

NOTICES

D. LATEINER: *Sardonic Smile: Nonverbal Behavior in Homeric Epic*. Pp. xxi + 340. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995. Cased, \$47.50. ISBN: 0-472-10598-1.

This long book on non-verbal behaviour in Homeric epic argues that various aspects of non-verbal interaction, as analysed by social anthropologists, pervade the poems and can be made fruitful to our understanding of them. Part 1 introduces the project as a whole and consists of three chapters: Chapter 1 offers an outline of the field with a discussion of 'nonverbal behavior in life and literature'; Chapter 2 introduces us to non-verbal behaviour in Homer; and Chapter 3 is a case study of *Iliad* 24. Parts 2 and 3 are devoted to the *Odyssey*. Here, too, L. moves from the general to the specific: first he looks at social etiquette in the 'heroic world' (part 2) and then focuses on specific characters (part 3), such as Telemachus (Chapter 8), Odysseus (Chapter 9), the suitors (Chapter 10), and Penelope (Chapter 11). The book ends with an appendix on the use of time. It is equipped with an index and a glossary which introduces the reader to some of the relevant terminology.

L. does make some interesting points, for example on the significance of spatial arrangement in the *Odyssey* (Chapter 7) and—less related to the main argument—on the rôle of Penelope (Chapter 11). But, on the whole, *Sardonic Smile* is a disappointing work. L. offers no coherent argument. His style is repetitive and often obscure, and jargon is used not only too often, but also inappropriately. German *Lebensraum* does not mean 'elbowroom' (p. 50); and '*Impionier-verhaltung*' [sic] (p. 288) is a barbarism which should not have escaped the eye of an academic editor. L.'s handling of the Greek material is hardly less problematic. Telemachus in the *Odyssey* may be a youth, but he is certainly not a 'ἦβη' (p. 117; L. glosses 'doer'); and his name will be linked with the verb *τλήναι* only by someone who has an axe to grind and little time for Greek prosody (p. 142). The same carelessness is apparent in L.'s treatment of the word 'sardonic'. Having repeatedly used it in the sense of English 'sarcastic' (pp. 99, 146, 163), L. confesses to not knowing what *σαρδάνιος* means when he discusses the one passage where the word occurs in Homer (p. 194). No attempt is made to explain or modify what has been said earlier. The reader is referred to the next book on the subject, while L. himself reverts to his former practice (p. 195 'sardonic suitors').

Behind the shortcomings of L.'s writing there lurks a more fundamental flaw. L. makes it his task to sell two ready-made products. On the one hand there is Homer's account of a 'cruel man's world' (p. 215 n. 22). On the other hand there is 'theory' which L. dispenses like a medicine and which we, as readers of Homer, need to swallow without further ado (e.g. p. 271 n. 53: 'Goffman . . . provides the theory for the next two paragraphs'). L. sees little need to question the often problematic claims of his donor-discipline. He does not ask what it means to speak of 'ordinary life' (e.g. p. 3) nor does he take seriously enough the question how non-verbal behaviour creates meaning (and what kind of meaning). Instead, post-Freudian notions of 'self' (see the index from 'Self' to 'Self-sufficiency') are mixed with research into animal behaviour (e.g. p. 57 n. 48) and snippets from Greek ritual practice (e.g. p. 11 where 'ritualized' is equated with 'conventional' as opposed to 'emotional'). The result is a methodological muddle. At the very least, L.'s own warning against 'psychologizing' interpretations of Homer (p. 22) could have led him to clarify some of his assumptions. He prefers to abandon interpretative consistency.

What drives this book and gives it much of its missionary fervour is a variant of the biological humanism familiar to readers of S. Pinker. After 'The Language Instinct', L. offers us the body-language instinct (for L.'s use of 'instinct' see e.g. p. 107) as yet another universal sign system characteristic of human beings. He sees a biological continuum (e.g. p. 139) which allows the present-day reader direct access to Homer beyond problems of text and cultural context. The need to sympathize is deeply felt and finds expression in repeated appeals to the 'real', 'immediate', and 'true' aspects of non-verbal behaviour (e.g. pp. 53, 83, 111, 206, 288). 'Like the rest of us', L. writes, 'epic characters, even Akhilleus, cannot always openly express sentiments' (p. 184). But while some epic characters join L. and 'the rest of us' by controlling their 'sentiments', there are others who remain excluded. They are the likes of the Homeric 'punk' Iros (e.g. p. 119); characters who behave 'in the macho and status-ridden Mediterranean manner' (p. 227) and

whom 'a modern "real-life" clinical analysis' might reveal as having 'brain dysfunction, emotional difficulties', or 'criminal tendencies' (pp. 237f.). Underneath the 'cloak of universality' (p. 229), L.'s non-verbal Homer shows an uncomfortably parochial face.

Cambridge

JOHANNES HAUBOLD

J. M. SNYDER: *Lesbian Desire in the Lyrics of Sappho*. Pp. xi + 261. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997. \$34/£24. ISBN: 0-231-09994-0.

S. starts from the premise that 'all readings of Sappho are really fictions of Sappho' but she then expresses the hope that the particular fiction which she has created is 'one that Sappho—were she to appear before us and converse with us . . . would at least be somewhat likely to recognise as being about herself' (p. 3). The introduction makes explicit the woman-centred focus of the work for, although S. pays tribute to those recent readings which have been grounded in a reconstruction of the circumstances of the composition of the poems and/or their performance, she is clear about her own choice of frame: she will read them 'for what they can say to women (and men who are willing to abandon a masculinist frame of reference)' (p. 1). Throughout the book her readings demonstrate a clear preference for Sappho's 'poetic world' over her 'actual world' (the construction on the basis of the fragments of a coherent 'Sapphic aesthetic' is its major strength), and the close attention which is paid to the recurrence in the corpus of individual words and phrases redresses the balance of those many discussions which have focused on only the two or three most complete poems. S. articulates delight in the 'idealistic visions' which the poems have inspired among feminist (and particularly lesbian) readers, and this readiness to forge identifications on the basis of sexual preference and to construct a lesbian literary history of which Sappho is an important part is likely to be the most interesting aspect of this book for those readers dissatisfied with a mere hundred years of homosexuality. S. follows the trend of recent commentators on Sappho who have tended to be inspired by a passion for equality and commitment to gender issues but is bolder than most in the foregrounding of her own agenda. It is a shame therefore (because it weakens her position) that at times she feels the need to muffle her distinctive voice and claim authority for her readings on the basis of their 'historical' viability. The problem is not so much that S. desires her readings to be preferred over any others; such a desire might be regarded as a prerequisite for publishing on any text. Rather, the problem is that the arguments S. uses as advocates on her behalf are thinly disguised variants of those which in another moment she rejects. For example, she asserts (*passim*) the impossibility of reconstructing from the poems a picture of what life was like among the aristocracy on Lesbos in around 600 B.C., but she does believe it is possible, on the basis of the same poems, to reconstruct the underpinnings of an aesthetics of desire, a desire 'based not on possession but celebration' (p. 42), and she insists that such an image of desire is derived, 'not from any modern vision of some sort of lesbian utopia' (p. 3), but from the poems themselves. At the very least this kind of juxtaposition shows an unwillingness to think through the implications of her own statement about the fictionality of readings of Sappho which is cited above. All the fragments discussed are not only translated but also transliterated in the sections where a critical assessment of them is given in order to help those without Greek gain some sense of their sound and rhythm. In addition, the Voigt text is reproduced in an appendix and a (somewhat unnecessary) translation given here for the second time. By far the richest chapter is the final one, where S. examines three twentieth-century women poets for whom Sappho has functioned as intertext. Here the aesthetic underpinnings of Sapphic desire are discovered in the lyrics of Amy Lowell, H. D., and Olga Broumas, and S. ably brings to fulfilment her project of asserting the continuing validity of the female lyric voice.

University of Bristol

VANDA ZAJKO

R. BÖHME: *Eppur si muove—und sie bewegt sich doch: das Mirakel der äschyleischen Orestie*. Pp. 185, Bern, etc.: Paul Haupt, 1997. Cased, DM 76. ISBN: 3-258-05559-9.

The thesis of this book is that the *Oresteia* as we have it is a radically rewritten version of Aeschylus' trilogy, composed by a minor poet for a production in the last decade of the fifth century, probably in 407–6 B.C. B.'s starting-point is his attempt to prove that the cannibal-feast of Thyestes was an innovation of Sophocles in his lost *Thyestes*, a play which he arbitrarily dates to 412, and that it cannot therefore have been used by Aeschylus at the end of his *Agamemnon*. Since this book is largely a repetition or rewriting of B.'s earlier books published over a period of many years, there is no need here for a detailed consideration of his arguments. Readers may wish to consult, for example, the reviews of *Bühnenbearbeitung äschyleischer Tragödien* (2 vols, 1956 and 1959) by G. Freymuth, *Gnomon* 31 (1959), 393–403, and by D. W. Lucas, *CR* 10 (1960), 198–200, and of *Aeschylus Correctus* (1977) by J. Diggle, *CR* 29 (1979), 307, and by myself in *JHS* 99 (1979), 173. Those who were not persuaded by these and other earlier books, because, according to B., they were blinded by dogma, are unlikely to find this latest work any more convincing.

University of Glasgow

A. F. GARVIE

E. HALL (ed.): *Aeschylus: Persians* (Classical Texts). Pp. vi + 201, 5 figs. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1996. Cased, £35/\$49.95 (Paper, £14.95/\$24.95). ISBN: 0-85668-596-8 (0-85668-597-6 pbk).

The earliest extant Greek tragedy, *Persae*, was once regarded as a comparatively easy text and along with the now suspect *Prometheus* was the schoolboy's most likely gateway to Aeschylus. Hence the existence of several school commentaries. In English at a scholarly level there is the serviceable commentary by Broadhead, but like many commentators of an older generation Broadhead is silent at points where a late-twentieth-century readership feels that the text is clamouring for a comment. It is eminently fitting that this play should be the second Aeschylean play to feature in this series of commentaries. Since H. is well known for her illuminating study of the early Greeks' relationship with and attitude to non-Greeks, *Inventing the Barbarian* (Oxford, 1989), it is also fitting that she should be the commentator.

H. states quite openly that she will not deal with issues that have featured prominently in previous commentaries and discussions. The play is not treated as a historical source, and historical problems are barely dealt with (for these topics see now Pelling in C. Pelling (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* [Oxford, 1997], 1ff.). Instead '... the focus is on the visual and performative dimensions of the play, its emotional impact, its metaphors, symbols, imagery, and psychological registers; central concerns are the poetic vocabulary used to delineate the ethically other, and especially the tension between the tragedy's "translation" of authentic Persian practices and blatant misrepresentations emanating from its ethnocentric Athenian perspective'. Since these aspects of the play are precisely the ones most neglected by previous commentators, this approach is entirely justified and the outcome is a thoughtful, refreshing, and stimulating work. Other interpreters of the play have tended either consciously or unconsciously to side with the Athenians against the Persians. H. shows that there is considerable distortion in Aeschylus' presentation of Athens' enemy and of the barbarian in general. On the other hand she seems to me occasionally to go too far in the opposite direction in attributing the worst of motives to Aeschylus in particular—tragic compassion is not a thing she appears to detect in the play—and to his fellow Athenians in general, for example when she speaks of the latter's 'vicious hatred' of their invaders.

H. produces her own text, which is based on West's Teubner and accompanied by a minimal apparatus. Like West, H. does not take note of Snell's *δορικρανοῦς* at 147. In the part of the introduction dealing with the history of Aeschylus' text it is surprising to find no reference to Gruys's excellent study of the early printed editions.

The translation is readable and on the whole accurate (but *πόθωι* . . . *μαλερώι* in 62 does not mean 'soft yearning'). At 654 might it not be more rhetorically effective to treat *Πέρραις* as dative of agent as Murray did in his translation and Rose in his commentary? Since many studying this play will rely on the translation for their principal linguistic assistance, there are places where one

would have liked something more literal, for example a translation which fully accounted for *πλάκα* in 718 or a precise rendering of 125, *βυκκίνοις δ' ἐν πέπλοις πέσει λακίς*. It is unfortunate that different expressions are used to translate *κυνάπτεσθαι* at 724 and 742. Does not the first occurrence anticipate the second in an unconsciously sinister manner? 'The remains of my outfit' introduces unwanted bathos at 1018.

The commentary is helpful and to the point. H.'s note on 424–6, however, is uncharacteristically disappointing: 'tunny were . . .'. They still are: see A. Davidson, *Mediterranean Seafood*, 143 and recall a memorable scene from Rossellini's film *Stromboli*. At 446 I would have expected a note on the form of narrative opening and likewise at 531 a discussion of the possibility of Xerxes' suicide. On 497–9 one might also point out that oaths by *Οὐρανός* are to be found in comedy. At 714 H. argues that in *διαπεπόρθηται τὰ Περσῶν πράγματα* 'a pun on *Πέρσαι* and *διαπορθεῖν* (= *διαπέρθειν*) is almost certainly intended'. She is wrong to support her interpretation with reference to the words which follow, *ὡς εἶπεν ἔπος*, and to adduce as a parallel Eur. *Heraclid.* 167, which does not differ from other examples of the idiom instanced by LSJ s. v. *ἔπος* II 4, where it is explained as 'qualifying a too absolute expression, esp. with *πᾶς* and *οὐδέεις*'. In our case the too absolute expression is to be found in *διαπεπόρθηται*, in the *Heraclid.*-passage in τὸ *μηδὲν ὄντος*. H. interprets 841 as having an oriental ring: see, however, H. Wankel, *Hermes* 111 (1983), 149ff.

The section on language and style in the introduction is somewhat disappointing and not all of the linguistic comments in the commentary are happy. Fehling's classic study of Wiederholungsfiguren is not cited in connection with l. 680. Discussing the expression 'King of Kings', H. trots out a technical term for the benefit of the 'technically minded'. It would have been more helpful to make it clear to the reader (who needs this information when confronted by *πιστὰ πιστῶν* in 681) that the phrase does not mean 'ruler of [other] kings' (her statement that l. 24 contains a 'grammatical inversion' of the phrase is therefore misleading), but that it is a superlative expression and is a linguistic borrowing (see most recently West's discussion in *The East Face of Helicon* [Oxford, 1997]). In the final paragraph of p. 23 H. presents a garbled version of Headlam's remarks about Ionicisms in the play, neglecting to bring his references into line with the enumeration of modern texts of the play. What is in question is a syllable containing a short vowel (short vowels are not 'lengthened') closed by the first phoneme of a combination such as 'tr' (l. 782 *νέα φρονεῖ*: H. misleadingly omits Headlam's 'etc.') and the 'Ionic' adjective, *μηλοστρόφον* in l. 763.

University of Manchester

DAVID BAIN

L. BATTEZZATO: *Il monologo nel teatro di Euripide*. (Pubblicazioni della Classe di Lettere e Filosofia, 14.) Pp. 210. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 88-7642-039-8.

Friedrich Leo, *Der Monolog im Drama* (Göttingen, 1914) begat Wolfgang Schadewaldt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch* (Berlin, 1926), who begat E. Medda, *La forma monologica: ricerche su Omero e Sofocle* (Pisa, 1983), and now in turn we have a new addition—in some respects a rebellious child—to the family of studies concerned with the monologue in Greek drama in the shape of this work on Euripides by Battezzato who, like Medda, is a pupil of Vincenzo Di Benedetto.

B.'s book, which has evolved from a 'tesi di laurea' examined at Pisa in 1990, opens with a most interesting and informative survey of the critical climate that formed the background to Schadewaldt's difficult, but important book. B. effectively places Schadewaldt in his intellectual environment. He rightly affirms that rhetoric and pathos are far from being mutually exclusive, and points out that Schadewaldt as the legatee of a nineteenth-century German high romanticism was sometimes led seriously astray by it when interpreting later Euripides. He was affected, for instance, by received wisdom to the effect that *Hecuba* is the last of its kind in Euripides' *oeuvre*, because it exhibits a pathos not to be found in the plays that followed. In this section B. reveals sound judgement and wide reading, reading by no means confined to the secondary literature which deals specifically with Greek tragedy (with which B. displays exemplary familiarity). It is pleasing, incidentally, to be reminded of Mommsen's view of Euripides (one wonders how he found the time to form one).

As he comes close to admitting ('come si vede, la ricerca che si presenta non rispetta rigidamente i confini del monologo; le forme monologiche sono usate come traccia per analizzare

di volta in volta singole opere, sconficcando in campi di indagine che il titolo generale del saggio non lascia intravedere'), B.'s title is somewhat misleading. He does not attempt a comprehensive study of the monologue in Euripides. Someone looking for a discussion of every monologic passage in Euripides will be disappointed. For instance, B. has nothing to say about *Or.* 671ff. The work consists of discussions of various themes connected with the phenomenon in question, starting from Schadewaldt's discussion of it, rather than a systematic study of the phenomenon itself. On the other hand, B. offers much more than his title would suggest: he by no means confines himself to the plays of Euripides. There are many valuable discussions of passages in the other two tragedians, and monologue or monologue-like material from comedy—I single out an illuminating discussion of Men. *Asp.* 399ff.—and other genres (epinikion, dithyramb, and iambus) is amply considered.

The agenda of the work is set out on pp. 23–5 (B.'s attempt to define 'monologue' is postponed until pp. 113f.). The first chapter begins by treating the type of entrance monologue which has a strong emotional content and considering the manner in which it was given an ironic twist in later Euripides. B. goes on in the second chapter to discuss non-'pathetic' entrance monologues, which he compares to choral entrances. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to what B. terms 'l'instabilità della condizione monologica', particularly to those passages which, though formally monologic, are clearly intended to provoke a response from auditors on stage. The third and final chapter deals with the transformation in drama of the ritual *threnos*. B. perceives a reverse of the normal form of antiphony described in Homer: he notes that in the lyric exchanges in Euripides rôles are reversed and that we find the *chorus* acting as *ἑξάρχος* and the *actor* responding. He also discusses threnodic monodies and, moving some distance from his main theme, deals with the 'lamento funebre rifiutato' in *Med.* and *I. A.*

In a way this is an unfashionable book since it is published at a time when many critics seem hostile to formal analysis of Greek drama or of literature in general. It is none the worse for that. With no particular critical axe to grind and a generous acceptance of diverse critical approaches to tragedy, B. proffers much acute and sophisticated criticism of individual passages in many plays. He shares some of Leo's incomparable feeling for form (a feeling also shared by Leo's pupil, Eduard Fraenkel). Leo's work has stood the test of time better than Schadewaldt's precisely because it dealt primarily with form, a topic which is less vulnerable to fluctuations in critical interpretation than other literary themes. This would seem to augur well for the lifespan of B.'s youthful, but extremely promising work.

The book is written in a clear and lively style, and is accurately produced. I noticed a few 'sviste'. On p. 5 n. 2 for 'loose' read 'lose' and on p. 6 Friedrich is not 'già citato'. P. 28 n. 3: read *συνομοιοπαθεῖ* and *παθητικῶς*. One of the most notable bit-part players who feature prominently in the section of Wecklein's edition of Euripides which contains *coniecturas minus probabiles* should be 'F. W(ilhelm)', rather than 'F. G(uilelmus)'. Schmidt, 'Lushing' should be 'Lushnig', 'R.' Frost (p. 114 n. 115) should be 'K.' Frost. Wilamowitz from time to time loses the final f in the second part of his name and in the reference to a work of mine in n. 74 on p. 22 the year should be '1977'. Albert Henrichs's surname is regularly misspelled. *Indices locorum* and *indices uerborum Graecorum* are provided. On allegedly 'compensious interpolations' (p. 126 n. 1) see now H.-C. Günther, *Exercitationes Sophocleae* (Göttingen, 1996).

University of Manchester

DAVID BAIN

W. STOCKERT: *Euripides. Iphigenie in Aulis.* (Wiener Studien, Beiheft, 16.1/2.) Pp. xxi + 152, 155–654. Vienna: Die Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1992. Paper.

This large-scale edition at once becomes indispensable to study of the play, and must be the foundation of all detailed engagement with its text. The book was fifteen years in the making (but what a task!—and the author had many other commitments); it assimilates a few preliminary papers modestly omitted from the bibliography but occasionally mentioned in the commentary, e.g. *Prometheus* 8 (1982), 22–30 on p. 274 and *WS* 95 (1982), 71–8 on p. 277. A supplementary discussion of vv. 1375–6 has appeared at *WS* 107/108 (1994/5), 221–4.

The edition comes in date between the generally conservative one of F. Jouan (Budé, 1983) and the more adventurous one of H.-C. Günther (Teubner, 1988), and J. Diggle's innovative presentation of the text in his OCT of 1994 (to which should be joined his *Euripidea* [Oxford, 1994], pp. 407–15, 490–507). The quality of MS L in the play, and the extremely large proportion

of the lines suspected or condemned as not original to Euripides, particularly since the assaults by E. B. England in 1891 and D. L. Page in 1934, make any one critical edition likely to differ markedly from another. Stockert has tackled the seldom definitively soluble problems with thoroughness and candour, and with a general caution which one must respect. Text and apparatus are based upon part-autopsy of MS L, otherwise upon microfilms; the Cologne papyrus was re-examined by a colleague, with a noteworthy discrepancy from Diggle's collation of v. 791. S. cites with approval in his apparatus, but does not print in his text, very many earlier conjectures, and his own are not numerous. I noted 77 *χόλων*; 84 *στρατηγὸν Μενέλεωι μὲν εἰς (πρὸς) χάριν*; after 109 lacuna; 119 *πρὸς* perhaps to be deleted; 151 *ἐξ ὀρμῆς σείει*; 234 *μελιχρὼν ἄδωναν*; 249–51 *κόραν* (for *θεῶν*) . . . *θεόν*; 395 *καλῶς*; 865 *ὄναυτο*; 931 *τά*; 934 *τοσοῦτον οἴκτωι*; 945–6 perhaps to be deleted; 1022–3 deleted; 1207 *μηδαμῶς κατακτάνησις* or *μηδαμῶς σύ γε κτάνησις*; after 1089 lacuna suspected; 1361 *ἔρ' ὄντος*; 1391 *ἄρ' ἔχουσι ἂν <τοῖσδ'> ἐν ἀντειπεῖν ἔπος*; and there are revised colometries at e.g. 1054–7, 1060–1, 1296–1300 (the first two correspond with OCT). English readers at least may welcome a brief sampling of S.'s choices (put first) against Diggle's, e.g. in the anapaestic prologue 4 *σπεύσεις* Dobree, *σπεῦδε* Porson; 22 *†καὶ τὸ φιλότιμον†* L, *καὶ τὸ πρότιμον* Nauck; 41 *καὶ* L, *κἄκ* Naber (not mentioned by S.); 46 *τότε* L, *πότε* Barnes (not mentioned by S.); 93 Nauck's deletion mentioned, Diggle silent; 149 *ἔξόρμους* Bothe, *†ἔξόρμα†* (but Diggle obelizes as far as 151 *χαλίνους*); 151 *†πάλιν ἔξορμάσις* (attributed to Tr², with *-εις* by L^{ac}, but Diggle records only *ἔξορμάσεις* by L) *χαλίνους†*. In 631–750 S. deletes 633–7 (Bremer); deletes 652 (Dindorf, Jackson); moves 662–4 between 651 and 653 (Jackson); deletes 665 (Wilamowitz, Jackson); suspects 674 (Paley); accepts lacuna (unquantified) after 739 (Günther); deletes 741; but opposes the deletion of 746–8 (Monk) and 749–50 (Hartung); Diggle moves (Porson) 633–4 after 630 and condemns 635–7; condemns 652, moves 662–4 and suspects 674 (all as S.); suspects 674, 675, and 681–93; strongly suspects 694; doubts 721–2; and strongly suspects 723–6, 739, and 740–50.

As well as bibliography, text, and apparatus, Volume 1 contains an introduction of eighty-five pages. S.'s critical appreciation of the play (pp. 3–38) depends almost wholly on determining the nature of Iphigenia's 'sacrifice'; reviewing her characterization against that of all the main figures, he concludes that her decision is free and spontaneous. Briefer sections deal with the rôle of the Chorus and the myth, especially its historical development (pp. 39–62). Discussion of the transmitted text (pp. 63–87) concentrates on the prologue(s)—the anapaestic vv. 1–48 and 117–62 are deemed perhaps authentic, the iambic trimeters of vv. 49–116 almost certainly a theatre-man's interpolation—and on the exodos, judged a heavily corrupt version of one written by the younger Euripides (S. declines West's argument that 1578–1629 are Byzantine).

Volume 2 has the commentary (about 150,000 words in about 500 pages) and ten pages of useful indexes. The commentary is arranged in today's usual manner, by episode and stasimon, with analyses of component *Bauformen*, scenes, speeches, lyric metres, and so on. There is nevertheless a heavy emphasis on textual criticism and illustration of idiom and style. The literature cited (as in the introduction) is almost exhaustive and the comparative material adduced amazingly full and well chosen; these qualities give the work a traditional solidity, and earn its status as the 'reference commentary' for the play.

The printing is handsome and commendably accurate. Purchasers are, however, warned: the review copy included one defective signature, eight of its pages being blank.

I apologize to author and to our editors for the lateness of this notice: a mixture of misunderstanding and sloth, both mine.

Oxford

CHRISTOPHER COLLARD

S. HALLIWELL: *Aristophanes: Birds, Lysistrata, Assembly-Women, Wealth. A New Translation with Introduction and Notes*. Pp. lxxxii + 297. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Cased, £45 (Paper, £6.99). ISBN: 0-19-814993-X.

This is the first volume of three which will eventually cover all Ar.'s surviving plays and selected fragments. It is aimed primarily at students 'in both schools and universities' (preface)—who will doubtless buy it in paperback, at one-sixth the price.

H.'s translation is in verse. Ar.'s dialogue trimeters are rendered into a blank verse that admits

trissyllabic feet fairly freely, while iambic ‘fourteeners’ are used for almost all his ‘recitative’ tetrameters; in lyrics, no attempt is generally made to reproduce the original rhythms (though strophic responson is retained), and iambic and trochaic movements predominate. Ar. is thus made to seem much more rhythmically homogeneous than he is; but any translation of him must be a compromise, and M. Neuburg (see *CR* 42 [1992], 432) has shown where metrical purism can lead. The translation is accurate enough to be usable for any academic or educational purpose for which the use of translations is acceptable at all.

Annotation is light—about ten notes per 100 lines, few exceeding 50–60 words, plus an index of proper names; the notes are almost all purely explanatory, not seeking to be controversial. Occasionally friction between translation and original makes a note inadvertently misleading, as when readers are told, on *Wealth* 267, that ‘circumcised . . . sometimes denotes an erection’.

Scholars knowing the contesting and contested views H. does hold on Aristophanic comedy will seek them in his introductions (both to the series as a whole and to individual plays), nor will they be disappointed. Some of H.’s underlying assumptions surface more clearly here than in his other writings, and readers acquainted with twentieth-century politics may be surprised to learn that if a proposal for political action is ‘thoroughly sentimental’ (p. 93), is based on distorted history (p. 92), disregards ‘the reality of military campaigns and the complexities of political negotiations’ (p. 83), or contradicts the slogans by which its proponent obtained power (p. 153), that is evidence that its public is not expected to take it seriously. One could easily prove, by similar (indeed, largely identical) arguments, that the amusing and touching 1996 film *Brassed Off* could not possibly have been designed to arouse indignation in its audiences against closures of coal mines. But this debate will continue; in all other respects the introductions have much to offer to readers well beyond H.’s target audience. He strives to set Ar.’s work in its social, historical, and literary context, and to define its character as drama and performance, stressing particularly its ‘combination of imaginative fluidity with technical formality’ (p. xxii), and valuably deepening and nuancing Dover’s concepts of ‘discontinuity of characterization’ and of the self-assertive comic hero (‘these characters are, or aspire to be, “saviours” as often as they are egotists’, p. xxviii). In his description of the performance space (pp. liv–lvi), H.’s is among the first non-specialist accounts to give prominence (though only with a ‘possibly’) to the Gebhard–Pöhlmann theory of a rectilinear orchestra (though a circular dithyrambic chorus of fifty could never have performed in an orchestra 20 m × 8 m); and he gives an unusually detailed treatment of Aristophanes’ *Nachleben*, especially in the English-speaking world (how badly this is needed is well shown by the strongly continental orientation of the associated bibliography).

