

inter Diuos relatus est (Eutropius).

(This is one of only a few ways to translate the Greek.)

- (iv) **siti oppressis pluua** diuinitus missa est (p. 70).

δίψει πιεζομένους ὄμβρος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο (*Chronicon Paschale*).

quum . . . siti laborabant . . . pluua missa est (Arm.).

pluua impetrata, cum siti laborarent (*HA***); **imbres in siti illa impetrauit**

(Tertullian).

- (v) Commodus **strangulatur in domo Vestiliani** (p. 72).

Κόμμοδος αἰφνίδιος ἐτελεύτησεν ἀποπνιγείς ἐν οἰκίᾳ Βεστυλιανοῦ (*Anonymus Matritensis*).

Comodus ex improviso obiit dilaceratus in palatio Bestiliani (Arm.).

in **Vestilianas aedes** . . . **strangularunt** (*HA***); **strangulatus** (Eutropius); **domo**

Victiliana (*Chron. urbis Romae*).

- (vi) Decius cum filio in **Abryto occiditur** (p. 78).

[*Δέκιος*] *ἐσφάγη μετὰ τοῦ νιού* . . . ἐν Ἀβρύτῳ (Syncellus).

Decius cum filio in Abrito occisus est (Arm.).

occisus praetorio Abrypto (*Chron. urbis Romae*).

A detailed examination of pp. 68–77 (ten pages out of the eighty-one that cover Jerome's translation of Eusebius' original text) found that thirty-five entries are irrelevant for the purposes of the book, since they contain no text added or augmented by Jerome; four contain original observations by B. of material added by Jerome but missed by Helm; thirty are entries already noted by Helm as being completely the work of Jerome; and twenty-seven contain errors where B. has mistakenly identified the work of either Jerome or Eusebius (i.e. almost three errors per page).

B. does, however, uncover a number of additions made by Jerome but missed by Helm and has identified many of Jerome's additions in entries noted by Helm with a (*). Unfortunately, because of B.'s faulty methodology, the reader cannot accept these without checking each entry against the surviving witnesses to Eusebius' original, something that one has always had to do with Helm's edition.

University of Ottawa

R. W. BURGESS

TOLLE LEGE

G. CLARK (ed.): *Augustine: Confessions Books I–IV* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics Imperial Library). Pp. x + 198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Cased, £37.50/\$59.95 (Paper, £13.95/\$21.95). ISBN: 0-521-49734-5 (0-521-49763-9 pbk).

Teachers wishing to introduce Latin students to Augustine's *Confessions* have always faced a problem. The commentary of Gibb and Montgomery gives little help to the modern student, the Loeb text has an antiquated translation and very few notes, and the recent commentary of O'Donnell is a bit on the expensive side. One therefore welcomes such an initiative from the Imperial Library.

I expressed my great admiration elsewhere (*CR* 45 [1995], 452) for C.'s general introduction to the *Confessions*, and since much of the material naturally reappears in

the introduction to her text and commentary—with appropriate changes of presentation, I hasten to add—I need say no more about its clarity and helpfulness.

Before turning to the text and commentary I note in passing that there is a helpful list of the works of Augustine referred to, and where to find them; perhaps something similar should have been done for other works, for a student looking up an anglicized title such as Cicero, *On Ends*, might have a problem. The reader then comes to a remarkably uncluttered text. The Latin is not interrupted by Scriptural references; there is no apparatus and no footnotes. The paragraphing is that of the Benedictines, but initial capitals, as well as the bold figures in the outer margins, point to Amerbach's chapters. There are no line references, which means that the cross-references frequently made in the notes are not easy to find. This is also of course true of the individual notes, which are clustered together in paragraphs without a new line for each lemma.

Each batch of notes begins with a short summary of the contents or significance of the paragraph. The range of the notes includes Biblical references (including, often very valuably, their unstated context), the events of Augustine's life and matters arising (C. is good at simply explaining a title like *Categories*, or making one feel at home with Manichaeism), and explanation of the thoughts of Augustine. The notes are simple and generally short, even where the text is unclear or the argument difficult. When commenting on *Aeneae nescio cuius* or *cuiusdam Ciceronis*, for example, C. does not hang about. The commentary is smooth and easy to read . . . at least for the Latin scholar. Although the implied user is a person with no specialist information about the classical or theological background, he or she is expected to have a complete familiarity with classical Latin syntax and the ability to recognize its constructions on the page. It is thirty years since I first read *Confessions* (on an overnight coach, I recall, no doubt to keep away *phantasmata quae vagantur mane*)—but what about the student with only two or three years' experience, or some other reader inspired by the simpler bits of Augustine, or drawn by the work's reputation, who wishes to read more but really has to work at the Latin? While C.'s discussions are often based on her interpretation of the Latin, so that some will be able to arrive at its meaning that way, plain and simple explanation of the Latin is very rare. On Book 4 there are about twenty notes (out of hundreds) that give help with the meaning of individual words, and almost none on phrasing, syntax, or word order. There is some translation, although readers have been told that C. assumed they would have access to Chadwick. (So at least £20, Jimmy, if you want to do the Augustine set text and cannot borrow the necessary books.)

