

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

away from his grasp (though cf. pp. 23, 107, 125 for L. on the brink of writing a genuinely important book). The high level of interest L.'s general discussion of Livian belief and scepticism generates (mercifully in literary, not theological, terms; readers of Virgil scholarship have to face both!) is never quite maintained and if L. had not had quite so well-developed a sense of how to avoid vast and troublesome issues, he could always have tried comparing the evanescence of Livy's philosophical and theological positions with those of his fellow-Lombard and near-contemporary, Virgil. There is much to commend in L.'s contention that Livy's avoidance of any clear philosophical and religious standpoint is entirely conscious (cf. p. 147 for a fine instance of drunkard-and-lamppost technique).

The book is accurately, not flawlessly printed and I could wish that L. had taken a little more care to seek out corrected reprints of some of the articles he cites (Prof. Brunt and the reviewer both suffer in consequence). And it is a great pity that L. has not been induced to adopt a less unpalatable manner of employing the English language; the reviewer has picked up and put aside *Religion* repeatedly. Neither theses nor first books, nor serious contributions to Latin historiography (and L.'s is all three, the last included, I stress) need perforce challenge the reader's concentration and digestion quite so brutally.

Rome

NICHOLAS HORSFALL

M. GRANT: *Anthimus De observatione ciborum: On the Observance of Foods. Translated and Edited with Notes*. Pp. 142, 7 ills, 2 maps. Blackawton: Prospect Books, 1996. Paper, £9.99. ISBN: 0-90732575-0.

Anthimus, the author of the first French cookery book, is, as G. tells us, an enigmatic figure from an obscure age. Apart from the culinary tastes evident in this treatise, all we know of him is that he was exiled from Constantinople by the emperor Zeno and wrote this work several years later, perhaps in Metz, after the accession of Theuderic, who became king of the Franks in 511. ('Your piety', as he almost peremptorily calls him before hastening to more practical matters such as the prevention of diarrhoea.) G. tells us this, and much more, in an introduction which goes back to an earlier interest of his, the closely parallel Oribasius (unfortunately dated by the blurb to the fifth century). As well as a historical sketch—rather fuzzy in places: Julian was 'promoted emperor in 360', and G. speaks of his assassination—it also gives very pertinent surveys of relevant trade, cooking in Anthimus' time, and diet and medicine. Humours occupy a central rôle: cranes, for example (p. 27), 'engender melancholy humour and should only be eaten occasionally and when there is a craving for them'. There is a brief note on the textual tradition, and a soupçon of critical apparatus beneath the Latin text, with appropriate notes in the commentary: but neither the text nor the orthographical and grammatical anomalies of the treatise are a major concern. Gastronomy rules.

Anthimus, like his commentator, is well informed, and brings to his task a varied experience and an urbane turn of phrase. He argues against the macho habit of eating raw and bloody beef ('such people are not really healthy'); he notes the French delicacy of bacon, used both internally and externally (to cure wounds); he notes that bustards and cucumbers, which he commends, are not available where he now is. He has a sardonic turn of phrase: 'you have no need of another poison' if you eat oysters that smell (p. 49), or if you eat baked cheese (p. 81). Anthimus is convinced that baked or boiled cheese will give you 'pure stones', and proves it—cool a piece of boiled cheese and it will become *omnino quomodo lapis*. G. gives a typically learned list of gastronomes who obviously did not agree. G. certainly knows his onions ('a mature fresh onion is about 87% pure water'), but I was surprised at his claim (p. 4) that in classical Latin *vervex* denotes 'lamb', which his two parallels hardly support. He also knows all about things like orach and panic, and that the Latin word *mora* denotes both mulberry and blackberry. In fact his commentary is a very useful introduction to food in the ancient world, and easily accessed (if one does not choose to read the whole) through the index of foodstuffs. It is well produced, with a map and illustrations, by Tom Jaine, a fellow gastronome, and consistently keeps the Latinless in mind (though referring to Statius, *Woods* goes a bit too far). An exceedingly good read.

Glasgow

R. P. H. GREEN