The introductions to individual plays are interpretative essays of 10–14 pages. The presentation of Peisetairos as taking wing and soaring to heaven ‘in order to realize urges which remain . . . all too (back) down to earth’ (p. 13)—to obtain power, food, and sex—might well have been linked with the chorus’s demonstration of the utility of wings for just these purposes (*Birds* 785–800) directly before the first entry of the newly feathered Peisetairos. The well-known inconsistencies in the plot of *Lysistrata* are convincingly explained on grounds of dramatic expediency. H. stresses the mixture of continuity and change in *Ekklesiazousai* and *Wealth*, particularly noting the increasing rôle of characters who are relatively realistic social types rather than fantastic or satiric creations and ‘vaguely urban’ (p. 151) rather than proudly rural; the agon of *Wealth*, often seen as contradicting the apparent message of the rest of the play, is persuasively interpreted as a confrontation between Chremylos and ‘a reflection of his own psychology’ (p. 209) which ends with his ‘banishing any fear of the moral degeneration that abundant wealth might bring’. H. is sometimes vague on the plays’ background in current events. One would never guess from his presentation that a few weeks after *Lysistrata* was produced, no politician was able to articulate any ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας for Athens unless she could secure Persian support (Thuc. 8.53.2–3); and contemporary references in *Ekkl.* point fairly strongly to a production in 391 rather than 393 or 392 (see most recently MacDowell, *Aristophanes and Athens* [Oxford, 1995], pp. 302–3).

H.’s select bibliography (in English only) is an excellent guide for those wishing to study Ar. more deeply than the plan of this series allows—though a future edition might perhaps suggest more that they could read on individual plays; only three items are listed specifically on *Birds* (for the first of these substitute now G. W. Dobrov [ed.], *The City as Comedy* [Chapel Hill, 1997], pp. 1–148).

University of Nottingham

ALAN H. SOMMERSTEIN

D. R. SLAVITT, P. BOVIE (trans.): *Menander, The Grouch, Desperately Seeking Justice, Closely Cropped Locks, The Girl from Samos, The Shield*. Pp. xii + 275. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998. Cased, £38 (Paper, £14.95). ISBN: 0-8122-3415-4 (0-8122-1626-1 pbk).

There are many ways of translating Menander, but this is not one of them. The aim of the volume, to produce fresh literary translations, is laudable enough, but the translators have added to this a series of features which seriously compromise the work's overall validity and usefulness. The first of these is the restoration of lost text. All the plays of Menander suffer from some form of textual damage of one form or another. In the case of *Dyskolos* (*The Grouch*) this consists of little more than the absence of some line beginnings and endings or the loss of short passages here and there. At the opposite extreme a play like *Aspis* (*The Shield*) is seriously affected by the virtually total loss of its last two Acts. Restoration of individual damaged lines is not at issue, since the overall context often guarantees contents. The restoration of whole Acts, on the other hand, is a different matter, especially when it is accompanied by the deliberate failure of the translators to indicate where they have inserted their own material. This is hardly honest, since it denies readers the ability to distinguish genuine sections of Menander from the counterfeit, and if readers are not concerned to distinguish, one wonders why they are bothering to read at all, or what they hope to gain from the exercise. In addition to restoring sections of text lost by damage, the translators have also added choral odes. Certainly, the manuscripts indicate that these existed, but we have absolutely no knowledge of their contents, or even if there was a text to be sung at all, so why the additions, and why, if they were deemed necessary, are they absent from *The Grouch* when they are included for the other four plays translated?

My next concern is centred on the intended audience. If this is the general reader, why do we find terms like *hetaira* included in *The Grouch*, with not a word of explanation, while other factors, such as the reason why Pan in the same play is said to be the only character meriting a greeting from Knemon, are surreptitiously smuggled into the text? If a more informed reader is intended, why have the translators made no effort to maintain some parity of line numbering, preferring instead to produce versions significantly longer than the originals, thereby preventing comparison with other translations and commentaries?

Not content with the addition of non-Menandrian material, the translators are also guilty of truncating or omitting outright whole sections of what the manuscripts do preserve. Two instances by way of illustration will suffice. In Act IV of *Epitrepontes* (*Desperately Seeking Justice*) Smikrines tries to persuade his daughter to leave her supposedly errant husband, but fails because of what seems to be a spirited defence of her marriage by the young wife, Pamphile. The text of this defence, albeit fragmentary, was included in the second edition of Sandbach's OCT published in 1990, but one looks in vain for it here. Worse is the deliberate and blatant bowdlerization of a scene in *Dyskolos*. At 889 the slave Getas summons Sikon, the cook, and invites him to take his revenge on Knemon for the earlier treatment he had suffered at the old man's hands. The vocabulary he uses is clearly intended to have obscene overtones, as Sikon's reaction, even more explicitly obscene, makes clear. Yet of this and the lines that follow there is, again, no vestige in the translation, a bizarre omission in this age of White House soap-opera.

Then again, the 'accuracy' of the translations, or perhaps the carelessness of the proofing, at times leaves one gasping in astonishment. For instance, almost at the end of *The Grouch* the cook and slave treat Knemon to some of his own medicine, but at 1183–93 of the translation Knemon is given a speech which clearly makes no dramatic sense, simply because it both omits sections of text and fails totally to signal changes of speaker.

Were there time and space, one could extend the list of shortcomings *ad libitum*; suffice it to observe that there is much here that is misguided, much that is inaccurate, and little that is worth reading.

University of Warwick

STANLEY IRELAND

P. GREEN (trans.): *The Argonautika by Apollonios Rhodios*. Pp. xvi + 474. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1997. Cased, \$60 (Paper, \$13.95). ISBN: 0-520-07686-9 (0-520-07687-7 pbk).

This is a verse translation of the *Argonautica*, accompanied by substantial notes, clear and useful maps, a fuller-than-usual glossary, and an introduction which touches on many of the subjects one would expect to find in such a place. The publishers have had the bright idea of also issuing a paperback without the commentary, at less than one-quarter of the price of the full volume; many readers will be able to identify other volumes which could with profit have been treated in this way.

I quite like the translation in 'the long, loose 5/6-beat stress equivalent developed by Day Lewis and Lattimore' (and on the back cover Jasper Griffin calls it 'crisp, energetic, and masculine'); the most important thing about a translation is that those whose knowledge of the *Argonautica* comes solely through the medium of English should not be seriously misled about the poem's tone, and in this task G. seems to me to have succeeded. Nothing is easier than picking holes in a translation, so here is a bit chosen at random (yes, really):

Tiphys, why comfort me thus in my sorrow? I committed
through my own folly an appalling, irreparable error.
When Pelias made his commandment I should have refused
this quest flat out, on the spot, even if it meant
enduring a pitiless death, torn limb from limb.
But now overwhelming fear and sorrows past bearing
weigh me down: I dread to sail this vessel over
the chilling paths of the sea, dread the moment when we'll
step ashore on dry land. There are enemies everywhere. (2.622–30)

So that all interests are declared, I should probably add that I do regret (but will live with the fact) that G. does not care for my own prose version of the *Argonautica*, though the accusation (p. xv) that I am a 'trot' will come as a surprise to those who know anything of my political views.

The introduction, as G.'s other publications will have led some readers to expect, offers us a much more traditional account of Apollonius' life and context than is now the norm: there really was a quarrel with Callimachus and (*pace* Cameron) epic flourished in the third century etc. etc. Here the beginner will need some gentle guidance through the rhetoric. The 'big idea' of the introduction is the same as that of G.'s recent essay in P. Cartledge et al. (edd.), *Hellenistic Constructs* (Berkeley, 1997), parts of which are here repeated verbatim: for all the Hellenistic technique, the *Weltanschauung* of the *Argonautica* is that of archaic Greek poetry, not of the mythological games of Hellenistic literature. Whether or not one believes G.'s characterization of the change in Greek *mentalité* and the application of this reading to the *Argonautica*—I myself would add more than one caveat—the subject is of fundamental importance for the study of third-century culture, and the prominence which G. has given it in a book which will be used by non-specialists is to be welcomed.

The commentary is a very solid set of notes which are (for the most part) genuinely helpful, if unevenly spread over the work. Some subjects are obviously dear to G.'s heart (e.g. sailing), and others (body odour, snake venom) have aroused his curiosity and are treated at what may seem disproportionate length, but there is much to admire in the information which he has compiled and ordered. He has read widely in the copious recent literature on the *Argonautica*, often gives a very fair run to views which he ultimately rejects, and is almost over-scrupulous in citing other scholars. His clear (and clearly stated) enthusiasm for the poem allows him to nudge readers who do not know it very well towards what will subsequently come to seem important, and all in all the commentary succeeds rather well within its own limited aims. In view of these virtues, it is a pity that G. apparently felt the need to utter a few sad and ritualized grunts (pp. xiii, xiv) against academic literary criticism, an attitude which occasionally resurfaces in the commentary (e.g. the attempted 'humour' at the expense of narratology on p. 217, where the choice of a very soft target gives G.'s game away). Nothing in the book, however, will seem to anyone who has thought seriously about the text and modern reception of the *Argonautica* quite as alarming as the jaunty

declaration that the 'omission of Hermann Fränkel's Oxford Classical text from [the] bibliography is not due to mere carelessness'; there are worse sins than carelessness.

Pembroke College, Cambridge

RICHARD HUNTER

P. KYRIAKOU: *Homeric Hapax Legomena in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius: a Literary Study*. (Palingenesia, 54.) Pp. 276. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1995. DM 124. ISBN: 3-515-06596-2.

Apollonius Rhodius is often considered to refer to contemporary debate about the meaning of particular Homeric words (see, for example, also the discussion by Rengakos). In this monograph, Poulpheria Kyriakou focuses on the connotations of and the atmosphere evoked by Homeric hapax legomena in the *Argonautica*. She rightly acknowledges the essentially subjective and sometimes speculative nature of her research; when a Homeric hapax legomenon is transferred to a new context, it is often extremely difficult to assess which elements from the original context we are meant to apply to the Apollonian passage. Many of the examples in her detailed analysis are extremely interesting and form a valuable addition to the debate on Apollonius' reworking of the Homeric epics. The book contains a useful index of passages and Greek words discussed. It would perhaps have been good if the full Homeric text had been cited more often to make a comparison slightly easier for the reader.

One of the conclusions of K.'s study is that the Apollonian characters tend to display the character traits of the Homeric heroes prominent in the episode from which the hapax legomenon is taken (e.g. p. 181). Some of her examples are more convincing than others. Two of the least persuasive: (i) Jason's use of *μελεδών* in 2.627 (cf. *Od.* 19.517) makes him echo the 'concerns of a worried queen' (p. 124) and 'enhances his anti-heroic image' (p. 126), and this hero therefore 'can very plausibly identify himself with two female characters in an outburst of depression' (p. 126); (ii) in her discussion of *ἐπαμβραδύς* (4.1030 ~ *Od.* 5.48) on p. 160, the suggestion that 'as the Homeric hero has only the thick vegetation of the Phaiakian forest to protect him from the elements and wild predators, Medea, as she herself explicitly says (*Arg.* 4.1058–60), has only the Argonauts to protect her against Aietes' wrathful vengeance' seems somewhat far-fetched.

In the first two chapters, various key episodes of the heroes' voyage are studied: the first chapter considers the nature of heroism in the episodes of the Clashing Rocks and Planctae, Jason's *ἄθλος* in book three, the Talos episode and Libyan episode in book four; the second chapter is entirely devoted to the Hylas episode in the *Argonautica* and Theocritus' *Idyll* 13, and discusses the rôle of Herakles. K. concludes that Apollonius seems to seek more complex effects with his persistent use of hapaxes (p. 120: cf. pp. 232–4), whereas Theocritus, whose use of Homeric hapaxes is more difficult to define and who in this *Idyll* restricts the hapax legomena to the ecphrasis of the spring, uses these rare words to create an ominous atmosphere before the accident itself.

The third chapter analyses the use of hapax legomena in speeches, mostly in the third and fourth books. Here, K. concentrates on the rôle of the reader and the poet's manipulation of the reader's expectations (e.g. p. 122).

In the fourth chapter, Apollonius' 'poetical symbolism' (p. 186) is discussed and his approach is compared with Callimachus' (*Aetia*) and Theocritus' (*Idyll* 7 ~ Philetas, e.g. p. 230). Although Apollonius 'never explicitly broaches the questions of poetics in his epic' (p. 185), K. argues that in the Sirens episode with its contests of singers, and in the visit to the garden of the Hesperides, Apollonius' contribution to contemporary debate about poetry becomes apparent in the form of a rejection of the poetical values expressed in Callimachus' programmatic pieces (pp. 206f.); at the same time, Apollonius would show the superiority of his epic over Homer (cf. p. 205 Orpheus [Apollonius]-Sirens [Homer]: 'It belongs to the past like the old men of Troy who are unable to participate in war and to effect anything'). The discussion in this part of the book is less convincing than in the rest.

The main difficulty seems to lie in the hapax legomena that are used for Homeric similes (cf. p. 13); in these cases, it is even more difficult than usual to decide how far we should take into account the original context surrounding the simile. For example, *λείριον* in 4.902–3, characterizing the Sirens' song, echoes *Il.* 152 (*λειριόεσσαν*), in which the sound made by cicadas is used to describe the voices of the Trojan men. However, I am not sure that as a result we should recognize in the Sirens a 'surreptitious hint of senile prolixity due to the association with the Trojan elders' (p. 197).

Thus, while recognizing the importance of K.'s observations and the value of her persuasive discussion, I think it is only to be expected that one would not always agree with her explanation of the function of a specific Homeric hapax legomenon in the *Argonautica*; inevitably each case should be considered on its own merits. Sometimes the context does not seem to matter, whereas at other times the use of a hapax legomenon undoubtedly adds an extra nuance to the passage.

University of St Andrews

MIRJAM PLANTINGA

K. J. GUTZWILLER: *Poetic Garlands. Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Pp. xiii + 358, 6 tables. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-520-20857-9.

G.'s aim is to establish 'the literary meaning the poems held for ancient readers' by placing them in context—that is, their social context and their context within each author's collection. The most innovative part of the book treats this second aspect, and attempts to use the drier researches of Gow, Cameron, and others on the composition of the Meleagrian and Cephalan collections as material for enhancing literary appreciation of Hellenistic epigrams. In order to make progress in this tangled field, G. has to make many conjectures about the nature of the anthologies used by Meleager to compile his *Garland*. The newly discovered Posidippus collection (if such it is) shows that arrangement by theme was one principle in use at the time, but G. is well aware that there will have been others. She remains sanguine, however, about the possibility of reconstituting sequences of epigrams from collections excerpted by Meleager, and she is willing to use literary criteria to support her hypotheses. Few of these hypotheses seem improbable, but their cumulation can be worrying. For example, G. feels confident enough in her reconstructions to be able to claim that Posidippus' epigram book had a Stoic timbre (*A.P.* 5.134) to contrast with the Epicurean tone of Asclepiades, while Leonidas' poems presented 'a coherent statement of class ideology, based on Cynic principles'. One wishes that the foundations of this *σωρός* of conjectures could be more firmly established. In addition, G. may seem to some readers overimaginative in detecting literary programmes in poems which she hopes were opening or closing epigrams in their authors' collections (*A.P.* 5.134, 6.300, 313, 7.89, 12.50).

G.'s strengths and limitations are the inverse of those of Gow and Page: she is much more stimulating than they in her literary interpretations, but less sensitive to textual difficulties. Many of these poems are corrupt even beyond conjecture; and G., although she is familiar with the problems and usually discusses them in footnotes, often gives the impression (aided by optically fluent translations) that the text which she prints is relatively uncontroversial. An extreme example is to be found on p. 29, where a new Posidippus epigram, quoted in a form which clearly defies metre, grammar, and sense, is translated with little reference to the Greek and discussed as if its text were unproblematic. At times such difficulties can add another layer of uncertainty to G.'s arguments. However, the book contains many interesting readings of individual poems and provides an excellent treatment of the origins and effects of epigrammatic variation on a theme.

Trinity College, Cambridge

N. HOPKINSON

F. L. MÜLLER: *Das Problem der Urkunden bei Thukydides: die Frage der Überlieferungsabsicht durch den Autor*. (Palingenesia, 63.) Pp. 213. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997. Paper, DM 78. ISBN: 3-515-07087-7.

Nine treaty-texts are cited verbatim in our texts of Th.'s history: the question M. addresses is whether they are there because Th. himself intended it, or because an editor inserted them after his death. Since Carl Meyer's *Die Urkunden im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* appeared in 1955, there has been a slight shift away from the 'analytical' approach of earlier scholars (notably Wilamowitz and Schwartz) and towards a 'unitarian' approach which accepts the documents as an integral part of Th.'s narrative strategy. M. grants that Meyer made valid criticisms of earlier scholars, but seeks to re-establish the view that the documents are editorial insertions.

M. devotes almost half of his book to a detailed response to Meyer's arguments. He argues that

passages of the narrative which Meyer saw as presupposing the reader's knowledge of the treaty-texts only presuppose Th.'s knowledge of the texts; and that Meyer's alleged back-references are in fact Th.'s explanations of specific terms, placed when they are required by the reader. He has some success with this approach, but he destroys some subtleties: it is important, for instance, that Lichas at 8.43.3 is precise about the areas of Greece ceded in the earlier treaties between Sparta and Persia, whereas the treaties themselves are vague. M. also follows the analytical approach by arguing that there are places where the documents do not fit in their context: the exact dating by magistrates and local months in a document at 5.19, for instance, is said to undermine Th.'s claim about the advantages of his own dating-system at 5.20—an argument that can be plausibly turned on its head (cf. R. Osborne, quoted by Hornblower, *CT* ii.118). Even if M. were right that the narrative does not require the documents' presence, there remains the counter-argument that Th. might have wanted to include the documents for their own sake. He attempts to meet this with four general arguments—none of them satisfactory. Two of his arguments are familiar: Th.'s habit of paraphrasing 'documentary material' elsewhere in his work (the 'natural' procedure, according to M.) and the alleged incompleteness of the sections in which (almost) all of the documents appear (books 5 and 8). One problem here is that M. does not attempt to justify his impossibly broad use of the term 'documentary material' (he shows no knowledge of Rosalind Thomas's work on written records in Athens). Another problem is that M. does not respond to some important recent defences of books 5 and 8—even though these defences have given the documents a positive rôle. W. R. Connor, for instance, has suggested that the documents in book 5 articulate the move from war to uneasy peace and expose the gap between obligation and actuality, and that the documents in book 8 highlight the theme of enslavement (see his *Thucydides* [Princeton, 1984], pp. 144–7, 218–19—perhaps the most influential recent book on Th., but not mentioned by M.).

M.'s other two arguments are that Th. (in the terms of 1.22) regarded treaty-texts as *λόγοι*, not *ἔργα*, and so would have shunned verbatim citation; and that detail-laden documents do not contribute to the usefulness of Th.'s history because they do not uncover the general beneath the particular (he contrasts here the rôle of the speeches—and even speculates that the treaties are somehow raw material for unwritten speeches [n. 303]). But 1.22 is not an all-embracing methodological statement; its emphasis on the difficulties of recollecting speeches does not apply to treaty-texts; and there are other sections of Th.'s narrative which contain seemingly irrelevant detail (Hornblower, *CT* ii.117, defends the documents as typical of Th.'s concern with [the effect of] accuracy).

So I am not persuaded by M.'s case against Meyer. He tries to answer an unanswerable question about Th.'s intentions by telling a story about the documents as 'Rohmaterial', 'Fremdkörper', which Th. could not possibly have conceived of including. It is possible to tell a more exciting story about the documents' rôle in the reader's construction of meaning and in the work's utility. And it is also possible to relate the documents to other concerns in recent scholarship: the representation of writing in Th. (see D. Steiner, *The Tyrant's Writ* [Princeton, 1994], esp. pp. 65–7 on oaths); the status of Th.'s own work as a written text; and Th.'s alleged pro-Athenian bias in book 1 (Th.'s scattered treatment of the Thirty Years Peace in 446/5—seen by M. as a sign of how he would have treated the other treaties—is central to Chapter 4 of E. Badian's *From Plataea to Potidaea* [Baltimore, 1993]). The documents have also featured in discussions of Th.'s reception by later historians (e.g. Hieronymus) and his relation to other historical traditions (Momigliano suggested that an eastern influence may explain the inclusion of documents). None of these approaches is mentioned in M.'s book (which was itself written partly in the 1960s).

The Queen's College, Oxford

TIM ROOD

P. J. RHODES: *Thucydides, History III* (Classical Texts). Pp. xiv + 273. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1994. Paper, £14.95.

Rhodes has written a valuable work on Thucydides Book Three to accompany his commentary on Book Two in the same series; a third up to 5.24 and the peace of Nicias is proposed. The format is standard; the introduction largely repeated from the earlier commentary; the translation fluent rather than literal.

The commentary eschews controversy on the whole, and is concise. R. gives valuable thumbnail sketches of most individuals mentioned in the text, and the illustrations are serviceable enough. Obviously, the appearance of S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides Volume 1 Books*

I–III (Oxford, 1991) has to be taken into account. R. rarely disagrees. On the text he defends the reading *Γραικῆς* at 3.91.3; and suggests after Woodman *ἐν ἔργῳ <καὶ> κάλλει* at 3.17.1. He defends 3.8.1 on Dorieus of Rhodes' Olympic victory against Hornblower's doubts; he is less convinced that 3.19.1 can only mean the first time the eisphora raised as much as 200 talents; at 3.51.2 he dismisses Hornblower's apparent implication that the assembly was not consulted about Nicias' attack on Minoa, and a more psychological comment on 3.59.3 (Hornblower: 'the forgetfulness of panic', R. 'simply closing a ring'); at 3.87.3 R. claims more confidence in the numbers of hoplites and cavalry who died in the plague than Hornblower; and at 3.104.1, R. believes that *δῆ* expresses a disparagement of Athens' obedience to oracles, rather than this particular oracle. Finally, when Demosthenes and the Acarnanians make a truce at 3.109.2, Hornblower sees this as a clear case of diplomacy unauthorized by the Assembly, but R. believes that Demosthenes is acting not as an Athenian general, but as a commander on the invitation of the Acarnanians.

This is a valuable addition to the series; one can see it aiding comprehension of the text. Nevertheless, the more thematic and detailed introduction, and the useful trailers at the beginning of each section that Rusten uses in his commentary on Thucydides Book Two (Cambridge, 1989), seems to me more helpful to a student, especially one who is using the text to progress in Greek; and R. could have done a little more to enthrone any reader when discussing the Corcyraean stasis and the Mytilenean debate. One last quibble (and not just with R.): Thucydides' influence on later thought both in antiquity and more recently has been of incalculable importance and interest. After all, many of the Greekless readers who will be coming to Thucydides will be coming from a background in Renaissance political thought, or even modern international affairs and political philosophy. For all our sakes, recent commentators, if they are lucky enough to attract general readers in the first place, could all do a little more to engage them before they pass by.

University of St Andrews

CHRISTOPHER SMITH

J. H. SCHREINER: *Hellanicos, Thucydides and the Era of Kimon*. Pp. 135. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1998. Cased, £19.95. ISBN: 87-7288-703-6.

Many historians have been disappointed with Thucydides' brief and chronologically vague account of the Pentecontaetia (1.89–118), but few accuse him of overtly distorting the past. S. has brought this charge against Thucydides, suggesting that he did so to refute Hellanicus' account of this same period in his *Atthis*, which, S. maintains, was more accurate. S. attempts to reconstruct Hellanicus' chronology for the Pentecontaetia in this lost work using ancient writers who report information which supposedly conflicts with Thucydides' account and was taken from Hellanicus' *Atthis*.

S. follows Felix Jacoby's thesis that this work chronicled the history of Athens down to the end of the Peloponnesian War (F. Jacoby, *Atthis: The Chronicles of Ancient Athens* [Oxford, 1949], pp. 68 ff.). According to S., later ancient historians attempted to harmonize Hellanicus' and Thucydides' conflicting accounts of the Pentecontaetia. S. therefore views Hellanicus' *Atthis* as the source of information provided by such writers which appears to contradict Thucydides' report or is not contained within it. He uses these bits of ancient testimony creatively to construct an alternative chronology for the Pentecontaetia. S., for example, reverses Thucydides' order of events for this period. Thucydides (1.100–2) places the battle at the Eurymedon river before the revolt of Thasos from Athens, followed by Cimon's expedition to Ithome and the subsequent alliance between Athens and Argos. S. dates the establishment of this alliance prior to the Thasian revolt and the battle at the Eurymedon after this rebellion was over. S. also maintains that Thucydides omitted reporting a great sea battle between the Persians and Athenians off Cyprus in 460 B.C. and exaggerated the size of the Athenian expedition to Egypt.

S.'s attack on Thucydides' credibility is not convincing. His chronology for the Pentecontaetia and his attribution of it to Hellanicus is not supported by any unequivocal evidence and is based on a number of very questionable assumptions. S.'s date for Cimon's expedition to Ithome, for example, is grounded in his assertion that the mysterious battle of Oenoe occurred in the early 460s, which, in turn, is based on the supposition that the painting depicting this battle in the Stoa Poikile was completed at the time of the original construction of the portico in the 460s. S.'s date cannot be verified by a single ancient source or by existing archaeological evidence. When S. does cite ancient sources to substantiate his views, his interpretation of the text is disputable. For

example, he bases his account of the Athenian expeditions to Cyprus and Egypt on the funeral oration in Plato's *Menexenus* by supposing that the oration's account of Athenian history (241e–242c) is accurate and arranged in strict chronological order. Since historical accuracy is not a characteristic of the funeral oration as a genre, such an assumption is questionable (see N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens* [Cambridge, MA, 1986], pp. 132–45).

There is also no solid evidence that would suggest that S.'s chronology for the Pentecontaetia appeared in Hellanicus' *Atthis*, or that ancient writers consulted this work in their accounts of this period. No known ancient author cited this *Atthis* for information regarding historical events (*FGH Hist* 4 F38–49). The fragments of Hellanicus' *Atthis* and those of his other works primarily report heroic myths and genealogies. Ephorus must have been acquainted with Hellanicus' works since he reportedly pointed out the latter's errors in his own work (*J. Ap.* 1.16). But Ephorus' disagreements with Hellanicus probably concerned *archaiologia* rather than the Pentecontaetia since Ephorus, like Hellanicus, was reportedly an authority in matters pertaining to genealogies and foundation stories (Plb. 9.1.4).

Although S. is unconvincing in his efforts to show that Hellanicus' account of the Pentecontaetia was more accurate than that of Thucydides, his work is not without value. His examination of the differences between Thucydides' and later authors' reports of this era only illustrates these writers' reliance on Thucydides, whose remark regarding the brevity and inaccuracy of Hellanicus' coverage of the Pentecontaetia (1.97.2) is probably an accurate assessment of Hellanicus' *Atthis* and not an example of 'sheer *odium academicum*' (p. 102) as S. suggests.

Johnson City, TN

DAVID L. TOYE

M. C. STOKES: *Plato: Apology* (Classical Texts). Pp. vii + 200. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1997. Cased, £35/\$49.95 (Paper, £14.95/\$24.95). ISBN: 0-85668-371-X (0-85668-372-8 pbk).

