ap.'s works, plausibly stressing the importance of his fellow-Roman North Africans Lactantius, Augustine, Martianus Capella and Fulgentius. Joseph Farrell (66–84) looks at Ap.'s recent emergence into the university Latin canon against the background of the culture/canon wars of the 1980s and 1990s, and notes that Ap. is already emerging in Late Antiquity (here surely his — then fashionable — Platonism is important as well as the African emperors of the period); he is relatively sceptical about 'African' Latin and Ap.'s 'African' identity.

The second section considers cultural contexts. Here Silvia Mattiacci (87–111) provides an excellent summary of the historical debate on 'African Latin' and rightly points to the recent work of Jim Adams, which shows that there were Latin loan-words from African languages and one or two other lexical features (both in sub-literary texts) as well as African pronunciation of Latin, but

no broad African literary style behind Ap.'s remarkable diction. She suggests that the latter may have been influenced by local rhetorical schools, but we need more evidence here (how were these different from those at Rome, for example?). Luca Graverini (112–28) looks for African colour in the *Metamorphoses* through Ap.'s use of the Vergilian figure of Dido, suggesting (amongst many good points) analogies between Ap.'s Hypata and Vergil's Carthage as places of diversion and entertainment (interesting) as well as between Byrrhaena and Dido (even more interesting given the latter's quasi-erotic interest in her guest). Wytse Keulen (129–53) compares the careers of Ap. and Fronto, suggesting persuasively that they knew each other at least by reputation, that both play on their exotic outsider/African status and span both Greek and Roman culture, and that Lucius becomes a kind of Fronto at the end of the *Met.*; Ap. is interestingly seen as a 'Ciceronian' new man with vim and panache, Fronto as a more elegant and established 'Caesarian' figure. David Stone (154–73) suggests that the real complexity of identity in Ap.'s work consists not of his self-presentation but of his presentation of other characters, based not on national/ethnic considerations but on a range and combination of categories and habitual actions. Emmanuel and Nedjima Plantade (174–201) look at potential links of the story of Cupid and Psyche with Berber folktales collected in the modern period; some of the parallels are striking, but for the reviewer it is hard to let go of the Fehling thesis that modern folk versions are likely to derive from the post-classical diffusion of the literary story.

The third and final section is devoted to theoretical approaches. Daniel Selden's remarkably rich and wide-ranging chapter (206–68) argues that some key features of Ap.'s style find their origins in Afro-asiatic poetics, taking issue with Adams' restriction of these features to sub-literary texts; his argument that Ap.'s florid prose style is more like Libyac and Punic poetry than post-classical Latin prose (for example, in its use of parallel phrasing) could be countered by the idea that it indeed derives much of its colour from Latin poetry. Sonia Sabnis (271–96) suggests that Ap.'s descriptions of India reflect elements of post-colonial resistance and criticism of the usual Roman exoticizing discourse; this is an interesting view, but I would suggest that domestication of this material for a Rome-oriented audience is more important than she allows here. Richard Fletcher (297–312) points out that there is little African colour in the Platonic works, and that even when Ap. talks about his origins, the point is at least as much philosophical as ethnic, a salutary reminder that we need to consider the author's whole output in this context. Finally, Benjamin Lee (313–26) picks up the reference to *Africae uiri* in the transmission of the *Florida* and rightly points to the central significance of the work's Roman/African audience as an identifiable local élite with particular cultural concerns.

Overall, this volume succeeds in giving a higher profile than before to Ap.'s African context and cultural identity, and in advancing (if not always concluding) debate on many connected issues. Scholars should be duly grateful to the editors and contributors for a significant milestone in modern Apuleian studies.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford
stephen.harrison@ccc.ox.ac.uk

S. J. HARRISON

doi:10.1017/S0075435815001094

C. WHITTON (ED.), *PLINY THE YOUNGER: EPISTLES BOOK II* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xiii + 328, illus. ISBN 9781107006898 (bound); 9780521187275 (paper). £60.00/US\$95.00 (bound); £21.99/US \$34.99 (paper).

Pliny the Younger has long inhabited a liminal place in classical scholarship. Respected for his prose, admired for his *humanitas*, and mined for historical and legal details, he and his writings have not been marginalized as such, nor have they been granted the study and scrutiny devoted to Cicero, Livy or his overshadowing contemporary Tacitus. Balanced between the margin and the centre, Pliny has historically suffered from a lack of attention, which has become circular in its continuity — little has been written on his literary achievement, and so there seems little reason to explore what he might have achieved as a writer. Christopher Whitton's list of editions, commentaries and translations (x–xi) demonstrates the paucity of resources available to the student or scholar looking to read critically Pliny's *Epistles*. It still remains largely true that if one wants to do a close reading of the *Epistles*, one has to turn for insight to individual scholarly articles or