For my money, or rather that of most students (I suspect), I would have preferred a commentary on fewer books—perhaps taking the story as far as Augustine's arrival at Carthage, a passage stylistically analysed so well by C. in her previous book—with more explanation of why the Latin means what translators say it means, or in other words more help for the student who seriously wants to get at the Latin as well as understand Augustine's philosophical and sexual problems. Perhaps the ideal solution to the problem with which this review began would be a commentary on Book 1 alone, based on careful thought about what today's average student actually needs to know, and backed up by a translation. Does the length of text covered in a commentary of the sixth form/university kind—traditionally based on the length of the antique (classical) book—and the proportion of explanation to text have to remain constant while readers' needs do not? The literature of Late Antiquity, where book lengths differ markedly from the classical norms—the *Confessions* are a good example of this—would be a good area for experiment. And perhaps there is even a market for

really helpful commentaries by scholars on the Latin of, say, a single episode of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, or a single satire, or a battle-scene from one of the historians, works which would be helpful to the tiro in approach as well as in price.

University of Glasgow

R. P. H. GREEN

THE CONTEXT OF TRAGEDY

B. GOFF (ed.): *History, Tragedy, Theory: Dialogues on Athenian Drama*. Pp. x + 228. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995. \$35. ISBN: 0-292-72779-8.

In the past decade, literary criticism and cultural history in a number of disciplines have refined, qualified, or challenged the 'deconstructive turn' of the late seventies and early eighties in order to re-establish and debate the importance of 'history' and 'context' for the interpretation of literary texts. This collection of essays represents an attempt to assess the implications of these recent developments in cultural and literary theory for the study of Greek tragedy.

G.'s introductory essay outlines and discusses the methodological lineaments of the 'New Historicism', with sensitivity to its competing deconstructive, feminist, Foucauldian, and Marxist ancestries. She usefully stresses that this is no monolithic or homogeneous school of thought, since the notion of what 'history' is has become highly contested. And classicists cannot afford to misrecognize new versions of historicism as amounting to the traditional philologist's 'untheorized' use of history as context. G. sets up the battleground on which many of the subsequent essays stake out their positions. To put it (too) simply, there are two areas of controversy. The first involves the extent to which the use of history or 'contexts' in interpretation should involve 'closed' readings or a denial of a tragedy's 'questioning' quality, its plural meanings, dissolved oppositions, or unresolved ambiguities. The second involves the hermeneutic status of notions of 'context'. Contexts are themselves 'texts' and always open to interpretation. How do we go about contextualizing tragedy? And how far is our selection and interpretation of historical frames for tragedy conditioned, not by some objective ahistorical standpoint but by our own position in space and time—our own histories and contexts?

In her essay, Michelle Gellrich makes a useful distinction between Derridean approaches to structuralism and history and what she calls 'post-structuralist socio-criticism' as represented by J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet and refined by critics such as J. Winkler, F. Zeitlin, H. Foley, and S. Goldhill. For some commentators (including Seaford in this collection) these critics are too ready to emphasize the 'questioning', 'ambiguous', or 'open' texture of tragedy at the expense of its conformity to a dominant ideology—a conformity which only emerges when we do a better form of historicism. For Gellrich, on the other hand, they do not go far enough because they argue that the structural oppositions of thought and ideology which form the context of tragedy are tested, challenged, and problematized by tragedy but not actually dissolved. To my mind, Gellrich unjustly paints all 'post-structuralist socio-criticism' in Bakhtinian colours. Her brief account of the tragic Dionysus as a figure who transcends or dissolves the logic of binary opposition is interesting and provocative. But Gellrich fails to demonstrate that her (potentially fruitful) deconstruction of structuralist assumptions is anything other than a product of a late twentieth-century desire to free Greek tragedy from ideology.