Apologies, especially public ones, are becoming very public and politic these days. Heads of state, even whole populations, are being encouraged to offer them to their aboriginal inhabitants. They might take notice of an ancient precedent for a public apology: Michael Stokes has now introduced this one in some detail, translated it faithfully, and provided an excellent commentary. Perhaps one of the most famous apologies of all time, it is one of the oldest recorded, and this latest reproduction in so complete a form is long overdue. It is, of course, no ordinary apology in the modern sense, no regretful acknowledgement of fault, but a spirited defence (to the point of being also an 'attack'), the defence of a remarkable man on trial for his life. It is literally a speaking-back-in-return (*apologia*), a spoken defence or response *from* or *of* [*apo*] someone, or by someone else on their behalf, to a set of accusations brought before a court. The preposition *apo* is sometimes used in compounds as a prefix with intensive force: e.g. to speak out: *apophanai*; to dare or speak outright: *apotelman*; to point out: *apodeiknunai*. Whether this speech was recorded *en autopsin* by Plato and/or (re)constructed later, it remains out of the ordinary and worthy of the close attention that S. gives it. If he seems inclined to believe it largely a work of fiction or 'faction' (cf. 4, 5, 163, and where he argues, for example, that the oracle story is fictitious [pp. 2, 115–16]), he does acknowledge that 'in general [it] shows every sign of being a serious, though provocative defence, "historical" or no' (p. 97).

In response to his subject, S. provides a serious, provocative commentary, a very useful and updated supplement to Burnet's 1924 edition, but with much more detailed philosophical analysis of Socrates' arguments alongside close textual discussion. Unlike Burnet, S. provides an accompanying translation, and despite his disclaimer to any 'literary pretensions', it is very readable as well as literal, and faithful to the Greek syntax. For close study of the original, this version, with parallel Greek, is very useful indeed. It does have some peculiarities, as for example: 'Ariston's son, whose brother Plato over there is' (34a2). This seems unnecessarily odd, and surely deictic *houtesi* can still be translated 'over here'. Not long after, Plato is very much 'here' (*hóde*: 38b6). Yet S. feels 'no necessity to believe' in his actual presence at the trial (p. 5), or to give it any special significance, despite its being a unique occasion in Plato's work. Alongside Plato's reported absence in the *Phaedo*, he suggests the former presence was a 'device for lending verisimilitude to a fictional narrative' and the latter absence was 'perhaps motivated by the need for Plato, if present to say something of philosophical import' (p. 5). Perhaps . . . but then why believe anything he or his characters say? Are there not some good reasons to believe he was

there? Even if not, a speech claiming to speak 'nothing but the truth' (17b8) is surely claiming more than verisimilitude. S. agrees this 'suggests a specially serious and determined respect for the truth' (p. 101), but not that this is any more than verisimilitude. It suggests to me that Plato is signalling we treat his *Apology of Socrates* as particularly concerned with Socrates and the truth. If some tradition and not Plato were the source of this title, that tradition may have good reason for restricting the name 'Socrates' to the title of this one Platonic work. Isn't this very plausibly a portrait of Socrates as Plato wanted him to be understood, and so in an important sense is truthful and accurate?

I wonder also why Socrates' claim that the god seems to be saying he knows or recognizes (*egnôken*: 23b3) 'in truth he is worth nothing in respect to wisdom' is not to be understood as a claim to knowledge, but simply as a claim to having 'realised' (p. 53). Socrates' earlier claim to having 'a sort of wisdom', perhaps 'human wisdom' (20d7-e), underscores the remarkable paradox of his knowledge of ignorance, a wisdom about lack of wisdom, which, as Socrates' distinctive contribution, surely ought not be diluted. Nevertheless, these questions are raised with respect and, I hope, are of the kind S. says he wishes to be raised (p. v). This must be one of the best translations and commentaries to date, and an exceptional work of scholarship. It provides an excellent teaching and research text, and new insight into its original source and provocation.

Murdoch University, Western Australia

MARTIN MCAVOY

F. L. MÜLLER (ed.): *Herodian: Geschichte des Kaisertums nach Marc Aurel: griechisch und deutsch: mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen und Namenindex*. Pp. 359. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. Paper, DM 144. ISBN: 3-515-6862-7.

Following his recent versions of Eutropius and Vegetius (see pp. 272–3 below), M.'s main aim in this edition of Herodian is the provision of an up-to-date German translation, filling the gap in recent modern language versions. In this M. succeeds perfectly well, with the facing-page translation set against the Greek text. This text relies heavily on earlier editions, with apparatus concentrated in six pages (pp. 27–32), listing with short comments divergences from Stavenhagen's 1922 Teubner edition. The introduction gives brief and fairly orthodox coverage of the main issues and controversies, such as H.'s date and status, and his work's perspective and sources; for instance, M. cautiously adopts a conventional view in placing the composition of the history in the reign of Philip, although Decius or even Gallienus have their advocates (see now H. Sidebottom, *Antiquité Classique* 66 [1997], 271–6). The notes provide concise stylistic and historical comments, with supporting ancient and modern references, followed by a useful bibliography of editions, translations, and secondary works, and a Greek name index. None of this pretends to be exhaustive, although a number of interesting supplements to notes and bibliography can be suggested. For instance, H. appears to be confirmed in his assertion that Lucilla was Marcus' eldest (surviving) daughter (1.8.3; A. R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius: A Biography* [London, 1987], p. 247); epigraphy has added to the evidence for the battle of Immae (5.4.6–7; J.-C. Balty, *JRS* 78 [1988], 100, referring to a tombstone of a soldier killed in the battle), and for the disturbances in Alexandria under Caracalla (4.9.4–8; C. Bruun, *Arctos* 29 [1995], 9–27; probably too recent for this edition); and Fergus Millar now gives an excellent discussion of 'Elagabal and Emesa', with his examination of 5.3.2–5 (*The Roman Near East 31 BC–AD 337* [Cambridge, MA and London, 1993], pp. 300–9). However, in providing a usable text and translation of H., M. has done German readers at least a signal service, although English-speakers are hardly likely to abandon Whittaker's fine Loeb set. The appearance of M.'s edition is certainly timely in urging us to consider Herodian afresh, given the publication of three substantial essays on H. in a recent volume of *Aufstieg und Niedergang* (2.34.4 [1998], 2775–952). H. may still disappoint many modern expectations of history, but he surely provided for his Greek audience a historical message and literary style they found congenial.

University College London

SIMON CORCORAN

A. LOPEZ EIRE: *Semblanza de Libanio*. Pp. 302. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1996. ISBN: 968-36-4676-X.

L. E.'s work resembles a collection of papers more closely than a book proper. The eight chapters deal with a variety of themes, with the opening, and by far the longest, eponymous chapter drawing a general picture of Libanius and his world. Substantial passages of Libanius' works are quoted throughout. These quotations are not presented uniformly—some are given only in Greek, others only in translation, and some in both Greek and translation. There seems to be no significant reason for this variation.

L. E. begins his first chapter with a *praeteritio* of which Libanius himself would have been proud, disclaiming the intentions of a biographer. The chapter continues with the insistence that Libanius must be seen within the context of his time and L. E., like his subject, is somewhat defensive about this. Libanius is seen as an idealistic dreamer, nostalgic for a Greek golden past which he attempts to relive, and intensely worried about the effects of the rise of Latin on what is left of his dream-world (a modern parallel might be a certain type of French intellectual). L. E. sees rhetoric and the *paideia* it inculcated as the key to understanding Libanius' intellectual life, 'what religion was for the Christians, Rhetoric was for Libanius' (p. 41). In a chapter on Homeric quotations in the orator's work, L. E. amplifies this view by suggesting that Libanius' frequent use of Homer—one in twenty of his letters contains an Homeric citation, the overwhelming majority of which are from the *Iliad*—not only takes his audience back to the orator's beloved heroic past, but also invites them to see orators as their age's new heroes in a world where rhetoric has taken the place of arms. Given Libanius' approach to the world, it is unsurprising that he was an admirer of the Emperor Julian, with whose outlook he had much in common. L. E., when discussing Libanius' defence of Antioch to the enraged emperor, comments rightly, 'In what world are we living, that of Julian and Libanius, or that of Achilles and Phoenix? The truth is, in a little of both.'

Libanius' nostalgia also makes it easy to understand both his love of Athens and, although his hometown was not part of the golden Greek past, his intense loyalty to Antioch. One area L. E. could have explored more here is Libanius' contrasting hatred of Constantinople. Was idealism out of place in the city which was at the heart of contemporary politics? Certainly another contemporary orator, John Chrysostom, found it so. Another problem is Libanius' relationship with the aggressively Christian Emperor Theodosius the Great. L. E. devotes a chapter to Libanius' hostility to Christianity where, following Peter Brown, rhetoric and *paideia* are presented as opposing the 'barbarian theosophy' of Christianity. Given their very different ideological views, one might have expected the two to be bitter enemies, yet L. E. believes that Libanius was more comfortable under Theodosius than at any time since the death of Julian the Apostate. He then, however, disappoints by noting this striking fact, but not explaining it. His chapter on Libanius' correspondence with Theodosius swerves away from this issue. Again a convincing picture is painted of a nostalgic Libanius who wishes to be seen as a defender of his community.

The speeches L. E. draws on, notably the *De Victis*, depict a harrowing picture of misrule at the provincial level with the emperor too distant to provide remedies; L. E. insists that the examples drawn upon are not cast as stock scenes but constructed with a powerful social realism. Again according to L. E. nostalgia is to the fore in Libanius' approach to the problem, with the orator playing the new Demosthenes to the corrupt governors' Philip. The general picture drawn is impressive but a little more exploration of possible underlying themes and problems would have been welcome. Is Libanius' criticism of the imperial system a veiled criticism of Christianity itself, particularly as many of the governors would have been Christian? Is Libanius' defence of the needy, for example his discussion of the *angaria*, a deliberate attempt to hoist Christianity on its own petard and to assert that pagans too care for the poor? L. E. seems to accept this concern for the entire community uncritically, but Libanius' own hostility to the regulation of corn prices at Antioch, a measure which would precisely aid the poorest in the city, claiming that a little suffering is worth independence, suggests that we should look more carefully at Libanius' vision of communal life.

L. E.'s objective was to provide an overview of Libanius and his world, in which he succeeds. There are of course questions which need further exploration, but this volume could provide a starting point from which to begin.

University of Keele

A. T. FEAR

G. MAKRIS (ed.): *Ignatios Diakonos und die Vita des Hl. Gregorios Dekapolites*. (Byzantinisches Archiv, 17.) Pp. 256. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1997. Cased, DM 124. ISBN: 3-8145-7740-9.

M.'s Cologne *Habilitationsschrift* provides a useful annotated edition of one of the more literary hagiographies of the ninth century, and is complemented by M. Chronz's reliable German translation of a text which can be obscure. The detailed introduction discusses Ignatius and his varied works: M. opts for a later chronology (c. 795–870) than argued by C. Mango, *The Correspondence of Ignatios the Deacon* (Washington, 1997), and credits him with the epigrams by Ignatius, *μαγίστωρ τῶν γραμματικῶν*, on the church of the Virgin of the Source (*Anth. Pal.* 1.109–44). The evidence is inconclusive, but Mango is probably correct to distinguish the two Ignatii. M. then examines the *Life*, elucidating its anti-iconoclast and anti-Studite tendencies, as well as the less interesting person of the honorand, and carefully scrutinizes the manuscript tradition. Establishment of a sound text is M.'s major achievement; identification of literary parallels and the discussion of style and language are also useful, especially since these are supported by good indices. The occasional historical references, for which this *Life* has usually been quarried, appear in their broader literary and hagiographical context: Gregory did things which interest historians of the ninth century, for example travel to Rome and contemplate visiting Slavs in the Balkans, probably Macedonia, but Ignatius provides little detailed information. Two good publications on Ignatius within a year represent a major upturn of interest; an English translation of his four hagiographies (George of Amastris, the Patriarchs Tarasius and Nicephorus, Gregory the Decapolite) would make a good volume for the Liverpool *Translated Texts for Historians* series.

University of Warwick

MICHAEL WHITBY

P. V. CACCIATORE (ed.): *Toma Magistro, La Regalità*. Pp. 105. Naples: M. D'Auria, 1997. ISBN: 88-7092-138-7.

More than any other ancient or Byzantine 'mirror of princes', the treatise on kingship, *Περὶ βασιλείας*, of the fourteenth-century Thessalonican rhetor Thomas Magistros has suffered from scholarly impatience with what a recent survey of Byzantine political thought has termed 'the archaising rhetoric that makes these works so unoriginal'. 'These works' were not routine literary productions, unlike imperial encomia. So when a Byzantine author tells an unnamed emperor—probably Andronikos II—that he is not going to deliver yet another encomium, because the ruler has become corrupted by too much praise, we pay attention. When he goes on to criticize a whole range of long-standing governmental practices—*inter alia*, the sale of offices, the use of mercenaries, the confiscation of treasure trove and intestate legacies—we have to concede that this is no mere repetition of toothless topoi. And when, besides recommending that the earthly monarch conform to the divine archetype, the author casts the emperor as a *demagogos* and tells him to be approachably *demotikos*, we suspect that the 'archaising rhetoric' of the ancient *polis* was more than an ornamental incongruity.

The new edition from the *textus unicus* (Vat. gr. 714) dispenses with the need to read the small, erratic print of the *Patrologia Graeca*. Beyond that, however, the thrill and the hard work of discovery still await the explorer. The Italian summary following the text is hardly more user-friendly than Migne's parallel Latin translation. The nine-page general introduction has virtually nothing to say about the author and the context of the work, and the historical significance of its critique is only vaguely touched upon. Some homework has been done on the philological side: the work is related to earlier examples of the genre, language and style are briefly analysed, and an apparatus is provided. But the introduction and apparatus curiously lack all citation of Aelius Aristides, whom Thomas imitated so thoroughly in two other compositions that their authorship was in doubt. Here the edition reveals its most serious limitation—the total failure to relate the *Περὶ βασιλείας* to other writings by the same author, notably his *Περὶ πολιτείας*, on the duties of subjects, which explicitly forms a companion piece. In every sense, this edition is a job half done.

University of St Andrews

PAUL MAGDALINO

F. ADORNO (ed.): *Papiri Filosofici. Miscellanea di Studi I* (Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere 'La Colombaria'). Pp. 153. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 88-222-4543-1.

Italy is the centre of the splendid efforts now being made to assemble and re-edit those papyrus texts of most interest to the philosopher: principally through the *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici*. The present volume is largely a by-product of those efforts, and contains no special linking thread. The texts discussed inevitably have an appearance of uneven value, yet small and seemingly inglorious finds may make a considerable contribution to our understanding of much broader topics. Until historians of philosophy have the opportunity to consider a good modern edition of papyrus finds, they cannot adequately assess their worth.

Here we are presented with six studies. In descending order of length these are Martina Richter's 'Zwei neue philosophische Papyri: P.Heid. Inv. G 1108 und 1109' (54 pages, 4 photographic plates), J. Frösén and R. Westman's 'Quatro Papiri Schubart' (42 + 3), M. S. Funghi and A. Roselli's 'Sul Papiro Petrie 49E attribuito al "De Pietate" di Teofrasto. Riedizione di PLitLond 159A-B' (22 + 2), C. Pernigotti's 'Appunti per una nuova edizione dei Monistici di Menandro' (14), F. Vendruscolo's 'Note testuali al papiro di Ai-Khanum' (7), and D. Sedley's 'A New Reading in the Anonymus [sic] "Theaetetus" Commentary (PBerol. 9782 Fragment D)' (6). There are additionally nine pages of photographs. I comment on four contributions without implying that the others are less significant.

Frösén and Westman tackle PSchubart 35, 37, 38, and 39, published previously by Schubart in 1950. The content is in all cases educated discussion on a topic of wide potential interest, *philosophic* in the broader sense. The first is a seventeen-line fragment discussion of kingship which mentions Alexander the Great and a Dareius (whose identity is discussed). Though all lines are truncated at the end, a good proportion (up to twenty-four characters in a line) of lines 6–16 is legible. The second is eight fragments, one with remains of three columns, of a work on the athletic games, and the third nine fragments (of up to three columns) of a treatise dealing with old age. Of this column II of fr. F is most interesting for its mention of the attractions of (i) Socrates and (ii) Anacreon in old age, of which it attempts to give a positive picture. The final papyrus of just fourteen lines discusses Hellenistic history, and includes a fragment of Aristo.

Almost inevitably the study of Funghi and Roselli does not lead to confidence in Gortemann's attribution of PLitLond 159A–B to Theophrastus. The papyrus discusses problems (perhaps Empedocles' problems) with the killing of animals, given their kinship with us, and perhaps other cases of alleged impiety. A small improvement in the restoration of 159B col. III might have made it as fascinating as 159A II and III, and established more precisely what the *verso* is discussing.

Martina Richter's study is of a potentially important text of mainstream ethics, dealing with (1108, col. I) pleasures and more especially pains, goods and evils, wisdom, justice and injustice; (col. II) looking after aging fathers, as do storks, and the merits of natural justice; 1109, col. II, which has some claims to be related, treats a philosophic school which demands complete adherence from its pupils, thus bringing immunity from dialectical and Megarian onslaughts. I suspected that the line-length in 1108, col. I, had been underestimated, being tempted to restore at 16–23:

παρὰ πλεῖ-
στον ἀ]ψτοῖς ἀντιλέγουσιν, καὶ πρὸς
τοὺς ἀ]ποδεικνύειν οἰομένους ὡς
οὐκ ἔστ]ιν ὁ πόνος κακόν (οὐ γὰρ τοῦτο
ἀν εἶ]πες): οἱ αὐτοὶ δὲ πείνα[ς δίδου]σιν
ὡς οὐκ] ἔστιν τοιοῦτος ὁ πόνος οἶον
ἢ ἄλλη ὁ]δύνη· τουτ[ο]ῖς γὰρ παρὰ [φύσιν
γενέσ]θαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἄλλα [

In col. II, where storks are prominent, I should prefer to Richter's]οι ὀζονται τοῦτ' εἰν[αι τὸ
θη-]ρίον τοῦτο εἰ δίκαιον something like μαρτύ-]ριον τοῦ πᾶσι δίκαιον (οἱ τοῦ τισὶ
δίκαιον). One needs a statement about how some regard the stork's alleged care of its father as
proof that caring for fathers is naturally just. This might be followed by καὶ τ[ὸ μὴ πα-]τέρα
τρέφειν γελοῖον ἐστ]ιν ὡς φα-]σιν etc.

I intend to comment further on Sedley's important ideas concerning fr. D of anon. *In Theaetetus* elsewhere. The fragment is now crucial for understanding the commentary's epistemological background. Where Sedley translates his reconstruction of lines 20–3 'and

are reminding us that his preceding words were a summary account of the criterion “by which” . . . , I prefer ‘and what’s been said reminds us to give a summary account of the criterion “by which”’. I would also suggest that this introduces a brief doxography of the criterion ‘by which’.

University of Newcastle, NSW

HAROLD TARRANT

F. BERTINI: *Plauto e dintorni*. (Quadrante, 88.) Pp. viii + 232. Rome: Laterza, 1997. Paper, L. 32,000. ISBN: 88-420-5150-0.

This book consists of eleven of Bertini’s essays on Plautus and his *Fortleben*, published over a period of thirty years. The book is divided into five parts: (1) Plautine bibliography, (2) modern adaptations of *Asinaria* and *Amphitruo*, (3) the theme of the double in Plautus, (4) Plautus in the Middle Ages, and (5) Plautus in the Renaissance. The essays in the fourth and fifth parts are by far the most valuable.

Part 1 is a reprint of B.’s bibliographical survey of Plautine studies in Italy between 1950 and 1970, first published in 1971. After an oversimplified review of mid-twentieth-century German, French, and Anglo-American scholarship, B. argues that the great contribution of Italian scholars in this period was to bring to life Plautus’ personality. The essay has some historical interest, but it is not clear why it deserves inclusion in a collection such as this.

Part 2 begins with a survey of the *Fortleben* of *Asinaria*. K. von Reinhardtstoettner’s standard review of Plautine adaptations (*Plautus: Spätere Bearbeitungen plautinischer Lustspiele* [Leipzig, 1886]) neglects *Asinaria*, so B.’s comprehensive, if sometimes cursory and speculative, study is most useful. The next essay, a similar survey of adaptations of *Amphitruo* since the Renaissance, adds little to the works of L. R. Schero (*TAPhA* 87 [1956], 192–238), C. D. N. Costa (in *Roman Drama*, edd. T. A. Dorey and D. R. Dudley [London, 1965], pp. 87–122), and A. C. Romano (*Latomus* 33 [1974], 874–90).

The two essays of Part 3 present nearly identical arguments on the rôle of the double in *Menaechmi*, *Amphitruo*, and *Bacchides*. Apart from a few *obiter dicta* and a cogent argument that the sisters of *Bacchides* were not identical twins (pp. 115–16), these essays offer nothing original.

Part 4, however, an essay on comedies of the twelfth century, is well worth reading. After a brief discussion of the alleged Plautine adaptations of Vitalis of Blois, B. turns to the fascinating William of Blois, who claimed that his *Alda* was an improvement on a Latin translation of Menander. B. argues persuasively that William’s claim is a lie, inspired in part by Donatus’ comments on the prologue of Terence’s *Eunuch*.

Much of B.’s work in Part 5 is revisionist: he defends an anonymous Italian translation of *Asinaria*, Ercole Bentivoglio’s adaptation of *Mostellaria*, and several Renaissance reworkings of *Menaechmi* against their dismissal by most scholars. He is for the most part successful, demonstrating that these works display more originality and literary merit than has generally been attributed to them. Less persuasive is B.’s attempt, in the only essay original to this collection, to redeem the comedies of Ludovico Dolce. B. also shows how Cornelio Lanci plagiarized the earlier anonymous translation of *Asinaria* and other works in his *Scrocca*.

Several problems plague this otherwise excellent last part of the book. First, even minor editing would have improved the book immensely. Reproducing in book form essays from hard-to-reach sources is all well and good, but the amount of repetition between the separate essays is frustrating. Second, B. sometimes fails to note obvious reminiscences of Roman comedy in the Renaissance adaptations. The parasite’s proposal at the end of the anonymous *Asinaria* that two rival lovers share the prostitute, for example, surely derives from Terence’s *Eunuch* (p. 154); and the metatheatrical joking in the prologue of Dolce’s *Il capitano* is taken right out of the prologue of *Menaechmi* (p. 209). Such failure to note derivations and borrowings vitiates B.’s arguments for the Renaissance playwrights’ originality. Third, B. would have done well to take more note of scholarship outside of Italy. In asserting that *Menaechmi* is little changed from its Greek original (p. 193), for example, B. fails to reckon with the important arguments of E. Stärk (*Die Menaechmi des Plautus und kein griechisches Original* [Tübingen, 1989]). Finally, readers of these essays will often find themselves wishing that B. had asked more questions of these interesting texts. Why, for example, should *Asinaria*, now generally considered one of Plautus’s least successful creations, have been so popular in the Renaissance? B.’s suggestion that the play’s popularity may have resulted from its place near the beginning of an alphabetically arranged manuscript is surely only a partial answer at best (p. 163). B. talks repeatedly of plagiarism, originality, translation,

and adaptation, but gives too little thought to just what these terms meant to the authors of the Renaissance. He alludes only briefly to the intriguing analogy between Renaissance adaptation and that of Plautus himself (p. 185).

All in all, then, a disappointing volume. Nevertheless, perusal of B.'s essays on William of Blois and the Renaissance adapters of Plautus will bring many rewards.

The University of Texas at Austin

TIMOTHY J. MOORE

G. LEE (trans.): *Horace: Odes and Carmen Saeculare, with an English version in the original metres, introduction and notes*. Pp. xxiii + 278. Leeds: Francis Cairns Publications, 1998. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-905205-94-4.

In 1956 J. B. Leishman (*Translating Horace*) translated thirty of Horace's odes into the original metres, and expressed the hope that others might be encouraged to do better. L. has picked up the gauntlet, and performed the same operation for the whole canon of the *Odes* and the *Carmen Saeculare*. The theoretical justification for this hazardous undertaking (persuasively developed by Leishman) is simple: Horace's achievement was to adapt Greek lyric metres to the Latin language, so the translator should make the same adaptation to his own language. Plausible, but is there any hope of success in English? The proof of the pudding must be in the eating.

'If the translator has done his job properly,' says L., '[readers] should be able intuitively to get the feel of the metre of each ode as it comes along.' Quite so. He then proceeds to enumerate a number of his own exceptional usages which ensure that even the informed reader will have extreme difficulty in fitting his prosody to his professed models. Take L.'s 1.1.1: 'Maecenas, the descendant of ancestral kings'. How is the reader to intuit, contrary to normal stress, that the last syllable of 'descendant' is long, and the first of 'ancestral' short? Take his 3.30.16: 'Apollonian bay graciously wreathes my locks', where 'my' is short: Pam Ayres would approve, but would have helped by spelling it 'me'. Between (and after) these two extremes there is scarcely a stanza which escapes at least one deformity of this kind. There are even places where the metre has been deliberately subverted in the interest (apparently: p. xi) of illustrating 'a conflict of metrical ictus and word accent' (e.g. 2.6.4, where the Adonic is rendered 'forever seething', rather than 'seething forever').

In point of accuracy the metres adopted by L. are not the same as Horace's. Part of Horace's adaptation was to insist on a long syllable in some places where the Greeks allowed an *anceps*, and also to impose rigid caesuras. In so doing he transformed the movement, especially of the Alcaic stanza. Driven by the difficulties (including the relative shortage of long syllables) of forcing English into this straitjacket, L. reverts to the Greek practice, thereby sacrificing part of the point of his enterprise.

These faults might be redeemed by a sufficiently consistent and compelling voice, and this is something which L., a very experienced translator of Latin poetry (Propertius, Ovid, Tibullus, Virgil, etc.) might have been expected to achieve. He is indeed capable of rising to the occasion:

Brave men there were before Agamemnon's time,
A multitude, but buried in endless night
They lie unwept and unremembered,
All for the lack of a sacred poet. (4.9.25–8)

And there are touches where the *mot juste* will be appreciated (e.g. 'demobilized' at 3.26.4, 'fluent' at 4.1.40—probably the only word to approach the pun in *volubilis*). But alas, the tyranny of his metre routinely produces such stammering as:

Our soldiers fear the arrows and speedy flight
of Parthians, Parthians chains and Italian hearts-
of-oak, but still it's the unexpected
Death-blow has taken and will take most off. (2.13.17–20)

Nor is the register consistent, nor are the inconsistencies attributable to changes in Horace's

tone. For example, in 2.3 we move from the trendy ‘Death is on standby, Dellius’ to the grandiloquent ‘Rich scion of primordial Inachus / Or poor, of lowest origin, sojourning / In the open . . .’; and in 3.1 we find Necessity drawing lots ‘for VIPs and lowest’, and end up with ‘Wealth that is even more labour-intensive’ (to fit this to the metre consult the exceptions). It is fair to add that L. is more successful with the rarer long-line metres (e.g. *Tu ne quaesieris, Diffugere nives*), than with the Alcaics and Sapphics.

The format is good, with the Latin text facing the translation. There are seventy pages of notes, which disarmingly mention the translator’s additions.

L. says that the book ‘is not aimed at scholars but primarily at lovers of poetry who wish to know what Horace says in his Odes and how he says it’. The *what* is here, but the *how*—the felicitous mastery of a unique medium—is not to be found by torturing English into an approximation of Horace’s metres. And if L. cannot do it, probably no one can. One is left with the conviction that Leishman’s goal is a mirage, a chimaera from which even Pegasus could not rescue the aspiring translator. This book will be of interest to connoisseurs, but the wider public addressed by L. will do better with the recent Oxford Classic (D. West, 1997).

Lincoln’s Inn

COLIN SYDENHAM

G. P. GOULD (ed.): *Manilius Astronomica*. Editio Correctior Editionis Primae (MCMLXXXV) (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana). Pp. xxxvii + 185. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased, DM 84. ISBN: 3-8154-1528-4.

The corrections to the first edition of this standard text can be discerned by their different fount, though why the publisher did not make it easier for us to find them by providing a handy list is a mystery. On your behalf, then, your editor has tried to track them down, and draws your attention to the following changes.

In the bibliography a work of Lucian Müller’s that was accidentally omitted from the previous edition is restored, and the apparatus at 1.75 has been duly tidied up. W. S. Watt’s ‘Maniliana’, *CQ* 44 (1994), 451–7 is of course included, and his emendations indeed account for seven changes to the text.

In the apparatus at 1.849 it is now noted that *tractibus* was Bentley’s emendation.

In the text there are corrections at 1.468 (read *creduntur*) and 2.193 (*hic* was added by Bentley), and alterations at 3.640 (*legit* is now preferred to *regit*) and 4.461 (Bentley’s solution is now preferred to Housman’s, following Watt’s arguments).

Finally there are improvements to the text which also affect the apparatus at 1.344, 355, and 414 (if I am not mistaken, this has generated a misprint in the apparatus, *escurcione* for *esurcione* at 423); 3.97; 4.473 and 686–7; 5.612–3.

King’s College London

ROLAND MAYER

GARETH D. WILLIAMS: *The Curse of Exile: a Study of Ovid’s Ibis*. (Cambridge Philological Society, Supplementary Volume no. 19.) Pp. 146. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 0-906014-18-2.

In this important monograph on Ovid’s difficult and often overlooked elegiac curse-poem the *Ibis*, Williams sets out to demonstrate that ‘any understanding of Ovid’s exile poetry is incomplete without recognition of what the *Ibis* contributes to the overall collection’ (p. 5). W. shows in his survey of previous scholarship that the *Ibis* has primarily generated a learned industry of exegetical investigation into the arcane allusions of the poem’s long catalogue of mythical exempla. W. offers instead a ‘fuller approach to an understanding of the poetics of the *Ibis*’ which involves a ‘radical reassessment on two main fronts’. He argues that the poem is not a slavish replica of Hellenistic prototypes, ‘merely a display of erudition’ (in Housman’s influential formulation), and, secondly, that the ‘*Ibis* plays an integral rôle in creating the “wholeness” of the poetic persona featured so centrally in the exilic corpus’ (p. 5). W. suggests

that the originality of the *Ibis* lies in Ovid's 'contrived display of an irrational psychology erupting in violence' (p. 23).

The first chapter deals with two questions which have been central to the study of the *Ibis*: the extent and the nature of Ovid's debt to Callimachus' poem of the same name and other Hellenistic curse poetry, and the identity of Ibis. W. rightly argues that we would hardly expect Ovid's poem to yield straightforward evidence of its lost Hellenistic precursors and suggests that Ovid's unique declaration of Callimachean imitation at *Ibis* 55–60 is a tactical ploy to support his pose of weakness (pp. 38–40). While the question of literary precedents continues to be of interest (more so than the author admits), W. importantly points us in the direction of considering the *Ibis* in the light of Ovid's own exilic corpus. In an earlier article (*PCPS* 38 (1992), 171–89) W. pointed to interesting exilic precedents for elegiac invective in the *Tristia* (esp. 1.8, 3.11, 4.9, 5.8). The anonymity of the addressees of these poems to enemies and friends surely is also relevant to the question of Ibis' identity.

W. holds that in the complete absence of any extra-poetic evidence we should accept the fictionality of Ibis. He explores the way Ovid uses the figure of Ibis as a literary construct: 'whether or not Ibis existed as a real enemy outside the realms of Ovid's imagination, he exists within the poem as whatever character he plays at any given moment' (p. 63). The question of Ibis' identity, however, no doubt will continue to provoke speculation, as it must have among his original Roman audience (cf. *Ars* 3.538 *multi, quae sit nostra Corinna, rogant*).

The following four chapters explore Ovid's 'artistic portrayal of a deranged psychotic condition' in the *Ibis* (p. 64), especially in the long catalogue of curses (251–638) which displays 'the (literally) maddening effects of *furor* as evidenced in the unrestrained and violent cursing which provokes more of the same and is never gratified' (p. 48). W. argues that this disjointed series of impossibly arcane mythical exempla in single couplets (so irresistible to modern scholarly decoders) is not merely a display of learning, but by its very obscurity is meant to induce consternation and foreboding in its targeted reader (p. 97). His discussion in Chapter Three of the various rôles the persona casts himself in (e.g. Dido, Aeacus, *vates*) is especially interesting. Fruitful comparisons with the *Heroides* and *Tristia* emphasize the portrayal of the psychological necessity of poetic expression and the issue of the function of writing in exile.

While W. asserts that this private fantasy of reprisal belongs solely to the self-delusional poetic persona (p. 67), the strict division between persona and poet proves hard to maintain. In his final chapter W. offers a diagnosis of the melancholic symptoms of Ovid's psychological state in exile and suggests that the *Ibis* can be viewed from the perspective of Ovid's exilic paranoia 'as an entirely self-absorbed effusion whose sole efficacy lies in the exploding of tensions' (p. 125). As elsewhere in the exilic corpus, the question is to what extent Ovid was aware of the ironies of his pose and what, if anything, beyond amply proving his continued poetic powers he expected his exile poetry to achieve.

Even if one does not agree with all of W.'s conclusions, this work marks a major change and progress in approach to the *Ibis*. W. surely succeeds in rescuing the *Ibis* from its relegation to the margins of Ovidian study.

University of Virginia

K. SARA MYERS

L. R. GARCÍA: *La poesía de Prudencio*. Pp. 312. Huelva: Universidad de Huelva; Universidad de Extremadura, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 84-88751-42-7.

García's book, he writes in his preface, was originally intended as a survey of scholarship to serve as an introduction to his translation of the entire Prudentian corpus. When it outgrew the limits of an introduction, he readjusted his horizons to write the present book, a work of synthesis on Prudentius and his poetry, incorporating bibliographical information on modern scholarship. G. explicitly disavows the detailed study of particular questions unless they are essential to the understanding of a poem or of the Prudentian corpus as a whole. For such critical analysis he refers the reader to the works cited in his 'Bibliography'.

This account of the genesis and scope of *La poesía de Prudencio* helps explain its strength and its weaknesses. The work is most valuable as a bibliographical guide. Both the footnotes to the text and the helpfully organized bibliography in the back of the volume allow a reader to get a quick and reliable overview of Prudentian scholarship. G. is thorough in his coverage. I noticed only the odd omission (e.g. I. Opelt, 'Der Christenverfolger bei Prudentius', *Philologus* 111 [1967],

242–57 and, under *Peristephanon* 12, J. Ruyschaert, ‘Prudence l’espagnol, poète des deux basiliques romaines de S. Pierre et de S. Paul’, *RAC* 42 [1968], 267–86). Although the occasional later work is cited, the bibliography essentially does not extend beyond 1992. One problem is that G.’s focus is quite narrow, on works that deal primarily or exclusively with Prudentius. When discussing the description of the catacomb of Hippolytus in *Peristephanon* 11 he makes no reference to Bertonière’s publication of the site, even though it contains a discussion of the relevant passage in Prudentius. Similarly, the reader is referred to Lavarenne’s Prudentius edition for a text of Damasus’ epigram on the saint rather than to an edition of Damasus’ poetry.

G. arranges his work into four chapters, on the life, poetry, poetics, and transmission of Prudentius. Of the four chapters, that on his poetry is by far the largest and presents the most problems. The author devotes all but a few pages of that chapter to a presentation of the content and structure of Prudentius’ work, poem by poem. Much is paraphrase, in the manner of a traditional literary history. My own preference would be to present this material schematically, allowing more space for the issues of interpretation raised by each poem. As it is, the reader cannot get a sense from G.’s account of the major issues of Prudentian scholarship. The footnotes often provide interesting perspectives, but they tend to be only loosely anchored to the text, and topics that cannot easily be keyed to the discussion of content (e.g. Prudentian allegory or the relationship of the poems to works of art) never receive a synthetic treatment. I regret that G. abandoned his original project of a survey of Prudentian scholarship, for which he is excellently qualified. Had he stuck to his plan, he would have avoided the problems of presentation in his main chapter.

Despite G.’s disavowal of detailed analysis, there are two occasions when he allows himself more leeway: a discussion of the seven fragments of Symmachus’ *Relatio* interspersed with Prudentius’ poem in the best manuscripts of book two of the *Contra Symmachum* (pp. 115–18) and an analysis of the rôle of violence in Prudentius’ poetry (pp. 220–4). In the first case he concludes, with all modern editors except Cunningham, that the passages are later additions and should not be included in the text of Prudentius. In discussing violence and the grotesque in Prudentius G. is engaging with a central issue in the scholarship. He reviews a range of opinions but makes no final judgement. In discussing this question, and in his overall evaluation of Prudentius’ poetry (particularly the *Peristephanon*), G. is handicapped by his critical preconceptions. In the case of the *Peristephanon* he recognizes that Prudentius is not striving for historical accuracy but, on the other hand, has no compunction about judging the poems by standards of realism. The detailed descriptions of mutilation and violence in the *Peristephanon* and elsewhere in the Prudentian corpus are ‘hyperrealistic’, while the improbably extended speeches attributed to some of the martyrs are criticized for their unreality. ‘Hypo-’ and ‘hyperrealism’ are two sides of the same coin. Abandon the criterion of realism, and the question looks quite different. Here G. is handicapped by his exclusively literary perspective. An interest in the cultural context, in this case the cult of the saints, might have suggested other criteria of evaluation.

G., then, achieves the limited objectives set forth in his preface. He provides a survey of Prudentius’ poems and a reliable bibliography. To understand the quality of Prudentius’ writing and the critical questions they raise the reader must turn to the scholarship to which G. gives access.

Wesleyan University

MICHAEL ROBERTS

L. NOSARTI (ed.): *Anonimo, l’Alceste di Barcellona. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento*. (Edizione e Saggi Universitari di Filologia Classica, 51.) Pp. lxxvi + 190. Bologna: Pàtron, 1992. Paper, L. 30,000.

Nosari’s edition of the *anonymus Barcinonensis* appeared ten years after the *editio princeps* by Roca-Puig. (For the lateness of this review, the reviewer is entirely to blame.) N.’s bibliography lists eight intervening publications of the complete text, and over forty articles on text and interpretation—testimony both to the rarity of totally new Latin poetic texts, and to the corrupt state of the sole papyrus of this one. N. offers a new text with detailed introduction and commentary. The introduction covers the manuscript, date of composition (N. wisely does not decide between fourth century or an earlier date), ‘artistic personality’ of the author (N. stresses

the rhetorical inclinations and learning of this ‘cultured dilettante’), structure, treatment of the myth, characterization, language and style, prosody, and metre. The text is accompanied by full apparatus, and followed by Italian translation, a detailed commentary, and indices, including *index verborum* (from which I spotted that 86 *ne* is omitted). The commentary deals with everything—textual problems, style, literary affinities—and contains a wealth of useful information and parallels.

In the case of minor poets with a very corrupt manuscript tradition, there is always the problem of when one stops correcting the faulty tradition and starts improving the poet’s own efforts. N. seems to me to err on the conservative side, as, for instance, when arguing for 7–8 ‘Quamuis scire homini sit prospera uita futuri / tormentum sit’ (‘Benché per uomo sapere se sarà prospera la vita futura si tramuti in tormento’), 23–4 ‘et alto / pectore suspirans: “Lacrimarum causa?” requirit’, 32–3 ‘Si lumina poscas, / concedam, gratamque [grateque *Hutchinson*] manum de corpore nostro, / nate, uelis, tribuam’, 78–9 ‘Non tristior atros / aspiciam uultus’. On the other hand, he may be right to defend the papyrus at 13 *maestumque*. He offers over a dozen of his own conjectures in text, apparatus, or commentary. At 98–9 ‘quos rogo ne paruos malis, indigne, nouercae / prodere’ (‘malis, indigne’ N.; ‘mans indigna’ pap.; ‘indigna’ also conjectured independently by Pianezzola) is convincing. The new punctuation proposed for 25–6 deserves consideration: ‘Edocet ille patrem fatorum damna: “Sororum / me rapit, ecce, dies, genitor . . .”’, and 61 *frater* is plausible, as is 85–6 ‘et tu me nomine tantum / ne (me *pap.*) cole’. Several conjectures are new attempts at cruces that are no more persuasive than older ones. Two conjectures introduce an elided monosyllable, 8 ‘<si> atra dies et pallida uitast’, and 62 ‘Bacchum fama refert <T>itanide <de> arte perisse’ (‘Titanide de arte’ N.; ‘Titanide Marte’ Tandoi: ‘itamdearte’ pap.). To ignore other problems with these conjectures, it is surprising, given N.’s usually painstaking attention to things metrical, that he does not discuss the likelihood of such elisions in this poet. As Parsons–Nisbet–Hutchinson, *ZPE* 52 (1983), 31, observe, the poet uses mainly light elision, and elides a long vowel only once (line 119, in N.’s numeration). The only case of a monosyllable being elided in the papyrus is in the corrupt line 72 ‘†me inquit trade inquit† me coniuix trade sepulcris’, where N. prints “‘Me” inquit “trade †inquit†, me, coniuix, trade sepulcris””; but elision of a monosyllable at the beginning of the line is extremely rare in hexameter poetry (cf. J. Soubiran, *L’Élision dans la poésie latine* [Paris, 1966], p. 417), and elision of *me* in direct speech before *inquit* seems exceptionally harsh. At line 72 ‘me, <me> [inquit]’ (Hutchinson, Parsons) should be accepted, and the elisions alone should rule out N.’s two conjectures.

So this is not a definitive edition nor, probably, will there ever be one with such a corrupt text—but the commentary especially will be useful for anyone grappling with this difficult but not untalented author.

University of St Andrews

HARRY M. HINE

W. S. WATT (ed.): *Velleius Paterculus Historiarum Libri Duo* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana). Pp. xv + 103. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998 (corrected reprint of 1st edn, 1988). Cased, DM 49. ISBN: 3-8154-1873-9.

As he explains in a brief note on p. x, Professor Watt has made some changes in the text, and quite a number in the apparatus. Once again, the publisher might have helped those who own the first edition by providing a list of the alterations for ease of reference. I have tried to detect altered typeface, and can draw attention to the following:

(i) Changes to the text (and sometimes therefore to the apparatus) will be found on pp. 11.8 and 26, 14.32, 30.28, 31.29–30, 49.12, 53.3–4, 69.11 and 23, 71.20, 84.25.

(ii) Changes in the apparatus appear at 11.13, 13.4, 29.28, 36.29, 38.4–7, 41.1, 54.8, 56.5, 68.9, 69.30, 70.22.

Of course there may well be others that I have missed.

King’s College London

ROLAND MAYER

© Oxford University Press, 1999

C. CONNORS: *Petronius the Poet: Verse and Literary Tradition in the Satyricon*. Pp. xiv + 166. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £35/\$54.95. ISBN: 0-521-59123-3.

In his recent and admirably concise monograph *The Poems of Petronius* (Atlanta, 1991), Edward Courtney discusses systematically each verse-passage in Petronius' fragmentary novel from a textual and philological viewpoint without, however, providing (or, perhaps, intending to provide) an assessment of the poems as cultural products of their age, a full evaluation of their literary merits and flaws, and (most importantly) an analysis of the narrative function of each poem in its context. It is this gap in Petronian studies that Connors comes to fill with her comprehensive treatment of Petronius as a poet.

C. discusses all the poems in the main body of the *Satyricon* and in the fragments which Müller assumes to belong to this novel. Her smartly produced and carefully proof-read book (the only serious mistake I found was the misattribution of some articles to Shackleton Bailey in the bibliography, p. 159) is effectively divided into four chapters (in fact, each chapter is helpfully presented in smaller sections with useful titles) preceded by an introduction, in which C. sets out clearly her methodological principles (*representation* is here the keyword), explains the structure of her monograph, offers the reader a stimulating preview of the main arguments in each chapter, and discusses the generic affiliations of the *Satyricon* to mime, Menippean satire, and Greek prosimetric fiction in order to trace the debt of Petronius the poet to these genres; she concludes, as one would expect, that 'none of the surviving examples of these forms use verse in the same extended and artistically exciting ways that Petronius does' (p. 19). Chapter 1 is a clever and thorough account of Petronius' fragmenting of celebrated epic models and reshaping them as entertaining fiction (one misses in the discussion Lichas' mention of Priapus in *Sat.* 104.1). Chapter 2 discusses the function of the shorter poems 'in the frame', i.e. the subversive or foreshadowing rôle in the narrative action of the poetic performances of Trimalchio, Eumolpus, and Encolpius ('the poems are often framed in such a way that what is figurative within them is made literal in prose', pp. 50–1); *controlling the frame* is the key-phrase in this section. Finally, Chapters 3 and 4 (by far the most rigorous and valuable contributions in this book) deal with the two longer poems delivered by Eumolpus; the detailed analysis of the *Troiae Halosis* and the *Bellum Civile* in short segments, and their interpretation both in the context of the novel's plot and as cultural artefacts of Neronian Rome are highly rewarding.

This book contains many stimulating and original ideas, which are too numerous to mention here, and should be used in conjunction with Courtney's invaluable commentary. C.'s main contribution to Petronian studies lies in the discussion of the poems as functional rather than decorative parts of the novel. But it is also here that I found several unconvincing arguments, for, in her attempt to demonstrate a connection between *all* the 'poetic performances' and their respective 'frames', C. sometimes goes too far. One example of this tendency is the irritating speculation that the *canticum de Laserpicario mimo* (*Sat.* 35.6), which in fact is not in the text and does not survive anywhere else, is intended by Petronius as an ironical comment on Trimalchio's and Fortunata's childlessness (silphium was an effective anti-fertility drug) (see pp. 53–6); why can we not simply assume that this song from *The Silphium Gatherer*, or even this mime, was popular at the time? Likewise, I remain unconvinced that 'the figure of the saffron-spewing pastry Priapus is . . . an emblem of the *Satyricon*'s refashioning of its epic models' (p. 30), that Trimalchio's house 'offers a profoundly pessimistic view of the human condition' (p. 36), that mime and moralizing are incompatible (p. 73), that there is a deliberate authorial connection between the *Troiae Halosis* and the Milesian Tale of the Pergamene Boy (p. 93), and that Giton is unable to play an epic rôle (p. 37) (see *Sat.* 79.4). But all these are minor points of disagreement.

C.'s translation of ancient texts is admirably careful and her knowledge of the secondary sources really impressive. I warmly recommend this stimulating monograph to students and scholars of Petronius.

University of Glasgow

COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS

Ἰ. Γ. Ταϊφάκος: *Πετρώνιος καὶ Κοραῆς. Κριτικὰ καὶ ἐρμηνευτικὰ σχόλια στὸ κείμενο τῶν Σατυρικῶν*. Pp. 185. Athens: Ἐστία, 1997. ISBN: 960-206-431-5.

Taifakos's interdisciplinary study deals with the hitherto unpublished manuscript 313 (Chios Library) of the learned Greek scholar Adamantios Koraës, who, in the second half of 1790 (this is the date convincingly proposed by T.), compiled a list of seventy-three 'adnotationes' on Petronius' *Satyrice*, using Hadrianides' 1669 edition for sixty-one of his comments and Burman's 1743 edition for twelve of them. Some of these 'adnotationes' are textual emendations on passages which continue to trouble modern editors of this novel, while most of them are, in Koraës's opinion, linguistic parallels from ancient Greek authors (Homer, Hesiod, Aristophanes, the three tragedians, the Hippocratic corpus, Athenaeus, Plutarch, and Lucian are only some of them; Latin authors do not feature as prominently in his notes) and from Greek proverbial expressions of Koraës's time. T. edits the MS with an apparatus criticus and an apparatus fontium (pp. 129–43), and offers a thorough treatment of the historical background in which Koraës worked on Latin texts, and the possible reasons which led him to the study of Petronius' fragmentary novel. There is a good bibliography on both Petronius and Koraës, and an invaluable appendix containing MS 297 (Chios Library), in which Koraës himself sets out clearly in Latin his methodological principles in textual criticism.

This elegantly produced book is an important study for three reasons: it gives reliable information on Koraës as a classical scholar and critic of Latin texts; it provides full documentation of Koraës's study of Petronius' novel and his methods of emending it; and it offers the opportunity to modern textual critics to consider previously unpublished material for the improvement of some corrupt passages of the *Satyrice*. Unfortunately, T.'s otherwise comprehensive study lacks his personal assessment of Koraës's emendations and his own view on the value of the linguistic parallels offered in MS 313. This, however, we are told in the preface (p. 11), will form the content of a forthcoming volume. I am looking forward to this; let this be a hint to all Petronian scholars to brush up their Modern Greek.

University of Glasgow

COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS

F. L. MÜLLER (ed.): *Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus: Abriss des Militärwesens: lateinisch und deutsch: mit Einleitung Erläuterungen und Indices*. Pp. 357. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997. Paper, DM 136. ISBN: 3-515-071178-4.

Müller has seized the chance to revise his unpublished German translation of Vegetius' *Epitoma rei Militaris* in the light of A. Önnorfors's new Teubner text, and printed a text based on the latter, on facing pages with his translation. He has provided an introduction, and more importantly, eighty-six pages of commentary, and substantial indexes and bibliography. As he is unaware of it, M.'s views are independent of my work (*Vegetius: Epitome of Military Science* [Liverpool, 1993, 1996]).

In fact, M. finds that Vegetius was a highly placed, politically motivated patriot, who was writing to recommend military reforms that could, he thought, save his endangered country—in the spirit of a Xenophon or Isocrates. The value of the work is, however, lessened by the modesty of M.'s aims, which are to present to the educated layman an ancient technical handbook *as a work of literature*. To this end he has kept all scientific comment to a minimum, contenting himself largely with a summary of each ancient chapter, and even paraphrasing his own translation. It is disappointing that he has avoided historical comment *per se*, and concentrated on literary analysis without going into matters philological. Even references to other ancient authors are a rarity, and where he does make such reference, as in the chapter on elephants (*Epit.* 3.24), he has knowledge of interesting material. Some valuable observations on Vegetius' rhetorical structures, patterns of thought, and use of hyperbole reward the persevering reader.

There is a lack of serious purpose behind this book. The reliance on the outdated Quellenforschung of D. Schenk (*Klio Beiheft* 22 n.F. 9 [Leipzig, 1930]) does not gel even with M.'s own observations (pp. 24 and 286), while M.'s belief in Vegetius' 'honour' in the context of his source-notices is alarming (pp. 245–6). That he has ignored the subject of the late Roman army in

a work he admits was written for its reform is reprehensible. D. Hoffman's classic *Spätromische Bewegungsheer* (Dusseldorf, 1969) is not in the bibliography. More research into late Roman social and military conditions could have sharpened the translation of *gymnaecia* 'woollen mills', *armatura* 'special drill/martial art', *plumbatae* 'lead-weighted javelins', *ex consulibus* 'ex-consuls', *civitas* 'fortress', *inter alia*. Further, I noted that the author has mistranslated *deinde* in *Epit.* 1.24, where it means 'secondly' in a list of three different standards of fortification, and has misunderstood the sixth battle-order at 3.20. In short, the book has the qualities of a pot-boiler.

Beckenham

N. P. MILNER

H. KÖHLER: *C. Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius: Briefe Buch I: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften, 2. Reihe, 96.) Pp. 350. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1995. Cased, DM 138. ISBN: 3-8253-0242-3.

Sidonius Apollinaris has in the past been a somewhat neglected author but there have been more recent reappraisals of his style (I. Gualandri, *Furtiva Lectio: Studi su Sidonio Apollinare* [Milan, 1979]; M. Roberts, *The Jeweled Style* [Cornell, 1989]) and a major work on his life and times (J. Harries, *Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome* [Oxford, 1994]). His letters are worthy of closer study both for an examination of their rôle in the development of epistolography and for further understanding of his difficult style within the development of later Latin literature. Köhler does not provide a new critical edition of the text as, apart from minor variations, Mohr is followed (*C. Sollii Apollinaris Sidonii*, rec. P. Mohr [Lipsiae, 1895]). Although this translation of Book 1 of the letters is the first to appear in German, two English versions have been available for some time (O. M. Dalton, *The Letters of Sidonius* [Oxford, 1915]; W. B. Anderson, *Sidonius: Poems and Letters* [London, vol. 1 1936, vol. 2 1965]), so the value of K.'s contribution lies chiefly in what she has to say about the contents of Sidonius' material. Commentaries are available on two of his poems (G. Ravenna, *Le Nozze di Polemio: Sidonio Apollinare, Carmina XIV–XV* [Bologna, 1990]; N. Delhey, *Sidonius Apollinaris Carmen 22* [Berlin, 1993]), but K. is the first to provide a full commentary on any of the books of letters. K. notes that Sidonius, owing to his late date, has escaped the notice of critics of epistolography such as P. Cugusi, *Evoluzione e forme dell'epistolografia latina nella tarda repubblica e nei primi due secoli dell'impero* (Roma, 1983), and proposes a similar approach to his in order to examine the themes and sources of the book's eleven letters, which illustrate Sidonius' career in government and the importance of holding office. This is by no means an historical commentary, although historical events are touched on as they arise, and the main point of interest for students of Sidonius is K.'s analysis of his use of language. However, she admits (p. 19) that she is somewhat circumscribed in this task by lack of any concordance (P. G. Christiansen, J. E. Holland, W. J. Dominik, *Concordantia in Sidonii Apollinaris Epistulas* [Hildesheim, 1996], postdates K., although P. G. Christiansen, J. E. Holland, *Concordantia in Sidonii Apollinaris Carmina* [Hildesheim, 1993], does not) and consequently her examination of Sidonius' use of language is limited. K. is not averse to using some of the older studies of Sidonius' use of language, such as E. Baret, *Oeuvres de Sidoine Apollinaire* (Paris, 1879), and M. Mueller, *De Apollinaris Sidonii latinitate* (Halle, 1887); these studies must still be taken into consideration but not without some degree of critical consideration. Baret has some useful points to make on style, but the inaccuracy of some of his translations casts doubt on a great deal of his material. Mueller employs long lists of references to illustrate grammatical and syntactical precepts but closer examination of the examples he cites proves many of them to be inappropriate. He makes no observations on Sidonius' usage, but works from the premise that divergences from Ciceronian usage are erroneous. K.'s commentary is rendered somewhat difficult to use by the lack of any *index verborum* and specific points are often referenced to a complete article, rather than to a particular page number, thus making these difficult to trace. The bibliography is broad but presentation is not always consistent: some full entries appear both in the text and in the bibliography, but some works are fully cited only in a footnote, thus making them difficult to find again. There are also some surprising omissions: Harries (see above) possibly was published too late for inclusion, but J. Drinkwater and H. Elton (edd.), *Fifth Century Gaul: a Crisis of Identity?* (Cambridge, 1992), would have provided valuable references for the background to the trial of Arvandus (*Ep.* 1.7). Even more surprising, given

the nature of the commentary and the limited amount of material on Sidonius' use of language, is the omission of mention of W. H. Semple's extensive and very useful notes ('*Quaestiones Exegeticae Sidonianae*', *Trans. Camb. Phil. Soc.* 6/4 (1930), 1–116). That said, there is much that is useful in K.'s approach; she recognizes the important transitional rôle Sidonius plays and not only investigates his sources but also pursues his influence on later writers.

Royal Holloway, London

L. WATSON

H. FLASHAR (ed.): *Tragödie. Idee und Transformation*. (Colloquium Rauricum, 5.) Pp. xii + 389. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1997. ISBN: 3-519-07415-X.

The aim of the Colloquia Raurica volumes so far published is to illuminate large issues from the perspectives of a group of different disciplines, with classics as the starting point or indeed (as in the present case) the centre. The latest volume focuses on Greek tragedy and its reception. It is based on a conference held in 1995, and contains articles by an interesting collection of German, Swiss, and Austrian scholars, all in German.

The topics are as follows: fate, guilt, and the tragic in Greek tragedy (Arbogast Schmitt); Aristotle's *Poetics* and Greek tragedy (Hellmut Flashar); Seneca's *Medea* as an instance of Greek tragedy Romanized (Eckard Lefèvre); Tasso's *Re Torrismondo* and Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* (Andreas Kablitz); *Medea* in opera (Jens Malte Fischer); Shakespeare and Greek tragedy (Ulrich Suerbaum); the *Merope* dramas of Maffei, Voltaire, and Lessing (Rosmarie Zeller); Lessing and Greek tragedy (Wilfried Barner); Goethe's *Helena* and its Euripidean prototype (Thomas Gelzer); Schiller and Greek tragedy (Joachim Latacz); Grillparzer's *Golden Fleece* trilogy (Gerhard Neumann); Hofmannsthal's *Elektra* (Juliana Vogel); Herakles as tragic hero in and since antiquity (Heinz-Günther Nesselrath); Greek tragedy and the post-colonial African drama of Rotimi and Soyinka (Ulrich Broich); mythology and Greco-Roman tragedy in the former East Germany (Christoph Siegrist); 'director's theatre' ('Regietheater') and Greek tragedy (Günther Erken). There is also a short introduction by the editor, Hellmut Flashar, and a brief epilogue by Ernst-Richard Schwinge. Of the above, several are classicists (Flashar, Gelzer, Latacz, Lefèvre, Nesselrath, Schmitt, Schwinge); two belong to the world of theatre or theatre studies (Erken, Fischer); and the others are specialists in modern literature, German or other.

The premise of the collection, as suggested by the subtitle, is to confront successive 'ideas' and 'transformations' of tragedy. The project is an admirable one, and a classicist can only applaud the given insistence on the centrality of the Greek, or Greco-Roman, to later experience, along with the willingness of established classical scholars like Gelzer, Latacz, and Nesselrath to focus on relationships between the classical and the wide world beyond. That said, it must be admitted that, for a volume that clearly has in its sights something like a comprehensive range, and a volume whose range is indeed impressive, there are some very big omissions, notably Wagner and Racine. More important, opportunities for incisive dialogue have been largely missed. There are some illuminating juxtapositions—notably, I thought, in the chapters by Fischer (on the operatic *Medeas*) and Siegrist (on the DDR)—but many of the papers are not much more than useful, unadventurous surveys. Again, there is a shortage of close discussion of tragic idiom—words or scenic language. Above all, there is very little engagement with tragic theory beyond Aristotle, despite the fact that most of the world's consequential theorizing about tragedy has been German, and that, in particular, most of the world's current 'ideas' of tragedy are, at one point or another, crucially dependent on the theories of Hegel and Nietzsche. It seems odd, to say the least, to find Broich noting the influence of *The Birth of Tragedy* on Wole Soyinka (p. 338), when none of the many learned contributors has anything to say about the 'idea' and/or 'transformation' of tragedy embodied in Nietzsche's book itself.

One last prosaic complaint. As with many 'conference proceedings' and collections of articles, there is no index. This is usually unfortunate and, in the present instance, crazy. Of all the many kinds of learned volumes that need an index, none needs it more than a heterogeneous collection, whose many contributors are dealing with overlapping material, but who are all, presumably, aspiring to speak to each other and to each other's constituencies. Editors and publishers should make a full index—of names, topics, passages discussed—a priority.

King's College London

M. S. SILK

J. L. ACKRILL: *Essays on Plato and Aristotle*. Pp. ix + 231. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Cased, £32.50. ISBN: 0-19-823641-7.

This collection of articles represents the strengths of Oxford ancient philosophy since the war. In an historical introduction Ackrill describes the developments in the subject during the forty years or so when these articles were written. He points to 'ordinary language' philosophy and the institution of the B.Phil. degree at Oxford as the most important impetus behind these developments. 'A graduate,' A. explains, 'who had read Plato or Aristotle for the B.Phil. would go away not having been taught what their "doctrines" were, but having been encouraged to study them as philosophers, to base analysis of their views on close attention to the texts, and to criticize and build on their discussions in clear, precise language without undue deference' (p. 5). It is this approach which has brought ancient philosophy into closer contact with the techniques and concerns of modern philosophy. The introduction attempts to reflect on general developments in ancient philosophy, but perhaps inevitably falls short of exhaustiveness: whilst Aristotle's biology, Hellenistic philosophy, and Neoplatonism receive mention, developments in Platonic studies, such as the increase in the range of dialogues which are now being studied philosophically, are largely ignored.

The virtues of the analytical approach are amply illustrated in this volume. The articles are *exempla* of analysis, rigorous interpretations of key texts that consistently bring important philosophical issues into new and critical light. A. is an expert at the precise incision, which is far from saying that he only does minor surgery. On issues such as the compatibility of Aristotle's statements about the good life (Aristotle on *Eudaimonia*) or the relationship between soul and body (Aristotle's Definitions of *Psuchê*) such detailed analysis is often exactly what has improved our understanding of the larger issues. A. generally sets himself relatively restricted tasks. Thus in 'Plato and the Copula' he aims 'not to give a full interpretation of this difficult and important passage' [*Sophist* 251–9], but to discuss one particular problem. It may be illuminating to contrast this approach with G. E. L. Owen's in 'Plato on Not-Being' (in G. E. L. Owen, *Logic, Science and Dialectic* [London, 1986], pp. 104–37), which not only presents a detailed analysis of the passage as a whole but also gives a more general account of the problem of not-being in Parmenides and Plato. With A. one is more often given a central piece of the puzzle than a whole picture.

Most of these articles are now classics in their own right. They need no summary and it would be futile to attempt a critical reappraisal within the confines of a short review. The volume is given unity by the overlapping thematic concerns of the chapters. Chapter 2 ('Language and Reality in Plato's *Cratylus*') continues the interest of Chapter 1 ('Anamnesis in the *Phaedo*') in Platonic teaching, whilst comments on the problem of naming in Chapter 3 ('Plato on False Belief') tie back with Chapter 2. Chapters 4 and 5 ('*ΣΥΜΠΛΟΚΗ ΕΙΔΩΝ*' and 'Plato and the Copula') in turn share the concern of Chapter 3 with the problem of falsehood. There are similar links between the eight chapters on Aristotle, which range from a discussion of Aristotle's theory of definition, through the masterful 'Aristotle's Distinction between *Energeia* and *Kinêsis*', to four concluding chapters on Aristotle's ethics. The thematic overlap gives the reader a sense of a growing understanding of a set of clearly defined but related issues. This is as well since the introduction does not introduce the articles as such and cross-referencing is limited to the occasional footnote. The most economical of subject indices contains no sub-headings and often offers little more information than can be gleaned from the table of contents (e.g. the entry on '*eudaimonia*' refers us to 179–200, 210–11, where 179–200 are simply the page numbers of 'Aristotle on *Eudaimonia*').

However, my main criticism of this volume would be its failure to relate the articles to subsequent developments in the debate. This raises particular problems in the case of articles published originally over forty years ago (e.g. '*ΣΥΜΠΛΟΚΗ ΕΙΔΩΝ*'). The reader's interest in the reprinting of an article such as 'Plato and the Copula' would have been greatly enhanced if it had been accompanied by some answer to critics of his thesis that *μετέχειν* with the genitive in the *Sophist* corresponds to the copula (e.g. Michael Frede, *Prädikation and Existenzaussage* [Göttingen, 1967], pp. 55–9). In this respect, this volume is a missed opportunity to strengthen the rôle that A.'s articles deserve to continue to play within the contemporary debate.

University of Bristol

T. K. JOHANSEN

J. ALTHOFF: *Warm, Kalt, Flüssig und Fest bei Aristoteles. Die Elementarqualitäten in den zoologischen Schriften.* (Hermes Einzelschriften, 57.) Pp. 311. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1992. Paper, DM 96. ISBN: 3-515-05826-5.

It seems astonishing that this is the first monograph on what, with hindsight, appears to be such an obvious topic. Not only is it obvious, but the elementary qualities—hot, cold, wet, and dry—are also of fundamental importance for Aristotelian biology. In the opening quote A. shows the chemist Justus von Liebig still praising the idea in 1878.

As stated in the title, A. deals with the zoological writings: *de Partibus Animalium*, *de Generatione Animalium*, *de Motu Animalium*, and, briefly, the *Historia Animalium*. However, section II looks at the *Parva Naturalia* as well as the *de Anima*, thus extending the discussion beyond zoology in a narrow sense. Every chapter is followed by a résumé of the research data and there is a general conclusion at the end of the main part as well. These are very useful, as there is no overall big question or project resulting in one answer and it is not easy to keep track of all the detailed observations. Because of its descriptive nature, the volume also defies summarization.

In the introduction, A. describes the origins of element theory among the Ionian natural philosophers, the concept of the elements developing into the four qualities. According to I. Düring, Aristotle's direct predecessor in this field was Philistion of Locri, but a variety of qualities is of course also prominent in the Hippocratic Corpus. (A. refers in particular to *περὶ ἰερῆς νόσου*, *περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου*, *περὶ ἀρχαίης ἡτρικῆς*, and *περὶ σαρκῶν*.) While some variants can be found, the most commonly used adjectives for these qualities before and in Aristotle are: *θερμόν*, *ψυχρόν*, *ὕγρόν*, and *ξηρόν*. The translation of these is not straightforward: apart from 'warm' or 'hot', *θερμόν* can also refer to the ability of a substance to transmit or retain heat, and the terms often rendered as 'wet' and 'dry' are even more ambiguous and multi-layered.

A. provides an outline of *de Generatione et Corruptione* in the introduction, describing it as the search for principles behind the elements. At II 2, Aristotle defines the four qualities, and it is clear from his definition that in this passage he is using *ὕγρόν* and *ξηρόν* in the sense of 'fluid' and 'solid'. The former certainly has a much greater range of meaning than 'wet', as it can be employed as an adjective defining, for example, water, oil, a sponge soaked with liquid, humid substances (such as damp wool), and even solid substances that can be melted (e.g. wax or lead). In many passages the two terms are also used as 'soft' and 'hard'.

In the same work Aristotle divides the qualities into active (hot and cold) and passive (wet and dry) ones. Although the definition of the active qualities in *GC* is schematic and provisional, and not used in the same way in the zoological treatises in general, it is relevant for the latter that both hot and cold can have the same effect, i.e. that of fusing similar things.

The four elements are explained as combinations of two each of the elementary qualities, one quality being dominant in each case: thus fire is dominantly hot, air wet/liquid, earth solid, and water cold. The elements in turn combine to form various homoiomerēs, i.e. substances in which mechanical division, even when repeated *ad infinitum*, always results in the same substance (e.g. metals, rocks, or organic tissues).

Also in the introduction, A. discusses book IV of the *Meteorologica*, which he calls Aristotle's 'chemical treatise' and, with Düring (against Jaeger), considers a genuine Aristotelian work. Like *GC*, *Mete.*, too, distinguishes between active and passive qualities; the effect of the former on the latter is the cause of the coming-to-be and transformation of natural substances, which is opposed by decay. Another parallel between the two works is the focus on the organic sphere; as A. writes, zoology appears to be a theme central to Aristotle's research. There is also a brief discussion of what secondary literature there is on the topic.

What emerges most clearly from the present volume is the presence of contradictions within Aristotle's way of presenting the qualities in different contexts. A. explains this partly from Aristotle's taking over of contradictions in the dogmatic positions of his predecessors and partly from his method of working. Since the writings under discussion, according to A., are not finished treatises but rather first drafts (perhaps lecture notes), they were the object of constant reworking and emendation; given his intellectual flexibility, Aristotle was not afraid to change his mind and correct received opinions according to observable phenomena.

A relatively constant feature is the division into an active and a passive pair of qualities, hot-cold and dry/solid-wet/liquid respectively. The active qualities provide the form, heat in particular being considered a source of energy. However, not even this scheme is rigid; for example, in the *de Sensu* the passive qualities acquire some active functions. The qualities are used

also in the explanation of the emotions, growth, the heart-beat, nutrition, respiration, and procreation. Furthermore, the elements are applied to the animal world as a means of classification.

The main section is followed by a brief excursus on the concept of *pneuma* and its development after Aristotle until the Stoics. The index of quoted passages follows, but there is no general index. This book is not easy to read, but the quality of A.'s scholarly research makes it worth the effort. It should be of great interest to historians of science and students of ancient philosophy, as well as classical philologists.

Cambridge

C. F. SALAZAR

T. IRWIN, G. FINE: *Aristotle: Introductory Readings: Translated with Introduction, Notes and Glossary*. Pp. xviii + 359. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett, 1996. Cased, £27.95 (Paper, £7.95). ISBN: 0-87220-340-9 (0-87220-339-5 pbk).

When teaching the philosophy of Aristotle it is notoriously difficult to know where to start and which texts to assign. Terence Irwin and Gail Fine, both eminent scholars in the field of ancient philosophy, who have taught for many years, offer the newest attempt to provide portions of Aristotle for the non-classicist non-specialist reader. The volume here reviewed is a slimmed down version of the larger *Aristotle: Selections* (Indianapolis, 1995). In *Selections* I. and F. say they created the books in order to provide a less expensive, better translated, and appropriately selected anthology for an introductory course in ancient philosophy. Subject to the following reservations, this book achieves that aim.

The book includes a short introduction, minimal notes, and a glossary. The introduction provides a brief biography, a sketch of Aristotle's works, and a discussion of their order. The final section presupposes too much prior knowledge to be useful to first-time readers. The glossary is also a disappointment. The abundant use of both logical notation and cross-referencing leads to complicated and confusing entries (e.g. 'INTRINSIC', p. 339). The entry for 'MAN' attempts to justify the term as the translation of *ἄνθρωπος* (human being) on the basis of grammatical simplicity (p. 343). This choice requires more explanation, as it is a marked rejection of the current academic consensus on the employment of gender-neutral language. Having said this, the volume's real strength is its new translations, which are, on the whole, very good. Many texts have not been translated for so many years that the student not only has the challenge of interpreting Aristotle, but also that of understanding early twentieth-century British English. By using modern idiom the new translations revivify Aristotle's words.

Some terms are, however, curiously translated. For instance, I. and F. translate *νοῦς* (standardly translated 'intellect' or 'thought') as 'understanding' (e.g. at 428a2f, 424a12), leading them to translate the famous sentence about God in *Metaph.* Lambda 1074b35 as 'its understanding is an understanding of understanding'. Other idiosyncratic choices include 'potentiality' for *δύναμις* in *DA* II where a set of soul functions should more properly be termed 'capacity'. They also opt for 'belief' instead of 'opinion' for *δόξα* (413a30, 428a2f, 1040a1), which results in a troubled translation at 428a22 where *πίστις*, which is more often translated 'belief', occurs alongside *δόξα*. The choice of 'desire' rather than 'love' for *ἔρως* may lead to confusion, since *ἄρεξις* is the Greek word for desire.

As for the choice of selections, a tenth of the selection is devoted to Aristotle's logic (*Cat.*, *Int.*, *Apo.*, *Tops.*), a quarter to his natural philosophy (*Ph.*, *GC*, *DA*, *PA*), another quarter to the *Metaphysics*, and finally 40% to practical philosophy (*EN*, *Pol.*, *Poe.*). The heavy weighting of texts on politics and ethics is something shared with previous anthologies and may be based on the sound premise that these texts are more accessible to a newcomer. Other texts have been selected with great care in order to focus on those topics such as substance, essence, form, matter, causes, principles, and soul which are crucially important to the study of Aristotle. My only substantial criticism of their selection is that the biology, which comprised a fourth of Aristotle's works, is inadequately represented. The omission is part of a long tradition which regards Aristotle's biology as merely empirical (which it is not). It is a shame that the biological treatises were not used in order to provide insights on the topics mentioned above. In general, however, any

teacher who feels disappointment at finding any area underrepresented will be comforted by the fine job this volume does of whetting the appetites of prospective Peripatetics.

St John's College

SOPHIA ELLIOTT

A. MOTTE, J. DENOZ (edd.): *Aristotelica Secunda: Mélanges offerts à Christian Rutten*. Pp. xii + 382. Liège: C.I.P.L., 1996.

The title of this collection of essays in honour of Christian Rutten recalls that he himself had jointly published a Festschrift for his own teacher Marcel De Corte in 1985 with the title *Aristotelica*. The present volume reflects in its variety the wide scholarly interests of Rutten himself, characterized by an Aristotelian Leitmotiv. It is then wholly appropriate that, apart from a short section on Aristotle's relations to his predecessors, the rest of the book should be divided into two sections, one devoted to Aristotle and the second to the Aristotelian tradition with a strong bias towards Neoplatonism, an area to which Rutten himself made notable contributions. An indication of some of the contributions will give a taste of the scope of the collection. L. Bodson and A. Motte both write on Aristotle and Democritus. On Aristotle himself there are contributions on dialectic and syllogism (E. Berti, P. Gochet), on the stylistic unity of the *Categories* (R. Bodéüs), and on judgement in the *Rhetoric* (L. Couloubaritis) and friendship (J. McEvoy). J. Follon interprets *Metaphysics* Δ 7.1017a7–30 on the meanings of 'to be' and B. Colin looks at the ways in which Aristotle distinguishes first philosophy, physics, and mathematics. Apart from J.-P. Benzécri on Theophrastus and D. O'Brien on matter and privation in Plotinus, the emphasis in the second section is on late antiquity and early medieval philosophy. O. Balléraux provides new fragments of Porphyry from Themistius. J. Pépin writes on Augustine, Carlos Steel on Proclus' criticism of Aristotle and the Stoics. The topic of the eternity of the world is dealt with by F. Pironet and E. Évrard. Boethius is not neglected: M. Lambert discusses Aquinas' commentaries on his *De Trinitate* and *De Hebdomadibus*, and A. de Libera the medieval interpretation of the *Categories*. Finally F. Beets compares Roger and Francis Bacon, M.-M. Zemb Aristotle and Kant on categories, and L. Derwa brings us to the present with an examination of the concept of space in Aristotle and modern physics.

University College Dublin

ANDREW SMITH

R. GORDON: *Image and Value in the Graeco-Roman World: Studies in Mithraism and Religious Art* (Collected Studies Series). Pp. xii + 338. Aldershot: Variorum, 1996. £62.50. ISBN: 0-86078-608-0.

Nine of Richard Gordon's essays are presented here: two about religious art in general and seven about aspects of Mithraism. They were originally published between 1972 and 1989, and have been updated with a preface and, at the end, an index and a section of 'Additions and Corrections'. The latter, which is not mentioned in the preface or in any of the essays (which are in exactly their original form), is likely to elude casual readers.

G. sets out his main themes as 'the place of representation in the construction of the religious world as objectively existent', and how meanings and values are connoted or implied by representations (p. viii). It is thus clear that some of the language will be more familiar to art historians than to others; this is especially apparent in no. I, 'The Real and the Imaginary: Production and Religion in the Graeco-Roman World', where G. comments on the difficulty of combining the approaches of art history and history of religion. Art was not intended to represent exact physical reality: in no. II, 'The Moment of Death: Art and the Ritual of Greek Sacrifice', he compares actual sacrifice, full of blood and guts, with the artistic images which showed to the Greeks what sacrifice 'really' was, with the mess removed.

G. sees Mithraism as replicating the structure of Roman society rather than providing an alternative to it. It seems to have been most attractive to soldiers and slaves, people for whom G. notes that submission to authority and the desire for promotion would have been normal. G. examines the nature of the seven grades closely, observing that many members of the cult never reached the highest ones. No. V is mainly a study of the lowest grade, *Corax* (Raven), and the fourth grade, *Leo* (Lion), identifying many structural similarities between the two.

In fact, the cult could only replicate half of Roman society, as women were excluded. In no. III, G. notes Mithraism's apparent lack of rejection of sexuality or family life, but elsewhere (IV p. 70) he claims that Mithras' birth from a rock represents the initiates' desire to escape from the feminine world, and (V p. 43) that the exclusion of women as impure was fundamental to Mithraic self-definition. He does not, and presumably could not, answer the question of what Mithraists thought would happen to their wives in the afterlife while they themselves achieved salvation.

Unlike Christianity and Judaism, Mithraism did not have its own funerary symbolism. Only two funerary inscriptions are certainly of Mithraists (III p. 102); the rest apparently did not choose (or their commemorators did not choose) to have their religious allegiance displayed on their tombs. Mithraea were the places where symbolism took on great importance, and G. discusses some of it in detail, associating it with representation of the cosmos and the journey of the soul. Mithraic art was full of symbols which initiates would understand and others would not (VIII p. 174). Modern scholars, as non-initiates, must struggle to interpret them, and G. offers some fascinating (if sometimes a little far-fetched) ways of doing so.

University of Wales, Lampeter

DAVID NOY

C. VIELLE: *Le Mytho-Cycle Héroïque dans l'aire Indo-Européenne: Correspondances et transformations Helléno-Aryennes*. (Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, 46.) Pp. xvii + 253. Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 90-6831-813-6 (Peeters, Leuven); 2-87723-219-0 (Peeters, France).

Engaging the methods of comparative Indo-European linguistics, this book juxtaposes various ancient Greek poetic traditions celebrating various major heroes—especially Herakles and Achilles—with cognate figures in ancient Indo-Iranian ('Aryan') traditions, especially in the Indic Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana and in the Ossetic *Nart* ('hero') legends, which stem from ancient Scythian lore. The perspectives yielded by V.'s systematic comparisons illuminate the oldest recoverable aspects of the ancient Greek heroic traditions.

At times, V.'s comparative evidence leads to insights that could not have been achieved by looking only at the internal evidence of the myths as we see them attested in the Greek traditions, as in the case of the narratives about Herakles' pursuit of the Hind of Cerynia (pp. 21–4), the wondrous birth of Achilles (pp. 47–61), and the avian metamorphosis of Memnon (pp. 61–70).

At other times, V.'s comparisons help resolve questions that have been left unresolved by the available internal evidence. For example, he has strengthened the case for arguing that the word ἥρωος is indeed related to Ἡρα, and, further, that the name of the hero Ἡρακλῆς is indeed built from a compounding of Ἡρα and κλέος, in the sense of 'he who has the κλέος of Ἡρα' (pp. 15–16; cf. Matris of Thebes, *FGrH* 39 F 2, via Diod. 4.10.1). Particularly striking is the Indic comparative evidence that V. brings to bear (p. 75 n. 16) in examining the etymologies of the names Ὀμηρος and Ἡσίοδος, which can be analysed as compound nouns meaning respectively 'he who fits together' (ὄμο- plus ἄρα- as in ἀραρίσκω) and 'he who emits the voice' (ἦσι- as in ἦμι plus -εῶδος as in ἀδῆ). Both names connote 'l'aspect "artistique" de la performance créative de l'ἀοιδός' (ibid.).

Other salient points of interest include the following:

- (1) The archaism of the Homeric *Hymn to Herakles* (XV) in featuring Herakles as a conflation of the ἄριστος-prototypes represented by Achilles in the *Iliad* and by Odysseus in the *Odyssey* (pp. 12, 86).
- (2) The Indo-European heritage of the Διὸς βουλή theme in its broader application by the *Cypria* and in its narrower application by the *Iliad* (p. 44).
- (3) Indic/Greek parallelisms in the pairing of heroes and gods, where a given pair of god and hero is symbiotic on the level of cult but antagonistic on the level of myth (pp. 57, 142).

There is room for disagreement on specific points, as in the case of V.'s argument (pp. 34, 36) concerning the fourth generation of humankind in the Hesiodic *Works and Days*: according to V., the wording of lines 166–73 subdivides the heroes who died in the Theban and Trojan wars into (1) those who are immortalized after death and (2) those who are left dead. But see the

counter-arguments of L. Koenen, 'Cyclic Destruction in Hesiod and the *Catalogue of Women*', *TAPA* 24 (1994), 1–34, esp. 5 n. 12. A key to the interpretation is the pivotal word *μὲν* in *Works and Days* 166, which can be taken to be parallel to *μὲν* at lines 122, 137, 141, and 161, not to *μὲν* at line 162, *pace* M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978), p. 192. On the 'affirmative' function of *μὲν* (vs. the 'preparatory' function, where *μὲν* anticipates an oncoming *δέ*), see E. J. Bakker, *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse* (Ithaca, 1997), pp. 80–5, esp. p. 81.

Such objections are not meant to detract, however, from the unequivocally positive assessment that this book deserves. V. has given Hellenists a treasurehouse of comparative evidence to supplement the internal evidence of ancient Greek heroic traditions.

Harvard University

GREGORY NAGY

B. ROCHETTE: *Le latin dans le monde grec. Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romain.* (Collection Latomus, 233.) Pp. 423. Brussels: Latomus, Revue d'Études Latines, 1997. ISBN: 2-87031-173-7.

The aim of this work is to illustrate 'l'étroite relation entre les deux cultures [i.e. Latin and Greek], qui finissent par former une sorte de *κοινή* gréco-latine' (p. 345). R. actually does more than this, but the Greco-Romanist model is important throughout. For the most part he does not offer linguistic analysis of language contact, but gives rather a broad overview of Greek and Roman relations through an analysis of Greek attitudes to Latin and an examination of the spread of Latin language and literature in the Greek world.

The introduction contains an interesting explanation of the older, predominantly German, idea of the *Kampf* between Latin and Greek. R. sees this as an inappropriate application of late-nineteenth-century presentations of the battle between Church and State in the travails of German nation-building. We must discard the notion of rivalry and work instead with Dagon's concept of gradual 'mutation' (p. 34). The historical background justifies this. In Chapter 1 R. outlines his interpretation of dual cultures. Greeks and Romans were mutually adoring and Greeks were in favour of Roman rule (pp. 63–83). He underpins this by appeal to Aelius Aristides' *To Rome* (he might have asked whether some flattery of Roman rule in a panegyric delivered before the royal family is not to be expected). With regard to the Second Sophistic, of which Aristides is a part, R. remarks that it 'concrétisait sur le plan culturel et intellectuel une étroite collaboration' between Greece and Rome (pp. 73ff., 339). It would have been fully germane to his subject to think about the implications of linguistic purism (Atticism)—crucial to the Second Sophistic, but hardly mentioned by him—for the reception of Latin in the East. The practical result of what is a rather poor understanding of cultural relations in the High Empire is that R. remains somewhat puzzled by the 'défenseurs acharnés de la spécificité de l'hellénisme' in the fourth century, Libanius, Julian, and also the Cappadocian Fathers with their disdain for the imperial tongue. One might in fact argue for more of a continuity in Greek attitudes—though there is the enormous question (not broached by R.) of what a Greek is.

In the remaining parts of Chapter 1 R. surveys official use of Latin from the Republic to Justinian. Parts of this are valuable. The effect of the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, the growth of influence of Latin following the extension of Roman law, especially the fascinating evidence from Egyptian papyri for the way Latin is used in official documents. The reforms of Diocletian on the structure of judicial discourse, reinforced by Constantine, are also investigated. They coincide with a decline in bilingualism in the West.

In Chapter 2 R. looks at the evidence for the teaching of Latin in the eastern provinces. He contends that there was no formal higher teaching of Latin in eastern cities until the third century. The section (pp. 177ff.) on elementary education is good. Here R. assembles the evidence for alphabets and glossaries used in some way for language instruction, mostly by Greek-speakers from the third century onwards. This is followed by an interesting discussion of glosses and translations for Virgil and Cicero, and finally an equally interesting account of exchanges of alphabets and writing practices (pp. 198–208).

Chapter 3 is a list of literary Greeks who knew Latin. The blanket insistence that Greeks only learnt Latin in western centres before the third century is hard to believe. R. pursues his belief in a happy *oikoumene*, describing, for example, the historians Appian, Cassius Dio, and Herodian as

expressing a 'parti pris pour l'impérialisme' (p. 255). Nor is he too subtle on Roman views of Latin's relations with Greek: if Greek grammarians at Rome with their Roman patrons in the first century B.C. and A.D. argued for close links between Latin and Greek, this does not mean Greeks could or would share in the Roman ideology of *utraque lingua* (p. 229; cf. pp. 43–5, 120), an important area which R. might have examined with profit.

In the final chapter R. studies the diffusion of Latin literature in the Greek world. Leaving aside some acknowledged speculation on literary echoes, there are further interesting remarks on the translations of Virgil in papyri and on the Greek version of the Fourth Eclogue.

In sum this is a worthwhile book, especially for its information and bibliography. It does not supersede Kaimio's *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Helsinki, 1979).

University of Warwick

SIMON SWAIN

M. BETTALLI: *I mercenari nel mondo greco I: dalle origini alla fine del V sec. a. C.* (Studi e testi di storia antica, 5.) Pp. 176, 4 maps. Pisa: ETS, 1995. Paper, L. 30,000. ISBN: 88-7741-882-6.

This is the first volume of a history of Greek mercenaries from their origins to the end of the fourth century B.C. The only comparable study in terms of aims and scope is H. W. Parke's *Greek Mercenary Soldiers, from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Ipsus* (Oxford, 1933), which, as B. notes (p. 9), covered the same period in a mere nineteen pages. Inevitably there is considerable overlap between the two, but B. takes a more critical line with some of the literary sources and devotes much more space to the pre-fifth century material than Parke. He is also able to consider evidence not available to Parke (e.g. pp. 36–8, 82–3, 127–30).

The book begins with a brief introduction, which considers the social and political context of Greek mercenary activity and outlines the main areas of investigation. B. justifies his choice of the end of the Peloponnesian war as a terminal date because it marks a watershed in Greek mercenary service, between the aristocratic style of the archaic and fifth-century mercenary groups and the masses recruited in the fourth century. In a short prologue B. surveys the largely inconclusive Egyptian and Mycenaean sources for the second millennium and considers the lack of mercenaries in Homer. The rest of the book is divided into two parts: five chapters on the Archaic period (pp. 43–111) and two on the fifth century (pp. 115–47). There are sketch maps which allow the reader to locate all the places mentioned in the book. However, apart from the cover, featuring a detail from an Athenian red-figure vase showing a peltast, there are no other illustrations, which does rather blunt the edge of some of B.'s discussion of the archaeological material from the Archaic period (e.g. pp. 44–6). The index of sources is very full, distinguishing between main text and notes. In addition to the index of ancient names and important subjects, there is a separate index of modern scholars and a prosopography of mercenaries and presumed mercenaries, which contains only a very brief statement on each individual, plus page references which duplicate those in the main index. A minor criticism is that while B. quotes a useful amount of the written evidence, focusing on short, key passages, he tends not to offer translations of the more obscure items, which must leave the Greekless reader uncertain as to the content of some of the passages under consideration.

The principal argument of the book is that early Greek mercenaries usually operated as individuals or in relatively small groups. B. characterizes most of them as a type of gentleman adventurer whose heroic ideals and pursuit of glory, wealth, women, wine, and enhanced status are best exemplified by Archilochos and Odysseus' Cretan *alter ego*, the son of Kastor. Even for the period of the Peloponnesian War he emphasizes aristocratic leaders like Aristeus, the son of Adeimantos (Thuc. 1.60), who are presumed to be drawing on 'friends' and 'clients' to provide many of their followers. This model seems less convincing when the numbers involved are thousands rather than hundreds, as in Sicily at the start of the fifth century (pp. 92–9). B. has little to say on the motivations of larger mercenary groups, beyond accepting that there was a greater economic imperative for many Arcadians and Cretans than for individuals like Archilochos. Perhaps the watershed mentioned above was less definitive than B. suggests?

B. displays a sure touch when dealing with the wide range of sources for the Archaic and early Classical periods. In the complex area of Near Eastern history, where he is necessarily reliant upon other specialists for much of the interpretation, he has read widely and thought carefully about what he has read. Caution is the hallmark of B.'s approach. His interpretations of the evidence and the conclusions he bases upon them are always sound and reasonable, as are his

judgements of the arguments of other scholars. For example, in his second chapter he surveys the scattered evidence of Greek, Egyptian, and Assyrian sources for Greek mercenaries in the service of the Saite dynasty in the light of key passages from Homer (*Od.* 14.245–72, 17.425–41) and Herodotus (2.147–52, 159–63). Throughout he insists upon examining the context of each item very carefully and the result is an excellent discussion which emphasizes the wide range of foreign mercenaries deployed by the pharaohs of the twenty-sixth dynasty and takes full account of Egyptian political history.

It is regrettable that few English-speaking students will have the skills or the inclination to read a book in Italian. An English translation of this volume and its successor would, therefore, be very welcome, especially if the publishers were prepared to enhance its value with some appropriate illustrations. This excellent little book certainly deserves to be widely read, not just by those concerned with ancient warfare, but by anyone who is interested in Greek history. I look forward eagerly to the appearance of the second volume.

St Mary's University College, Strawberry Hill

PHILIP DE SOUZA

L. B. PASTOR: *Mitridates Eupátor, rey del Ponto*. Pp. 507. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1996. ISBN: 84-338-2213-6.

Historians, according to Pastor, have had nothing positive to say about Mithridates Eupator. Words used to describe him include 'despot, bloodthirsty, and savage assassin'. His victories over Rome were opportunistic and his 'Hellenism' an attempt to win over the masses for his own ambitions. Nineteenth-century scholars, influenced by the classical tradition and romanticism, portrayed him as a 'sultan' with his 'harem, jewellery, and riches'. In sum, he was a 'terrible being' capable of cruelty without dignity, a traitor to the Greek world, a foe of Rome, an enemy of 'civilization'.

P.'s work is an attempt to redress the balance, and on the whole he has produced a sober reassessment. Based on a Spanish doctoral thesis, this is the first monograph to deal with M. exclusively since the appearance of T. Reinach's *Mithridate Eupator, roi de Pont* (Paris, 1890).

The book is divided into nine chapters with a conclusion. A detailed list of contents makes it easy for readers to identify areas of interest. The first six chapters adopt a chronological approach. Chapter one sets the context with a brief examination of the Pontic region and the origins and evolution of the Mithridatic dynasty. Chapter two discusses him from his birth through to his consolidation of the kingdom and the establishment of a power base in the region. Chapters three to six recount the events of the Mithridatic Wars following a chronological sequence. It is in the last three chapters where the meat of the book lies. Collectively, they give detailed analyses of M.'s character and image, his ancestral kingdom in Pontus, and the relationship of Pontus with its Greek and non-Greek neighbours, including the 'pirates' and Rome. Here P. removes some of the negativity and perhaps even cynicism associated with M.'s career. P. observes that M.'s actions, government, and representation were no different from contemporary 'Hellenistic' kings. Modern authors acknowledge both his Persian and Greek roots but tend to concentrate on the former. Against this, P. reminds us that Macedonian blood ran through his veins, the product of at least two marriages with Seleucid princesses (Laodice, sister of Seleucus II Callinicus and daughter of Antiochus II, married Mithridates II; and Laodice, daughter of the aforementioned, married Antiochus III). For P. the Greek world accepted M. as their liberator (a view certainly worth considering against Kallett-Marx's recent philoromanist perspective). P. also argues that we should not view Pontus itself as a kingdom of different tribes. Most surrounding regions had been under the influence of earlier Mithridatic kings; M. made no attempt to modify and incorporate the savage tribes bordering the Black Sea into the Pontic kingdom. Thus, the label 'king of barbarians' should be once and for all removed. As P. notes, Greeks occupied the most important positions in the state. The kingdom's political and ideological forms were taken over from earlier Hellenistic kingdoms. M. simply followed the pattern of acquiring and retaining power that had been established by Alexander.

In sum, P.'s book is well researched, with a wide usage of epigraphic, numismatic, archaeological, and literary evidence, and a fair acquaintance with the modern secondary material. Perhaps a chapter (P. donates a few pages) could have been devoted to the source material, inadequate though this is. The three maps could have been made clearer and up to date (as it is, they follow Reinach). Spann's dissertation about Sertorius (p. 204) is footnoted, but not mentioned in the bibliography (a serious omission). There are a few minor blemishes that point to

a lack of final revision—e.g. p. 506, chapter VII = VIII and VIII = IX. Nevertheless, the book is a more than welcome addition to Mithridatic studies and worthy of scholarly attention.

University of Warwick

JUAN STRISINO

C. D. HAMILTON, P. KRENTZ (edd.): *Polis and Polemos: Essays on Politics, War, and History in Ancient Greece in Honor of Donald Kagan*. Pp. xxiii + 368. Claremont: Regina Books, 1997. Cased, \$39.50 (Paper, \$19.50). ISBN: 0-941690-76-8 (0-941690-75-X pbk).

The title nicely sums up the honorand's scholarly interests: politics and warfare in classical Greece, particularly at Athens. The contributors, all former undergraduate or graduate students of Kagan, have stuck closely to the brief contained in the subtitle, and the result is a Festschrift of unusual coherence. The ten papers in the first part concern 'Thucydides and the Peloponnesian War'; of the six in Part II, 'After the Peloponnesian War', five deal with the fourth century, while the other, Bregman on the emperor Julian, discusses his view of classical Athens, including the Athenian empire.

Familiar ground is often revisited here with new and stimulating approaches. Legon teases out of Thucydides 1.1 the wider implications of his declaration that the beginning of the Peloponnesian War marked his progression to contemporary history in the belief that it would be the greatest war ever. Krentz offers a telling critique of the common perception of Greek warfare as agonistic in character while suggesting that the Spartans missed a trick in their attempts to cope with Periclean strategy by invading Attica in overwhelming force and so failing to offer the Athenians a fair fight on land. J. E. Lendon finds a resolution of the tension between *philotimia* and pressures to conformity and obedience at Sparta in the fact that the latter was itself the object of competitiveness, and in a thought-provoking piece, Valerie French argues that traditional Spartan child-rearing practices, well-suited to preparing Spartan children psychologically for the Lycurgan system, were undermined as the changing position of Spartan women from the later fifth century reduced their rôle as mothers.

Elsewhere, W. J. McCoy re-evaluates Theramenes' political debut in 411; Hamilton scrutinizes the sources for the peace negotiations of 405–404, particularly the parts played by Lysander and Theramenes and the history of the proposal to destroy Athens; David Rice uses the fall of Timotheus to insist that factions in fourth-century Athenian politics might be separated by real issues of policy; Kenneth Harl presents a plausible reconstruction of the battle of the Granicus which allows it to take place in the river-bed, as Arrian and Plutarch report; and James Williams highlights elements of anti-democratic ideology in the constitution of Demetrius of Phalerum.

Historical comparisons and modern parallels, for which Kagan has a fondness, are regularly deployed to good effect, as in Strauss's comparative examination of the poor 'alliance management' of Athens and Sparta, and the consequent failure of their hegemonial ambitions. Manville, drawing on the world of management consultancy, suggests that Periclean Athens, like exceptional modern corporations, owed its success to an ability to combine objectives normally considered mutually incompatible—a concern for the interests of both the community and the individual, for example. John Hale's delightful paper compares the theory of Sun-Tzu's *The Art of War* with the practice of Phormio, concluding that the fifth-century practice of warfare was much more sophisticated than a lack of treatises might lead us to suppose. Only Alvin Bernstein's sustained parallel between the collapses of the 'sheltered defense econom[ies]' of Sparta and the Soviet Union seems to blur distinctions rather than illuminate.

A couple of other papers disappoint, perhaps through over-ambition. Sixteen pages are hardly sufficient for Elizabeth Meyer to rebut all work on the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War since Kagan's 1969 book, before devoting a similar space to her own account of Thucydides' *alethestate prophasis*. Paul Rahe's presentation of Thucydides as a critic of 'ancient constitutionalism' is weakened by his use of Thucydides as evidence both for the constitutionalist principle and for its breakdown in the Peloponnesian War, and, more seriously, by a failure to distinguish between relations within a community and those between *poleis*, especially in wartime.

The volume is nicely produced: there is a light scatter of misprints and some bibliographic slips, mostly resolvable by reference to other contributions. The intended readership of a Festschrift

(recipient apart) is often unclear; given the coherence and quality of this one, Greek historians will find much to interest them and quite a lot to recommend to their students.

University of Leeds

ROGER BROCK

W. K. LACEY: *Augustus and the Principate. The Evolution of the System*. (ARCA: Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs, 35.) Pp. x + 245. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1996. Cased, £36/\$52.50. ISBN: 0-905205-91-X.

The many mansions housing historians certainly have room for critics differing as to the Augustan Principate. W. K. Lacey is one of the distinguished scholars, recently contributors to K. Raafaub and M. Toher (edd.), *Between Republic and Empire* (Berkeley, 1990), who minimize opposition to Augustus' establishment; his title is carefully chosen. The Principate, product of a series of encroachments, came last in a number of attempts to achieve stability through one-man rule, and was acceptable because of that (though there was a crisis, if no plot, in 23 B.C., pp. 97, 104).

These essays, published over twenty years, are consistent in their thinking and share underlying principles, such as L.'s view that 'criticism of the sources [has] gone beyond reason' (p. vii). In particular, 'Students of Augustus should begin with Tacitus' (p. 1), an injunction that leads on the one hand to readiness to re-examine accepted interpretations, on the other to heavy dependence on rhetorical passages (pp. 36f.).

The opening chapter, 'Coming Home', might seem to concern 30–27 B.C., but it ranges from the *adventus* of Cicero through Octavian's entry of 43 B.C. to the *cortège* of A.D. 14. The theme returns in Chapter 6, which, dealing with the arid question, when the Principate began, gives 19 B.C. a run.

While Chapter 2, 'Managing the Res Publica', treats relations with sectors of society, Chapter 3 is a celebrated and successful paper focused on one event—'Octavian in the Senate, January 27'—putting the question of consular provinces. The more controversial article that follows, 'Protecting the People', contains the core of L.'s doctrine on tribunician power. Augustus had planned for a revival of the balance between consuls and tribunes (p. 105 with reinterpretation, pp. 2f., of *Ann.* 1, 2, unconvincing in its weak rendering of '*servitio*': 'serve the regime'; cf. p. 152); the change was unobtrusive, the counting from 23 necessary because the consulship no longer provided a beat. L. turns to the development into *summi fastigii vocabulum* in Chapter 7.

'Agrippa's *provincia*' does not follow chronologically from Chapter 4; here again L. makes an early start, 27 B.C. Focusing on (inductive) method, he concludes that Agrippa had powers modelled on those of the *Lex Gabinia* but derived from his consulate by *lex curiata*, and Sextus' title *praefectus classis et orae maritimae*, a heterogeneous and artificial scheme, certainly involving 'encroachment' when he dealt with Spain (p. 128). The *SC de Cn. Pisone patre* ll. 34–7, invoked on p. 129, is useful for all subordinate commands.

Chapter 8, apparently taking us into a different dimension, family religion, develops into an account of how Augustus made himself supreme in state religion. With the end approaching, Chapter 9 introduces the succession, and, presaging horrors of *Annals* and the *Piso SC*, 'Encroachment and Servile Flattery'. Readers will wonder if thunderings over Julia's misdemeanours in 2 B.C. are likely to have quietened, not encouraged, gossip about Augustus' grandsons' paternity. The final encroachment, giving decisions of the *consilium* the status of *SCC*, is not mentioned. More important, no word of economic change.

Here is a nourishing, outspoken book. Such collections are liable to obvious failings, chapters starting with introductions, repetition common. Besides, the Augustan mansion has long been inhabited. It still draws students and scholars to refurbish it (note the issue taken [p. 16] with views put forward in *CAH² X*), but others, hunting post-modern dwellings, will pass by. Rightly, perhaps, but nobody is better qualified to grind the nitty-gritty of evidence or to force it on to the attention of reluctant peers in well-documented footnotes than L. He must be heard, if only to be refuted, as he must be on Agrippa's *imperium* and, more importantly, with other evolutionists, for his comfortable view of Augustus' takeover. For encroachment is not the alternative to '27 and 23' (pp. 3f.) but a supplement to a whole series of jerky improvisations. L.'s aside, that resigning the consulate in 23 B.C. should have brought popularity (pp. 44f.), and his view that taking Spain, Gaul, and Syria in 27 B.C. was reassuring (p. 90), show how irrevocable differences are.

At a lower level some renderings of Latin, necessary though they are, are objectionable; ‘Mana’ (repeatedly for *auctoritas*) is *obscurum per obscurius*; an explanatory glossary might have been more useful. Other details: it is surprising to find ‘the commercial class outside the senate’ identified with ‘knights or *equites*’ (p. 7, cf. p. 20), and [Octavian’s] adoption (sic) an asset to him in 44 (p. 10; ‘testamentary adoption’, p. 226). Is Agrippa’s refusal of triumphs inexplicable (p. 46)? It inhibited others, but see the invaluable remarks, pp. 72f. Tiberius’ triumph belongs to A.D. 12, not 11 (p. 53 n. 149). ‘He did not resign his proconsulate’ [in 23], so ‘his consular *imperium* immediately became proconsular’ (p. 110 n. 27) and ‘active within the *pomerium*’ (cf. p. 151): this is partly anomalous, partly ambiguous, and it is hard to believe that Augustus allowed ambiguity in 23 B.C. On elections, A.D. 14 is hardly ‘the legal termination of the institutions of the “Republic”’ (p. 135), for the People’s formal participation survived; ‘accept nomination’ (p. 147) is anachronistic. The work of N. Mackie, *Coll. Lat.* 196 (Brussels, 1986), pp. 302–40, anticipating views on *Res Publica*, should have been taken account of (not in the bibliography).

St Hilda’s College, Oxford

B. LEVICK

P. SOUTHERN: *Domitian: Tragic Tyrant*. Pp. viii + 164, 7 maps, 24 pls. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. £40. ISBN: 0-415-16525-3.

Pat Southern has written a careful, straightforward (but rather brief) account of Domitian’s life and reign. It reads well. Those expecting (or fearing) a lengthy discussion of statements such as ‘What is it like to live in constant fear for your life?’ or ‘Domitian is examined from a psychological point of view’ (both appear on the cover) will find a mere six pages in the last chapter devoted to those topics: there, S. looks briefly at various theories on imperial paranoia—of which Domitian was surely a classic example if ever there was one! But whatever one’s views on that topic, the remaining 120 pages are completely uncontroversial. Most of the book is arranged chronologically: of the twelve chapters of almost equal length, the first three look at the period up to his accession (‘Early Years’, the ‘*Bellum Jovis*’, and ‘*Augusti Filius*’), the next three (‘Domitian *Imperator*’, ‘Imperial Rule’, and ‘Cost of Empire’) are thematic, and are followed by five on his wars and last years. There are twenty-four plates, including the remarkable Toledo bust, some Domitianic coins, busts of Julia and Domitia Longina, sections of the Cancellaria reliefs, and several good recent photographs of Domitian’s palace together with seven maps. There is also a useful appendix on his building programme.

Only occasionally are S.’s conclusions open to serious question. Suetonius’ reference (*Domitian* 1.1) to the young Domitian offering himself for money to the future emperor Nerva elicits the comment (p. 2) that ‘it is difficult to comprehend how this scandalous affair confirms Domitian’s moral turpitude without staining Nerva’s reputation’. But it is amazing that Suetonius, writing in Hadrian’s court, would, in his one and only reference to Nerva, have accused his master’s (adoptive) grandfather of sodomy. But, apart from that, the point is that, had Domitian been a *puer* at the time of the alleged incident, then Nerva’s reputation would have been stained and he would certainly have been subject to the strictures of the *Lex Scantinia* (the *Digest* refers specifically to *stuprum* against a *puer praetextatus*: 47.11.1.2); after that age, though (and Domitian was clearly not a *puer* at the time), it is only the passive partner in homosexual activities who incurs blame. That is the point of Cicero’s attack on Antony in *Phil.* 2.44 or the defence offered by Suillius Caesoninus in the trials that followed Messallina’s execution in A.D. 48, i.e. *Caesoninus utiis protectus est tamquam in illo foedissimo coetu passus muliebria* (*Ann.* 11.36).

On the topic of Domitianic freedmen, it is a pity that S. did not have access to Weaver’s articles on Epaphroditus in *CQ* 44 (1994), 468–79 and on Abascantus in *ECM* 13 (1994), 333–64. To take but one example: his discussion of the word *communicavit* in Suetonius’ statement (*Dom.* 7.2) that Domitian *quaedam ex maximis officiis inter libertinos equitesque Romanos communicavit* is particularly important. In brief, he translates it as ‘shared’ in the sense of ‘caused to be held or performed together in a collegiate sense’ and argues that it means ‘the appointing, where appropriate, of procuratorial pairs, one equestrian, one freedman, both carrying the same (or close variations of the same) title’ (*ECM* 38 [1994], 357). S.’s views on his interpretation would have been worth having.

Perhaps more could have been made of the fact that three men physically close to the emperor, his two senior freedmen (Tiberius Julius Aug. lib. and Tiberius Claudius Classicus) as well as the praetorian prefect and imperial relative L. Julius Ursus, were all replaced early in the reign; and despite Domitian’s reputation, each was dealt with gently, the worst ‘punishment’ being Tiberius

Julius' exile to Campania. Perhaps this removal of officials close to him yet appointed by someone else could have been used by S. to illustrate what she sees as the 'mistrust and its attendant alienation . . . built into his character from the earliest times' (p. 123).

Domitian's wars receive comparatively detailed coverage (almost half the book), the most substantial treatment being reserved for Britain and the career of Agricola. Maps of the Roman occupation of Scotland (before and after Agricola) and of the German and Danubian frontiers are provided, though parts of the latter have disappeared into the binding. Commanders' names are kept to a minimum, so there is no mention of Cornelius Nigrinus or of Funisulanus Vettonianus. More significant is the omission of any reference to his Parthian policy. One looks in vain for some reference to the Bejuk Dagh inscription (*AE* 1951, 263) which reveals the presence in ancient Albania (and far to the east of its base) of a unit from the *XII Fulminata* (the only Domitianic legion not cited by S.) and is relevant in any assessment of his policy in the Cappadocia–Galatia region, a policy that seems (once more) to have been a continuation of his father's.

That aside, S. provides a brief, uncontroversial account of some of the more important events of Domitian's reign.

University of Queensland

BRIAN W. JONES

G. WEBSTER, H. ELTON (intro.): *The Roman Imperial Army of the First and Second Centuries A.D.* (Third Edition). Pp. xxiii + 349, 54 figs, 32 pls. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998. Paper, \$19.95. ISBN: 0-8061-3000-8.

The third edition (1985) of W.'s standard work on the organization and deployment of the Roman army is brought up to date with eight pages of bibliographical survey by Hugh Elton. This highlights the new controversies and changing scholarly interests which have ensured that W.'s classic status is unlikely to be challenged, and is particularly useful for the regional summaries of major archaeological publications.

University of Warwick

MICHAEL WHITBY

H. A. POHLSANDER: *The Emperor Constantine* (Lancaster Pamphlets). Pp. xiv + 105, 10 figs. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Paper, £6.99. ISBN: 0-415-13178-2.

One can only be sceptical of a book of hardly one hundred pages that claims to introduce and analyse Constantine and his reign. Hans A. Pohlsander's Lancaster Pamphlet more than justifies such scepticism.

The text is chiefly an awkwardly put together chronological narrative with superfluous illustrations, and odd digressions and emphases that rob legitimate topics of space (e.g. Trier, pp. 17–19; the *Vita Silvestri*, pp. 25–7; Donatists, pp. 29–32; church foundations in Rome and Palestine, pp. 34–7 and 55–8; Licinius' illegitimate son, pp. 43–4; a description of Constantinople, pp. 59–67; and 'Constantine's Image in Roman Art', pp. 78–82). The emphasis is clearly on the religious aspects of the reign, with the result that a chapter called 'Constantine's Government', a catch-all for the non-religious achievements of the reign, is granted barely four pages (pp. 68–70, 72).

P. reveals biases that are surprising in our generally secular modern historiographical traditions (cf. his claims on p. 2). One looks twice at sentences such as, 'In the course of the work the tomb which was believed to be—and in all likelihood is—the tomb of Jesus was discovered' (p. 55). But one has serious misgivings as P. labels as 'blasphemous' then 'reprehensible' Constantine's supposed association of himself with Christ, and as 'presumptuous, if not blasphemous' the arrangements for his funeral (pp. 66 and 86).

P. seems to believe that it is the job of the modern historian to sit in judgement on the past. He says of Diocletian, 'Nor can much moral blame be attached to what he did' (p. 7). His final chapter (pp. 83–7) is chiefly devoted to determining history's 'judgement' on Constantine and his

reign: 'In the end we must . . . deny to Constantine the title of Great. We can do so without denying his excellence as a general and his historical importance. But we must find fault with his character and many of his deeds' (p. 84). '[W]e must deny to Constantine the title of Saint and take the risk of offending Orthodox believers. We need not deny that he committed himself to the Christian religion. . . . We can excuse the late date of his baptism. But Constantine died with blood on his hands' (p. 85). '[T]he blame for the bloody coup of 337 falls squarely on the shoulders of . . . Constantine himself' (p. 85). 'But certainly Constantine stands guilty of the murder of the Licinii, father and son' (p. 86). This is no way to teach students about ancient history.

As for the actual content, the book is littered with many errors, misrepresentations, and questionable statements, most tiny, some serious, the worst of which congregate in the second chapter on the third century and the Tetrarchy. The bibliography is skewed towards works on church architecture and art. There is no index.

Because of its treatment of Constantine and chiefly because of its general approach to and treatment of history and the historical method, I would not recommend putting this book into the hands of students.

University of Ottawa

R. W. BURGESS

J. C. S. LEÓN: *Los Bagaudas: rebeldes, demonios, mártires. Revueltas campesinas en Galia e Hispania durante el Bajo Imperio*. Pp. 168. Jaén: Universidad de Jaén, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 84-88942-49-4.

The Bagaudae were rural malcontents who terrorized Gaul and Spain under the later Roman Empire. They have attracted much attention from social historians. The best known treatment remains that of E. A. Thompson in *Past & Present*, 1952. However, a great deal of work has been done since then, with Thompson's Marxist analysis being largely discredited. A comprehensive and reliable overview of the current state of research would therefore be very welcome. In this respect, I can firmly recommend León's new book. He demonstrates an encyclopaedic knowledge of previous publications (which he lists, unusually but conveniently, in chronological order at the end); and throughout he makes extensive and intelligent use (with frequent quotation) of the most recent studies (e.g. pp. 16, 59 n. 41, in rejecting the authenticity of the third-century 'Bagaudic' coinage).

But L. attempts more than just synthesis. This book results from and complements his *Les sources de l'histoire des Bagaudes* (Paris, 1996: superseding Czúth's *Die Quellen der Geschichte der Bagauden*, 1965). L.'s reconsideration of the evidence causes him to advocate a new approach to the Bagaudae. He argues that modern research has erred in becoming too general. His aim is rather, on the basis of his source-work and, in particular, of comparison of the Bagaudic *movimiento* in both Gaul and Spain, to establish the 'character' and the 'perception' of the Bagaudae (pp. 11, 26). So (pp. 31–80) he proposes that the Bagaudae arose in marginal, poorly Romanized regions, as these areas found themselves exposed to the depredations of the late Roman state and the great landowners and clerics who were its servants. Insecurity caused by barbarian invasion and civil war was an important but only a secondary factor (pp. 37–8). The Bagaudae consisted mainly of the indigenous, uneducated, rural, free poor, stiffened by bandits and deserters, and by some members of the local ruling class (pp. 43–4). They were resisting incipient feudalism; their 'fundamental aim' was 'social separatism'—'to free themselves from the oppression of the imperial order and to establish themselves at the edge of the Roman state and Roman society' (pp. 56, 61). Then (pp. 83–106, 109–120) L. shows how later generations, during the late Empire and into the Middle Ages, and even in the nineteenth century, demonized or heroicized the Bagaudae for their own social and political ends. He ends with a handy digest of the sources. Here, too, L. can be warmly recommended. He writes clearly, identifies and tries to reconcile the most important strands of modern thinking, and has many interesting things to say.

However, I have some doubts. Thompson once described the Bagaudae to me as his 'King Charles's head'; and, indeed, it is a feature of Bagaudic studies that interest can lead to obsession, in particular to the detection of Bagaudae where, perhaps, they do not really exist. So here, for example, it is striking that L. (e.g. pp. 18–19, 35–6, 74, 87), like Thompson, bases much of his interpretation of the Gallic Bagaudae as a Loire-centred, social *movimiento* on Rutilius Namatianus, *De reditu suo* 1.213–16 and the *Querolus*, ed. Herrmann, pp. 95–7, despite the fact that neither passage specifically refers to the Bagaudae, and the belief that they do so is currently

suffering heavy criticism (see e.g. most recently, W. Lütkenhaus, *Constantius III* [Bonn, 1998], p. 189). Likewise, while L. (e.g. pp. 17, 42, 84, 93–7) makes much of Sulpicius Severus, *Vita S. Martini* 11.1–5, as an important ‘new’ source on third-century Bagaudism and its reception, there is nothing to prove that the (admittedly fascinating) ‘Robin Hood’ figure of this text was a Bagaud. With this and other similar evidence taken out of consideration, the assumption that the Bagaudae should be treated as a single homogeneous (p. 37: albeit multi-centred) phenomenon is seriously compromised. L. notices (pp. 32–3) the idea that the label of ‘Bagaud’ could have become applied pejoratively to a number of types of rural lawbreakers. I agree. I suspect that, as in the case of ‘teddy boys’, ‘skinheads’, or even ‘football hooligans’, if we had a modern, professional, social report on the Bagaudae (*contra* L., p. 20, Salvia is certainly not enough) we should find that they arose in all sorts of areas, from all sorts of backgrounds, and for all sorts of reasons.

University of Nottingham

J. F. DRINKWATER

D. W. PHILLIPSON: *Ancient Ethiopia. Aksum: Its Antecedents and Successors*. Pp. 176, 12 pls, 60 figs. London: British Museum Press, 1998. Cased, £20. ISBN: 0-7141-2539-3.

During the first seven centuries A.D. the city of Aksum, situated in the northern highlands of Ethiopia close to the border with the modern state of Eritrea, formed the centre of a flourishing civilization whose rule extended during the later part of that period to large areas of southern Arabia and possibly Meroe in the Sudanese Nile Valley, and whose contacts stretched from the Mediterranean to India and even, perhaps, China. Its kings adopted Christianity probably within a decade of that religion being formally tolerated in the Roman Empire and, in spite of political decline, it has continued to remain a bastion of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church. Indeed, its support in religious matters was sought by the emperors Constantius II and Justin. Aksum therefore stands out as particularly worthy of attention from those interested in the separate histories of the peoples and civilizations on the edge of the classical world with whom the Greeks and Romans came into contact.

P.’s book provides an excellent introduction to the current state of knowledge of Aksumite civilization and its place in Ethiopian history. He has come to it with strong credentials, having directed research on the site since 1993 on behalf of the British Institute in Eastern Africa. Not only is the book clearly written but it is also profusely illustrated, including beautiful and fascinating photographs of both ancient buildings and the contemporary landscape.

The first chapter sets the scene by describing the physical setting and human geography of Ethiopia as well as the development of knowledge of the country on the part of outsiders. There follows a review of the history of civilization in the region before the foundation of Aksum at the beginning of the first century A.D., with particular emphasis placed on its links with South Arabia, from where writing, monumental stone architecture, and sculpture were introduced perhaps in the sixth or fifth century B.C.

Aksumite civilization itself is presented in the three central chapters, which deal successively with its political, social, and economic history; its material culture and beliefs; and its nature as a polity. The last of these includes an attempt to offer a new, albeit preliminary, analysis of the city’s political decline. P. suggests that the political capital was moved to another site shortly before the disappearance of the coinage by the second quarter of the seventh century and that environmental factors, linked with overexploitation, may have been primarily responsible. He also connects Aksum’s decline to the fact that at about the same time it was cut off from its former trade links with the Eastern Mediterranean as a result of the rise of Islamic control of the Red Sea.

The last two chapters look briefly at the continuing influence of Aksumite traditions in the monuments and art of Ethiopia in the Zagwe period, which extended to the thirteenth century, and at the interpretation of tradition as a source for the history of the region.

P. offers a useful reassessment of the rôle played by Aksum, through its port Adulis, situated on the Eritrean coast, in the international economy centred on the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean. He argues that Mediterranean (and Egyptian) imports have been overrepresented in previous scholarship and that insufficient attention has been paid to Aksum’s exports. Moreover, he criticizes the fashion to ascribe most movement of goods to ‘trade’, or to refer to it vaguely as ‘exchange’. However, his own account is unable to make much progress.

Classicists will be especially interested in the evidence for the cultural influence of the Roman Empire on Aksum. The adoption and spread of Christianity provides the most obvious example. Tradition and the written sources allege that it occurred in two phases, a view which P. believes is confirmed by the archaeological evidence. Less well known is the introduction *c.* A.D. 270 of a native coinage, whose gold coins followed the weight standard then prevailing in the Roman Empire for at least 100 years, and the use of Greek not just on coins of all metals but also in inscriptions, such as those established by King Ezana in the fourth century to commemorate his exploits.

The fascination of Aksum and the history of Ethiopia is well conveyed by this book. Much remains unclear, however, and it is to be hoped that a stable political situation is achieved in the region so that further research can be facilitated.

Christ Church, Oxford

MICHAEL SHARP

W. AMELING: *Karthago: Studien zu Militär, Staat und Gesellschaft*. Pp. xi + 289. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1993. Cased. ISBN: 3-406-37490-5.

The history and archaeology of Carthage have recently become popular again. The area had been sadly neglected since the groundbreaking works of Warmington and the Picards in the 1960s; however, the last decade has seen an explosion of excellent work on the subject. These run from current archaeological surveys, such as Ennabli's UNESCO report of 1992, to new interpretations in history, most notably Winfried Elliger's *Karthago* (Stuttgart, 1990) and Serge Lancel's *Carthage* (Paris, 1992). Ameling's book uses archaeology as its primary source, but it is above all a revisionist history; a new look at old Carthage. It is a bold challenge to the views held by most specialists on Carthage, questioning the very fabric that many believe held Punic society together.

The work opens with a lengthy chapter on the Battle of Himera in 480 B.C. A. reaches the conclusion that the entire campaign was in fact a private war waged by Hamilcar to restore Terillos to power in Himera. The battle supposedly took place on the same day as Salamis, and therefore some Greek chroniclers have seen the two fights as a great Hellenic crusade against a barbarian alliance. A. successfully refutes this, demonstrating that the two campaigns were fought for entirely different reasons. Though it is not mentioned by A., judging by a late-fifth-century inscription, Carthage could be seen as being closer to Athens in terms of a military alliance (see Meritt, *Athenian Studies*, 1973). Chapters two and three trace Punic history from monarchy to oligarchy and then proceed to outline Carthaginian government and external strategy. Chapter five deals with the Carthaginian treaties made with Rome, analysing three distinctive clauses—those concerning restrictions on travel, rules on trade, and special rules governing Roman trade with and travel to Sicily.

It is in Chapters four, six, seven, and eight that the book's strengths lie. These are a thorough examination of Carthaginian piracy and the army and navy down to the Hannibalic war; a most welcome addition to modern scholarship, as nothing equivalent exists in any language. The piracy chapter centres on privateering and includes a colourful segment on Hannibal the Rhodian. The army sections cover the Sacred Band and citizen soldiers, but A. rightly concentrates on the formation of the mercenary and allied land forces which Carthage had come exclusively to rely upon by the fifth century; Chapter seven in particular ends with a very useful breakdown of the ethnic make-up of the mercenary bands. Also illustrated in detail is the Punic navy; specifically its organization, manpower, and use as an instrument of power. Considering Carthage fought three major wars against Rome, its military capability has somehow been overlooked by previous historians; A. does not make this mistake, and does well with these extremely interesting chapters.

Unfortunately, the major thesis of the book contains two fatal flaws. A. challenges the notion of other Punic specialists that Carthage was a state ruled by a maritime aristocracy. It is his claim that Carthage was run entirely by a landed gentry which governed the city along the lines of a Hellenistic *polis*. Certainly there is something to this; Carthage did have interests in Africa and controlled much of the populace in the northwest of the continent. This should indicate that there was a class in Carthage which favoured landward expansion. Unfortunately, A.'s argument cannot stand. To achieve his conclusion, he is forced to ignore the archaeological evidence from Italy and Spain that strongly suggests a powerful merchant class was present in the city. Furthermore, the neglect of this material leads to the second flaw, since it is only with the artefacts from the greater western Mediterranean that one may prove that Carthage was similar in

so many ways to a Greek *polis*. At present, we are left with little choice but to see the capital of the Punic thalassocracy in the light of the Hellenistic world as a whole, rather than as an entity which, even in the third century, was more Phoenician than Greek. A. does present his central thesis well, and it is a significant contribution to modern scholarship. However, it is better to take a middle ground on the subject. Throughout its history, Carthage was beset with *stasis* between the merchant and landowning aristocracies; both were present and equally powerful within the city. The effort of the Punic home front to supply Hannibal in Italy best illustrates this aristocratic conflict, as aid from Africa fluctuated between full support and abandonment. It was this civil strife that caused Carthage to be so horribly inefficient in foreign wars, and it seems that there was a significant section of the aristocracy which did not favour maritime expansion. A.'s work contains many exciting and groundbreaking ideas, especially on the Punic military, but in the end the work is rendered erroneous by the central thesis.

University of St Andrews

JOHN SERRATI

J. M. BLÁZQUEZ: *España Romana* (Colección Historia, Serie Mayor). Pp. 468, ills. Madrid: Cátedra, 1996. ISBN: 84-376-1460-0.

España Romana is not a book, but a collection of essays (all in Spanish) written by B., dating mainly from the 1980s and 1990s. As many were originally published in Congress *Acta* or difficult-to-obtain journals, this collection is to be welcomed in making these pieces more accessible. Unfortunately there has been no cross-referencing of the items included, with the result that the footnotes refer to other articles which are included in this collection only by their original place of publication. The consequence is that while many of the pieces can be read profitably in conjunction, only the diligent reader will discover they are in the same volume. There are other odd errors too, such as the misspelt title of Chapter 24.

The collection covers all of the Roman period in Spain. There are nine items on the Republican period, including three on mining and one which is a rather forced comparison of Iberian culture with Burebista's Thracio-Dacian kingdom; eleven on the principate, six of which deal with B.'s work on the Monte Testaccio and trade in olive oil; and five pieces on the Late Empire, some of which cover the same ground from slightly different perspectives.

B.'s articles contain an immense amount of data, which on occasions is simply presented to the reader without much in the way of interpretation. This is true, for example, of the piece on Etruscans in Spain or that on euergetism in Roman Spain. Bibliographies are also prominent in the footnotes, though there is little recognition of English language material. H. Chadwick's *Priscillian of Avila* (Oxford, 1976), for example, is not mentioned in a list of works dealing with the Priscillianist movement in Chapter 22.

There is frequently a tendency to view the ancient evidence cited in a highly positivistic light. When discussing the martyrdom of Stas Justa and Rufina of Seville, B. is content to accept the account of the *Breviary of Evoras* as an unproblematic version of what happened with no concern for the ideological nature of the account or possible distortions introduced by the passage of time. At other times there is a lack of interpretation. B. notes the rise of the villa in Later Roman Spain, but does not discuss why such a striking shift in the tastes of the local aristocracy might have occurred. This problem surfaces again with B.'s accounts of late Roman towns. B. cites Paulinus of Nola's statement that there are many 'glorious' cities in Spain and goes on to assert that, judging by the mosaics found there, late Roman Merida must have been 'a magnificent town to live in'. Again we need to be more careful. Paulinus was married to a Spaniard and owned land in the peninsula, and his comments are made as a direct riposte to Ausonius' criticisms of Spain and hence are not a disinterested statement of the state of the Iberian peninsula in the way that B. assumes. Moreover, as the modern world makes clear, private opulence can coexist with public squalor and we must at least take into consideration that this could have been the case too in the ancient world. There is occasional confusion over the date of demise of Italica (and no mention that the *nova urbs* there was abandoned for reasons peculiar to the site), which at times is cited as having ceased to exist and at other times of producing wealthy mosaics in the late period. This perhaps highlights the methodological problem outlined above. Another curiosity is a tendency to place the town of Castulo (a site which B. knows well) in the province of Baetica. This occurs in discussions of Baetica in both the Julio-Claudian and the Late Imperial periods. While the town was initially part of this province, it was soon placed in neighbouring Tarraconensis, so its inclusion without any rider in these discussions of Baetica is therefore rather odd.

B.'s approach to certain aspects of Iberian history differs sharply from some scholars. Some of these differences are mentioned in this collection, for example Sotomayer's rejection of an African origin for the Church in Spain, though the counter-arguments are not engaged with. There is, however, no mention of Arce's counter-arguments to B.'s view that there was a form of *Limes* in the north of Spain in the later Roman period (for these see J. Arce, *El último siglo de la España romana (284–409)* [Madrid, 1986]). It is a shame that there is not more dialogue here.

In general there is a wealth of detailed material in this collection, but at times the reader must approach the treatment of it with caution.

University of Keele

A. T. FEAR

B. SAITTA: *L'antisemitismo nella Spagna visigotica*. (Studia Historica, 130.) Pp. 158. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 88-7062-896-5.

When dealing with racial prejudice there are two distinct areas for an historian to analyse: formal discrimination embedded in law, and the more nebulous field of sentiment. S.'s short work (104 pages) deals more successfully with the former than the latter. The book falls into two halves. There is a very short section on the 'Arian' kingdom (a mere ten pages), followed by a much longer section on the 'Catholic' period. While evidence for the earlier period is scarcer, a more detailed survey would seem in order. One surprising omission here is any discussion of the late Imperial Spanish author, Juvencus, who has been seen as an anti-Semite (see J.-M. Poinssotte, *Juvencus et Israel: la représentation des Juifs dans le premier poème chrétien* [Paris, 1979]). The potential differences in the attitude to Jews of the Goths themselves and the Hispano-Roman population of the peninsula could also have been further discussed.

S. tends to explain anti-Semitism in political terms, looking at it as a way of producing unity in the kingdom. A substantial amount of Visigothic law survives and S. uses this to good effect, giving a very full account of the legal relationships found between Jew and Gentile in the peninsula. Much of the legal material is quoted in the original Latin in the extensive footnotes. S.'s approach is strictly diachronic, which allows the reader to see clearly how legal thought on the subject developed, but is less helpful when trying to discern the underlying themes of the legislation. This is indicative of the work's main weakness, namely that S. does not engage deeply with the question of why Visigothic rulers found anti-Semitism such a potent political weapon or indeed if they did. While there is indeed a plethora of laws on this subject, we must be aware that these might have had an ideological, rather than a practical, purpose. Determining the degree of enthusiasm with which this legislation was enforced is also important if we are to gauge the strength of feeling within a community, and one piece of contemporary evidence, Pope Honorius' rebuke of the Spanish church for its apathy towards anti-Jewish measures, could suggest we ought to be careful in taking an overly positivist view of Visigothic legislation in this field. Here perhaps there could have been a more extended discussion of how closely the formal position of the Church and its practice coincided. S. does not, however, eschew all such issues. There is a brief discussion of Isidore's *De Fide Catholica ex Vetere et Novo Testamento contra Iudaeos*, and the anti-Semitism of Julian of Toledo is seen as a Torquemada-like product of Julian's being the son of *converso* parents. It is a pity here that S. did not take the opportunity to speculate on how many such *conversi* entered the church and how many shared Julian's inclinations. In short, this work is a fine introduction to the legal framework of anti-Semitism in Visigothic Spain, but the reader is often left to supply his own answers as to why this edifice was built in the first place.

University of Keele

A. T. FEAR

D. W. ROLLER: *The Building Program of Herod the Great*. Pp. xvii + 351, maps, figs. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998. Cased, £37.50/\$50. ISBN: 0-520-20934-6.

The contents of this book are far richer than its rather bald title would suggest. It is true that the core of the work lies in a thorough catalogue of Herod's building programme (pp. 125–238)—actually itself far more than just a catalogue, since Roller provides a history and

discussion of each site as well as a description and bibliography—but the surrounding chapters amount to an acute and wide-ranging study of numerous aspects of the rôles in the Roman empire filled by Herod and, to a lesser extent, his descendants.

The first five chapters (pp. 10–75) deal mainly with political and cultural history, looking at Herod's three journeys to Rome, his relationship with Marcus Agrippa and other influential Romans in the city, and the intellectual circle which surrounded him in his court in Judaea. But R. never loses sight of his main topic: hence a learned chapter on 'What Herod Saw' (more accurately, 'may have seen') in Rome, and a thorough discussion of the quite extensive building in the Southern Levant initiated by Roman aristocrats in the late Republic, all intended to show (in Chapter 7, which has the same title as the book itself) both the architectural influences on Herod and the extent of his innovation. In the end it is Herod's originality that most shines through. At the forefront of architectural fashion, he introduced into his kingdom and the numerous cities he patronized outside his realm Italian styles in theatres, temples, and amphitheatres, adapting the Italian villa to create his sumptuous palaces, and arranging his burial in a tomb modelled on Augustus' mausoleum. R. paints a convincing picture of a compulsive builder determined to emulate his patron Augustus with extraordinary assiduity and success.

This is firmly a work of classical scholarship, although R. is also well acquainted with recent archaeological and numismatic work in the regions he covers. He essays an impressive (and sometimes imaginative) exercise in prosopography to establish which Roman aristocrats might have met Herod in Rome in the early days before he became king. The same techniques are used to good effect to produce a catalogue of the intellectual circle at Herod's court; one imagines that Tryphon, the court barber, would have been flattered to be included in such company (p. 65). R. has little interest in the purely Jewish side of Herod's rule, reflecting, as he rightly notes (p. 162), the bias in Josephus' narrative towards description of Herod's secular and pagan projects rather than his Jewish buildings. The exception, the Jerusalem Temple, might seem rather too big to ignore in the light of Josephus' detailed pictures in both *BJ* and *AJ*, but R. has no interest in the often discussed problem of the relationship between these depictions and the rabbinic accounts, restricting his discussion of the Temple to three pages (pp. 176–8). R. also gives short shrift to the difficult issue of the origin of the wealth required for Herod to build so extensively: he states that 'the problem is not inscrutable' (p. 119), pointing both to money inherited by Herod from his parents and to the agricultural transformation of parts of Judaea during his reign (p. 120), but that is hardly sufficient, and R.'s assertion that the fact that Agrippa I died in debt despite not building as much as his grandfather 'indicates that building programs were not a major expenditure of any of the Herodian kings' (p. 124) does not convince.

R.'s concentration on the Roman side of Herod and his family is amply justified by his impressive book. Here was a politician determined to be as Roman as the Romans in Italy, even importing raw material from Puteoli in order to make the concrete for his new harbour in Caesarea (p. 138). His experiments had far-reaching effects on the Romanization not just of his own kingdom but of the eastern empire as a whole. This theme, similar to that of Fergus Millar in *The Roman Near East* but evidently arrived at independently and by a different route, is here exemplified in remarkably readable detail, with numerous black and white photographs and some helpful maps—although fig. 22, a picture of Herod's street in Antioch, which could have been taken in almost any other town in the Eastern Mediterranean, is not the most illuminating.

Oriental Institute, Oxford

M. D. GOODMAN

J. T. FITZGERALD (ed.): *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*. (Society of Biblical Literature: Resources for Biblical Study, 34.) Pp. xiii + 330. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997. \$44.95. ISBN: 0-7885-0271-9 (0-7885-0272-7 pbk).

This volume of essays is useful for classical scholars as well as the biblical scholars at whom it is primarily aimed. As the title suggests and the introduction states (pp. 1–11), the book contains a series of discussions of different aspects of friendship in the Greco-Roman world, rather than a comprehensive survey of the field. In the first chapter the editor gives a survey of 'Friendship in the Greek World Prior to Aristotle' (pp. 13–34), with most space being devoted to the Homeric poems. F. M. Schroeder, 'Friendship in Aristotle and some Peripatetic Philosophers' (pp. 35–57), briefly surveys the ideas on friendship of Aristotle himself and later writers who

belonged to, or were influenced by, the Peripatetic tradition (Theophrastus, Cicero, Arius Didymus—who receives the fullest treatment, Alcinoüs, and Aspasius). B. Fiore surveys ‘The Theory and Practice of Friendship in Cicero’, including discussion of the *Commentariolum Petitionis* (pp. 59–76). J. C. Thom, in ‘“Harmonious Equality”: the *Topos* of Friendship in Neopythagorean Writings’ (pp. 77–103), gathers together the scattered references to friendship in the heterogeneous Neopythagorean sources, and finds considerable agreement about both the importance of interpersonal relationships and their affinity to human relationships with the gods and with the cosmos. E. N. O’Neil, ‘Plutarch on Friendship’ (pp. 105–22), looks principally at the vocabulary of friendship in Plutarch. D. L. Baich, ‘Political Friendship in the Historian Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*’ (pp. 123–44), analyses four stories in Dionysius in which the nature of friendship and enmity is at stake. R. F. Hock, ‘An Extraordinary Friend in Chariton’s *Callirhoe*: the Importance of Friendship in the Greek Romances’ (pp. 145–62), is a vigorous plea for the importance of the theme of friendship in the novel, and the significance of the Greek novel for wider studies of friendship. R. I. Pervo, ‘With Lucian: Who Needs Friends? Friendship in the *Toxaris*’ (pp. 163–80), argues for the view that the *Toxaris* is a mischievously humorous work, rather than a serious praise of friendship. K. G. Evans, ‘Friendship in the Greek Documentary Papyri and Inscriptions: a Survey’ (pp. 181–202), takes a sample of Greek documentary evidence and usefully analyses the contexts in which the terminology of friendship occurs, and the problems we sometimes face in interpreting this terminology in such documents. G. E. Sterling, ‘The Bond of Humanity: Friendship in Philo of Alexandria’ (pp. 203–23), collects Philo’s scattered statements about friendship and argues for Stoic influence on his views (but the discussion starts from a mistranslation of *Abr.* 194, where τὰς φιλίας, ὅσαι δι’ ὀνόματος γεγόνασι surely means not ‘the forms of friendship, as many as have become famous’, but ‘the friendships that have become famous’, i.e. famous mythological and historical friendships). The final chapter by A. C. Mitchell is a critical survey of recent work, some of it by Mitchell himself, on the theme of friendship in different books of the New Testament (pp. 225–62). A general question thrown up by the volume, particularly in Mitchell’s discussion of the New Testament writings, is the relationship between the social conventions of friendship and the analytical discussions of friendship that one finds in philosophical and other literature. Phrases like ‘friendship traditions’ and ‘conventions of friendship’ are in danger of obscuring the issue. Do we think that, for instance, the New Testament writers and the communities they addressed were acquainted with Greco-Roman theoretical discussions of friendship? Or is it just that the social conventions with which they were acquainted corresponded to some of the themes of those discussions? If they did, was that because analytical discussions accurately reflected conventional practice or because the discussions at some point influenced practice?

Few editors of collaborative volumes have to suffer what J. T. Fitzgerald did: his home was destroyed by Hurricane Andrew in 1992, and consequently the publication of this volume was severely delayed. Hence portions of this book now look slightly dated; and we now have the more general survey of D. Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World* (Cambridge, 1997), which makes use of the Fitzgerald volume. But the volume is still valuable for its detailed studies of the theme of friendship in the specific authors and genres that it covers, and it is made easy to consult by the very full indexes of Names and Places, Subjects, Greek and Latin Terms, Ancient Authors and Texts, and Modern Scholars.

University of St Andrews

HARRY M. HINE

P. GARNSEY: *Cities, Peasants and Food in Classical Antiquity: Essays in Social and Economic History*. Pp. xvii + 336. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-521-59147-3.

G.’s status as the ancient world’s leading economic historian is amply demonstrated by this collection of sixteen important articles (two presented in English for the first time) arranged in three groups: cities, peasants, food. Editorial work was performed by Walter Scheidel, who has standardized and consolidated the individual bibliographies and, for twelve of the pieces, contributed addenda. The majority of these are short, less than a page, which place the article both in a broader scholarly context and against G.’s developing historical interests, and provide an annotated bibliography of significant work in response to G.: these are intelligent reading lists which will help undergraduates and more senior scholars. Longer treatment is accorded

two articles where G.'s views have generated controversy, on the decline of urban aristocracies in the Roman empire and the Athenian grain supply. Both cases are complex and S., though somewhat partisan, clarifies matters by treating key issues separately, even if this may not bring out the continuing relevance of G.'s overall presentation. On grain, S. almost acknowledges (p. 200) that G.'s quantification of Athenian food requirements attempted to impose undue precision on inadequate evidence, a conclusion which could have been reinforced if G.'s conflation of unground barley and barley meal had been noted. But, even where unsuccessful, G.'s arguments are clear and stimulating, and this volume will be a great boon to teachers and students alike.

University of Warwick

MICHAEL WHITBY

K. LUCK-HUYSE: *Der Traum vom Fliegen in der Antike*. (Palingenesia, 62.) Pp. viii + 264, 12 figs. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997. Paper, DM 88. ISBN: 3-515-06965-8.

This book is dedicated to a subject that was apparently very fascinating in antiquity: 'the dream of flying'. Consequently, the point of the book is to edit and to comment on texts that belong to this category. L.-H. offers two criteria for her choices (technical descriptions of flying and explanations of flight-like movements), but the state of research (with regard to this topic) is not taken into account. Only several rather dated studies dealing with the subject in general are listed in the bibliography (many texts already in W. Behringer, C. Ott-Koptschalijski, *Der Traum vom Fliegen* [Frankfurt a. M., 1991]).

The material is presented in four sections and there are summarizing comments at the end, followed by a detailed bibliography and an index. The index contains a useful list of Greek and Latin terms related to flying.

The first and largest section deals with flying proper. It is subdivided into four chapters: flying in mythology, i.e. flights of gods like Hermes and Iris, as well as aerial journeys in carriages of all kinds, for instance, in Homer, Virgil, and Ovid, and especially such flights undertaken by heroes and humans, among others the myths of Perseus, Daedalus and Icarus, Phaethon, Bellerophon, Phrixos, and Helle. There is an especially detailed treatment of Ovid's description of the construction of Daedalus' wings in *Ars Amatoria* and the *Metamorphoses*. This leads to the question (answered in the affirmative) of whether flight may after all have been possible with these wings. L.-H. also attempts to disclose common aspects of those 'air travellers', for example, the hubris of their desire to aim higher and higher, which is, however, something that cannot be said about Helle. In general, L.-H. treats the texts with great care, whereas she appears not to be exactly up-to-date with regard to secondary literature.

In the following chapter L.-H. deals with phantasies and parodies of flying. In his comedy *Eirene* Aristophanes parodies the Bellerophon-myth in the celestial journey of Trygaeus on a dung beetle. L.-H. gives convincing evidence for this parody at a number of points. However, little can be said about the celestial and lunar journeys in Varro's fragmentary *Satires*. In his *Icaromenippus* Lucian narrates the parodied aerial journey of Menippus, which was undertaken with a pair of wings (eagle and vulture) constructed by himself as a second Icarus. L.-H. sees this as evidence for the fact that the unusual idea of flying may have been ridiculed in antiquity, 'vielleicht weil man es für unmöglich hielt oder davon überzeugt war, daß Luftfahrt Unsinn war' (p. 112). This is too concise an explanation, since this has to be seen in the context of ancient humour in general.

Under the title of 'Other Parodies' she only deals with one aerial journey in Lucian's *Verae Historiae*. The aerial journey of Abaris on one of Apollo's arrows must be evaluated differently. It is seen here in the context of soothsaying and redeeming activities—the comparison to modern flying-doctors is utterly misleading.

Under the title 'Narrations of Legendary Aerial Journeys' she merely deals with the aerial journey of Alexander the Great, which is incorporated in the Alexander-romance. In this respect it would have been desirable to interpret this in a closer relation to the context of this particular work. Finally she also treats historical reports about flight models and attempts, among others artificial birds (in Archytas and Boethius). Here she focuses again on the question of concrete realization.

The following section is about texts on flying as a fulfillable wish, namely with a comparison to birds and mythical models, caused by a yearning to flee unpleasant and difficult situations.

Another section deals with 'Flying in a Figurative Sense'. Three forms are distinguished: flight of the soul, dreams of flying, and visions of flying as well as the view from above. For this L.-H. presents a vivid panorama of the relevant philosophical texts. What one definitely misses is a treatment of the passages in Artemidorus' *Oneirocriticon*, which would have offered an opportunity to discuss the 'dream of flying' in its conceptualization with regard also to everyday culture and not only to myth, philosophy, and parody. Not only did Artemidorus in a chapter on its own (2.68, and also 5.69–70) treat different ways of flying and their interpretation for different social groups, but he also collected the symbolic meaning of various birds.

The last chapter, 'Flying as a Metaphor', contains an analysis of differing formulations: flying as provider and recipient of an image, as well as for rapid transportation on land and on shore.

What remains is an ambivalent impression: on the one hand L.-H. deserves to be commended for her outline of an interesting subject by collecting at times out-of-the-way passages; on the other hand, some of the often very complex texts would have deserved a more intensive discussion in a wider context.

Eichstätt Catholic University

GREGOR WEBER

M. PIZZACARO: *Il triangolo amoroso: La nozione di 'gelosia' nella cultura e nella lingua greca arcaica*. ('Le Rane', 13.) Pp. 192. Bari: Levante, 1994. Paper, L. 28,000. ISBN: 88-7949-077-X.

Jealousy can be a matter of much ado about nothing; this book, based on P.'s Urbino doctoral dissertation, confronts a similar problem on the level of historical enquiry. The archaic Greeks did not have a word for it, or at any rate used no such word in their extant literature; did they experience jealousy, what did they make of it, and how can we know? P.'s response to this challenge is to take as his focus the (in the words of Giovanni Cerri, who contributes a 'Presentazione') 'situazione concreta' of the 'triangolo amoroso', which sees the 'equilibrio di coppia insidiato dall'intervento di un terzo incomodo' (p. 9). P. emphasizes in his 'Premessa' that his concern is with, not institutions, but sentiments and their articulation: 'Ciò che intendo mettere a fuoco è il sistema di nozioni e di lessemi specificamente pertinenti alle reazioni emotive del soggetto che nell'ambito di un triangolo amoroso si sente tradito dal proprio partner, sia o meno in questione un vincolo di tipo matrimoniale' (p. 18).

Chapter I, 'Triangoli omerici', considers Menelaus, Helen, and Paris in the *Iliad*; Amyntor, his *pallakis*, and Phoenix (*Iliad*, 9.444ff.); Proetus, Anteia, and Bellerophon (*Iliad*, 6.155ff.); Calypso at *Odyssey*, 5.206ff.; Hephaestus, Aphrodite, and Ares at *Odyssey*, 8.266ff.; and, finally, Achilles, Briseis, and Agamemnon. P.'s conclusion is that 'il sentimento della gelosia non era certamente sconosciuto ai Greci durante l'età arcaica; ma esso non assumeva un ruolo centrale nella cultura e nell'ideologia espresse e tramandate dai poemi epici. Non si riteneva opportuno accentuare questo tipo di sentimento, se non in contesti comici o semi-comici come quello dell'episodio cantato da Demodoco' (p. 50). Two short chapters follow, 'Era gelosa: triangolo amoroso e gelosia negli *Imi omerici*' and 'Adulterio e gelosia nel *corpus* esiodeo'; Chapter IV then considers pederastic rivalry in Theognis. In Chapter V, 'La gelosia "rituale" nei tiasi femminili', P. briefly discusses Alcman, *Partheneion* 60ff., then, at greater length, Sappho 31. Chapter VI, 'Rivalità e gelosia non "rituale" di Saffo: Andromeda', takes as its starting-point Maximus of Tyre's equation of Sappho's and Socrates' *technē erotikē*, which highlights 'lo stretto legame fra insegnamento ed *eros*, presente tanto nel tiaso di Saffo che nella cerchia di Socrate, e definisce bene l'atteggiamento di Saffo riscontrabile nei frammenti superstiti in cui si accenna alle rivali' (pp. 105–6). Chapter VII surveys 'Elena nella poesia da Omero a Pindaro', with particular attention to the *Odyssey*, and brief discussion of Sappho 16, verses which, P. believes, take a favourable view of Helen unique in archaic poetry.

In his 'Conclusionone', P. summarizes his findings: 'Tensioni emotive intorno al triangolo amoroso esistono, anche se angolate diversamente rispetto alla nostra cultura; ma non emerge l'esigenza di adoperare un significante specifico che le indichi' (p. 147). Why did matters change in the classical period? The explanation lies, for P., above all 'nel quadro generale dei cambiamenti politici e culturali che hanno luogo nell'Atene classica. Con la democrazia ateniese si verifica un mutamento di prospettiva radicale, consistente soprattutto nel rendere pubblica la singola individualità con i suoi più riposti dissidi e le sue intime miserie—e grandezze' (p. 150).

An appendix, 'Lo Spartano non sia geloso', considers Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 15ff. The volume concludes with indices of 'Passi Antichi Citati', 'Autori Moderni Citati', and 'Termini Greci', and

a bibliography. Passages discussed are invariably translated; on what basis the original is sometimes given, sometimes not, was unclear to me.

University of Nottingham

R. I. WINTON

M. DARDER LISSÓN: *De nominibus equorum circensium. Pars occidentis*. Pp. 402, 16 pls. Barcelona: Reial Acadèmia de Bones Lletres, 1996. Paper.

In the preface to *Roman Circuses: Arenas for Chariot Racing* (Berkeley, 1986) John Humphrey bemoaned the scant attention paid to sociological aspects of the games and, above all, the lack of studies of horses and charioteers. D. L.'s thoroughly researched and well illustrated study redresses the balance and establishes the importance of race horses (interestingly, to a lesser extent charioteers) within Roman society. D. L.'s coverage is outlined in a brief introduction: the western Mediterranean between the late first and the early fifth century. D. L. also discusses the varied sources: *defixiones*, mosaics, inscriptions, knifehandles, tesserae, gold, glasses, pottery, and contorniates as well as some literary evidence; these are all listed in an appendix (pp. 291–337) which facilitates cross-referencing.

The bulk of the volume comprises an alphabetical list of 562 names of horses, including incomplete and doubtful ones (pp. 17–290). Entries present the same twofold structure: name, evidence, and Catalan translation, followed by interpretation and definition based on etymology and semantics. Names are classified according to six different yet complementary fields: appearance, mood, skill, origin, affection, and expectations. For example, *Phosphorus* (Ausonius, *Epitaphia Heroum* 33, 1) referred to the horse's appearance and colour but also conveyed hope of victory and good omens. Likewise *Maurus* indicated the horse's colour and speed as well as its origin. Names of gods remained common at the end of the fourth century, an illustration of why the Church continued to regard hippodromes as places of the Devil even when emperors were enhancing their significance. The inventory provides a fascinating body of linguistic and socio-cultural information, which illumines the social status of the *equi circenses* and the relationship between owner, horse, and charioteer. Much benefit can be derived even without a knowledge of Catalan.

University of Nottingham

A. COROLEU

H. SOLIN: *Die stadtrömischen Sklavennamen: ein Namenbuch*. 3 vols. *I: Lateinische Namen; II: Griechische Namen; III: Barbarische Namen; Indices*. (Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei, 2.) Pp. xxiv + 184; xvi + 185–597; xvi + 598–727. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996. DM 196. ISBN: 3-515-07002-8.

In this work, the leading authority on Roman onomastics sets out to provide an exhaustive catalogue of slave names (including the *cognomina* of freedmen) that are attested in or for the city of Rome, above all in inscriptions. The first fascicle lists Latin (184 pp.) and the second Greek names (413 pp.), while the third contains 'barbarian' (18 pp.) and otherwise obscure names (20 pp.) as well as various indices. The preponderance of Greek names is obvious at first sight. Latin and Greek names are classified according to their meaning: slaves' names were derived from historical and mythological characters, geographical terms, physical and mental properties, circumstances, functions, the calendar, animals and plants, and much more. In Latin, names related to circumstances or conditions, such as 'lucky', are the most numerous, followed by those referring to qualities. In Greek, by contrast, a mythological background is by far the most common. 'Barbarian' names are mostly of Semitic origin, with only a few Iranian, Thracian, Egyptian, African, Illyrian, Germanic, Celtic, and Iberian additions. Each source has been roughly dated and, if possible, the individual references for each lemma are listed in chronological order; the collection extends into the fifth century A.D. The printed catalogue omits contextual evidence of servile status or origin: the reader is asked to rely on S.'s

classification (p. XXII). The final fascicle closes with a reverse glossary and an alphabetical register of the lemmata.

The 'top ten' list (p. 680) reveals the most common slave names: Felix (attested 461 times), Eros (346), and Hermes (328), followed by Hilarus, Prima, Antiochus, Alexander, Onesimus, Faustus, and Primus. It should be noted, however, that Prima and Primus between them account for 397 references and thus come second overall. In stark contrast to the reality and common perception of slavery as a degrading condition, the most popular names stress fortunate circumstances, such as being lucky or the first. If Euripides' claim that slaves often bore ugly names (*TGF*² fr. 831) is not borne out by Athenian inscriptions, it is even less true for Roman society. Although slave names on Greek epitaphs in Rome more often insinuate character weaknesses than Latin texts, derogatory names remain very rare overall. Only seldom would speaking names draw attention to the slave's *status*: the blunt term 'Erilis' appears just once, whereas Ingenuus/Ingenua are more frequent (twenty-three references). Sexual connotations (beyond, perhaps, Mammata and Ruma) also seem to be missing.

It catches the eye that the favourite slave name of the Roman jurists, Stichus (borne by two-thirds of all slaves in the Digest: see M. Morabito, *Les réalités de l'esclavage d'après le Digeste* [Paris, 1981], pp. 136–41), is attested only once in the capital (p. 566). Conversely, the most popular slave name in the epigraphic record, Felix, appears only once in the Digest. This strange inversion requires explanation. To complicate matters further, the second most popular choice of the jurists, Pamphilus/a (every fifth slave in the Digest), is also very common in the epigraphic material, where it is attested 130 times. Names ending in *-por* (p. 131), thought to have been customary in early Roman history, hardly ever crop up in inscriptions (with only one Gaipor, Marpor, Naepor, and Olipor each). They must have gone out of fashion by the end of the Republic, even though the one reference to Gaipor dates from the Principate.

S. does not give the total number of recorded slaves and freedmen but it clearly runs into tens of thousands; the index lists close to 5,800 different names. As an indexed catalogue of names, this work represents an enormous quarry for future study but does not offer any commentary. For that, one will eagerly await S.'s own 'historical–philological analysis' of these names currently in preparation (pp. XXI, XXIV). Existing work is old (e.g. J. Baumgart, *Die römischen Sklavennamen* [Breslau, 1936]) and most recent work deals with ancient Greece, where the detailed discussion by C. Fragiadakis, *Die attischen Sklavennamen von der spätarachaischen Epoche bis in die römische Kaiserzeit* (Mannheim, 1986) set a new standard for the study of ancient slave names.

Darwin College, Cambridge

WALTER SCHEIDEL

A. WINTERLING (ed.): *Zwischen 'Haus' und 'Stadt': antike Höfe im Vergleich*. (Historische Zeitschrift, 23.) Pp. vii + 175. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1997. Paper, DM 58. ISBN: 3-486-64423-8.

This collection of essays on the court in antiquity takes throughout a fairly abstract view of its subject, with a focus on the way court society communicates with itself and the rest of society, the presentation of image, the recruitment of members to court, and the triangular relationship between monarch, court, and state.

The chapters include a general and methodological chapter at the beginning, and a comparative conclusion at the end, by Winterling, and in between chronological chapters. G. Weber on the Hellenistic period focuses on the increasingly formalized court; R. Rilinger indicates ways in which the *domus* of the great late Republican politicians was developing features similar to those of the later imperial court (though his account of the development of Roman domestic architecture, and of earlier Rome in general, is particularly schematic and unconvincing); Winterling develops ideas on the palaces of the early emperors as maintaining some of the attributes of private Republican homes; and C. Gizewski looks at the development of the court apparatus of the later empire.

That the ancient world had something approaching a court system is not a new idea; the so-called 'friends' of Philip, Alexander, and the Successors have been studied, and Wallace-Hadrill has carefully analysed the early empire in terms of a court system (*Cambridge Ancient History* volume X [second edition], pp. 283–308). The broad comparative spectrum does point up the differences between Pompey's position at Rome and even a client-king's position in his own kingdom, or between a Ptolemy, with the security of a long tradition of monarchy, and an early

emperor with the weight of morality and tradition resting strongly in a Republican past; and carrying the story into the later empire reminds us of the important question of the extent of continuity of the court and the structures of court society across the period of the fall of the Roman empire and into the early Middle Ages, though it is not something really addressed here, despite the comparison with later periods.

However, the determination to structure the book around the contrast between the private *oikos* and the public *polis*, and to situate the court between the two, is not wholly successful. It does not really work for Rome, and it leads Winterling to equate 'Höflichkeit', 'courtesy', 'courtoisie', and 'cortesia' (which I suspect all cover slightly different semantic ranges) with *urbanitas* and *ἀστεύστῆς* (p. 165), which seems to blur all sorts of distinctions and temporal shifts, ancient and modern.

This is a challenging general approach to a fascinating subject. Perhaps its greatest failing is not to convey a greater sense of what being at court might have been like. In later times, courtiers we know of were awestruck by grandeur, dreadfully bored, or mortally afraid—sometimes all at the same time. Even Castiglione, who wrote the most renowned account of how to be a courtier in the sixteenth century, ended his career in embarrassment. This book would have been more true to the reality of the court if it had included more in the way of the chilling story told by Philo of Alexandria in the *Legatio ad Gaium* and *In Flaccum* of the Jewish delegation to the court of Gaius Caligula in 40 A.D., of their long waits, their moments of elation and despair, of the distance in almost every respect between themselves and the emperor, who was as likely as not to turn his attention to interior decoration rather than the plight of Jews forced into a ghetto in Alexandria and threatened with the desecration of their temple. Since the court depends not just on the character of the monarch, but even on the monarch's changing moods, a generalizing account can only tell part of the story.

University of St Andrews

CHRISTOPHER SMITH

C. GILLIS, B. WELLS, G. NORDQUIST, M. FRISSELL, M. ELLIOTT: *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: Sweden, 4: Medelhavsmuseet and Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, 2*. Pp. 88, 220 figs, 35 pls. Stockholm: Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien, 1995. SEK 260. ISBN: 91-7402-254-7.

The five authors of this *CVA* discuss 214 vases from Mycenaean to late-fourth-century black-glaze. The volume is detailed, clearly written, and illustrated to the expected standards, although the plates are on flimsier paper than is usual in *CVAs*.

The twenty-four Mycenaean vases (discussed by Carole Gillis) are, except two, from Cyprus, the earliest an LHIIB rounded alabastron (pl. 1.4), the latest an LHIIB late/IIC stirrup jar (pl. 3.3). The Protogeometric and Geometric (Berit Wells) are almost entirely Attic (with two Melian vases on pl. 16, and perhaps pl. 14.4–6, West Greek), and mostly LG with no EG or MG. The four vases on pl. 5 (where the captions for 5.4 and 5.6 have been transposed) are dated broadly PG, with pl. 5.7–8 at the end of the period (might it be EG?). Pl. 6.1–4, an LGIIB neck-handled amphora by W's Stockholm Painter, depicts warriors and chariot, with a lower frieze of bulls. W. refers to the LGIA pitcher, pl. 10–11.1–2, as 'a good example of the employment of templates for executing maeanders' (p. 23), an important observation needing expansion and better illustration, as the use of templates is not obvious from the photographs.

'East Greek and Related Pottery' (Gullög Nordquist) ranges from the splendid Linear island style amphora of 670–650 (pls 17–18) to the Rhodian lion's head aryballos of c. 560 (pl. 22.3–5) and several late archaic plastic fruits, probably also Rhodian (pl. 22.6–10). In between come more workmanlike products, e.g. a Fikellura amphora (pl. 19.3–5), and Klazomenian amphora, dinos, and krater fragments (pl. 20.1–4; the latter needs a figure-drawing). The small Ionian oinochoe, pl. 20.5–6, looks patterned rather than BF, as no incision is apparent. Pl. 21.8 (p. 37, fig. 78), called a BF skyphos, also appears to lack incision; unfortunately, no parallels are offered. Pl. 22.1 is from Robert Cook's Enmann Class (not 'Group'). Here (and p. 38), the 1st edn of Cook's *Greek Painted Pottery* is used rather than the 2nd edn (1972); the 3rd edn appeared after this *CVA*. Only the 1st edn of Noble, *Techniques of Painted Attic Pottery* is used (pp. 63, 65, 68, 84).

The pattern vases (Marianne Frisell) are, except two Boeotian, all Attic, mostly lekythoi, about

half white-ground. The remaining dozen vases represent a variety of shapes, including a feeder (pl. 28.1) and three plemochoai (pl. 29.1–7).

Maria Elliott's discussion of the black-glazed pottery makes much use of parallels from the Pantanello necropolis at Metaponto, since 'there are few published works on black vases outside Greece' (p. 59). Fair enough, but the place of origin is of greater significance for present purposes than the find-spots, especially since, as E. notes, 'The majority of the black vases in the Museum have no provenience'. It is reassuring, therefore, that frequent reference is made to *Agora XII*, still essential for anyone working with black-glazed vases. B. also contends that in the Black Sea area, Attic imports increased in the fourth century. This is received wisdom: E. cites J. Bouzek, *Studies of Greek Pottery in the Black Sea Area* (Prague, 1990), but that is a partial study, and the picture is changing in some respects at least. For example, the recent Moscow Academy of Sciences/University of London renewed study of Attic imports at Phanagoria indicates that the peak, for both black-glaze and figured, occurs in the fifth not fourth century (C. Morgan and K. Arafat in M. Fol and G. Tsatskheladze [edd.], *Proceedings of the 1st International Pontic Congress* [forthcoming]).

None of the above points detracts from the value of this *CVA*, nor does the one major editorial inconsistency, which, nonetheless, is worth noting. Munsell readings are used for Protogeometric and Geometric, for fabric; East Greek and related pottery (apart from pl. 16.6–7), often for paint as well as fabric; and black-glaze pottery (after 'the surface has been scraped in order to separate the colour of the clay from a covered wash', p. 60, a dubious procedure); in addition, the surface colours of the black-glaze vases are given by Munsell terminology, but not readings. It is in the Mycenaean section that Munsells are most missed: their use for both the fabric and paint of Mycenaean vases has been championed particularly by Jeremy Rutter (e.g. *The Late Helladic IIIB and IIIC Periods at Korakou and Gonia in the Corinthia*, PhD diss., 1974 [UMI, 1981], pp. 17–18, 570–81), and his example is now standardly followed in Mycenaean publications. The use of Munsells in a *CVA* is unusual, perhaps unprecedented. It is a welcome development, but either it should be done consistently, or the need for it should be assessed, and explained, for each category of vases.

King's College London

K. W. ARAFAT

P. HEESSEN with H. A. U. BRIJDER, J. L. KLUIVER: *The J. L. Theodor Collection of Attic Black-Figure Vases* (Allard Pierson Series, 10: Studies in Ancient Civilization). Pp. 210, 51 pls, 156 figs. Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Museum, 1996. ISBN: 90-71211-26-6.

Volume 10 in the *Allard Pierson Series* publishes the J. L. Theodor vase collection, Brussels, to coincide with its exhibition in the winter of 1996/97 at the Allard Pierson Museum; Dr Theodor had already presented eleven items from his collection to the Museum, and they appear here with the rest.

The collection's distinguishing features are its concentration on a single fabric, Attic black-figure, and the unusually high overall quality of the vases. Theodor's particular interest is cups, a field shared by all three authors—Professor Brijder has published shape-monographs earlier in the series. The collection provides a representative view of the development of the Attic shapes, from Komast cups onwards, finishing with Type C cups and a cup-skyphos dated to the end of the sixth century B.C. Equally useful is the run of lekythoi, from a splendidly corpulent item decorated by the Malibu Painter, c. 560–55 B.C., to a rail-thin white-ground member of the Haimon Group dated to about 475 B.C. Some fine amphorae, jugs, and a kalpis balance the smaller shapes.

The volume shares a very high quality of production with its predecessors in the series: virtually all the vases receive a colour illustration, and each of the fifty-two items has its own catalogue entry—a description with excellent photographs, attribution, and bibliography where appropriate. Each entry also has a commentary, which allows its author to discuss painter or iconography, and adduce comparanda. Perhaps the most useful outcome of this is the discussion of workshop habits or practice, and of stock scenes: the short sections on chariot scenes in the commentaries on nos. 4 and 18 are excellent examples. Here one of the commonplaces of late-sixth-century subjects is given a context, and taken together, the two pieces expand the connotations of chariots and funerary iconography.

A recent trend seen in fascicles of the *Corpus Vasorum* is the more comprehensive provision of profile drawings, which reflects greater interest in potting as well as painting, or at least in the whole vase and not merely its decoration. *CVA* Berlin 7, like other recent publications, includes some images produced radiographically. Profile drawings produced by conventional methods have their drawbacks, not least the practical difficulties of measuring the thickness of the walls of closed shapes. Real anomalies in potting may go unrecognized, because the inner surface of a complete vessel cannot be seen. The exhibition of the Theodor material allowed an opportunity for the vases to be put through the CT scanner of the Academic Medical Centre of the University of Amsterdam, and each entry here is accompanied by a scanned image. This reveals the interior surface of a vessel very clearly. Winifred van der Put illustrates in an appendix the future possibilities of the technique for ceramic studies with scans of two lekythoi by the Gela Painter, clearly produced by the same potter, who had a difficulty in centring the cylinder demonstrated by the uneven thickness of the wall; the lowest point of the interior is lower than the top surface of the foot. A conventional profile drawing might reveal the latter, but the irregular wall-thickness would be very unlikely to emerge in the process of measuring-up a complete lekythos. That the two vases came from the same potter seems undeniable, and further studies of such scanned material could have important consequences for the understanding of Athenian workshop practices and techniques. Together with the treatment given here to the wider context of standard subject matter on these vessels, we have the conditions in which to expand the study of an important craft tradition which very occasionally gave rise to masterpieces of decorative art, rather than an art form with a depressing underclass of substandard products.

University of Glasgow

ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

V. KARAGEORGHIS, R. LAFFINEUR, F. VANDENABEELE (edd.): *Four Thousand Years of Images on Cypriote Pottery. Proceedings of the Third International Conference of Cypriote Studies, Nicosia, 3–4 May 1996*. Pp. 174, 1 ill. Brussels, Liège, and Nicosia: A. G. Leventis Foundation, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 9963-560-31-8.

This volume contains the papers delivered at the Third International Conference of Cypriote Studies (1996). Previous conferences considered Cypriote Terracottas (1989) and Cypriote Stone Sculpture (1993), and this volume emulates its two predecessors in publishing the proceedings within two years of the conference. The four thousand years of its title cover the Chalcolithic down to the Roman period; of the fifteen papers, ten are in English and five are in French. There is particular attention paid to the range of striking zoomorphic designs, with papers devoted to the subject by Annie Caubet and Robert Merrillées on 'Les askoi anthropomorphes et zoomorphes aux périodes CA et CM', Marguerite Yon on 'Rhytons zoomorphes et vases figuratifs au Bronze Récent', Nota Kourou on 'Cypriot Zoomorphic Askoi of the Early Iron Age. A Cypro-Aegean Interplay', and Antoine Herman, on 'Vases à embouchure en forme de tête animale à l'âge du Fer'. In each case the papers are free-standing, and presumably have been published much as delivered in conference form; in consequence we miss the element of editorial interaction between papers, so that, for example, there is no cross-reference between Caubet & Merrillées and Kourou.

The volume opens with a brief survey of 'Incised and Painted Human Figures in the Neolithic and Bronze Age' by Paul Åström: examples are few, and Åström extends his survey to include Middle Bronze Age Cycladic, Helladic, Minoan, and Near Eastern, as well as Cypriot. Against this background, he pleads for a comprehensive survey of the representation, and meaning, of gesture in all facets of Cypriot artwork, a plea which it is to be hoped will not go unheeded. The theme of human, as well as animal, representation is taken up for the transitional stage between the last phase of the Cypriot Bronze Age (Late Cypriot IIIB) and the Early Iron Age by Maria Iacovou in 'Images in Silhouette: the Missing Link of the Figurative Representations on Eleventh Century BC Cypriote Pottery'. Again, the material is limited, in this case to Proto-White Painted Ware in LCIIIB, and to a mere eleven examples of it at that; however, Iacovou adds a previously unpublished Proto-White Painted askos which resurfaced in 1996, probably originating from the necropolis of Alaas. Particularly striking amongst the images on these twelve vases discussed by Iacovou is the warrior on a kalathos from Palaepaphos, dressed in a short tunic, with helmet, greaves, and long sword with tasselled sheath, whom she considers

closely kin to the foot soldiers depicted on the famous LHIII C Warrior Vase from Mycenae; a further attribute is a lyre which he carries in his raised hand, and which persuades I. to recall the portrayal of Achilles in *Iliad* 9: more likely, perhaps, the Homeric parallels (particularly in the form of Paris) might suggest that in the lyre-playing warrior there is the antithesis of the worlds of peace and of war. However, it is the sudden appearance of silhouette portrayal which is the most important feature of Proto-White Ware, and I. maintains the Syro-Palestine affinities of the technique against a proposed Minoan origin. A modified form of this latter is presented by Vassos Karageorghis in 'The Pictorial Style in Vase-painting of the Early Cypro-Geometric Period'. K. engages with I.'s earlier *The Pictorial Pottery of Eleventh Century BC Cyprus* (Göteborg, 1988) rather than her conference paper, pointing to larnakes of LM Crete as possible prototypes, whilst stressing the rôle of the native painter in thus fusing influences from both Aegean and Levant into the distinctive Cypriot pictorial style. Similarly Louise Steel in 'Pictorial White Slip—The Discovery of a New Ceramic Style in Cyprus', discussing a fragmentary White Slip krater discovered at Kalavassos in 1994, takes full account of the oriental connotations as well as the elements of Mycenaean pictorial style in its decoration, but nevertheless gives proper emphasis to it as a local response to these external influences. Other subjects covered in this wide-ranging volume include Ellen Herscher on 'Representational Relief on Early and Middle Cypriot Pottery', Karin Nys on 'Vases with Anthropomorphic Protomes in the Cypro-Geometric and Cypro-Archaic Periods (1050–475 BC)', Héléne Cassimatis on 'Le rhyton à Chypre à l'époque historique', Frieda Vandenebeele on 'The Pictorial Decoration of the Cypriote Jugs with Figurines Holding an Oinochoe', Demetrios Michaelides on 'Magenta Ware in Cyprus Once More', Robert Laffineur on 'The Cypriote Ring-Vases Reconsidered', and Antoine Hermary on 'Le "style d'Amathonte"'.

For this breadth of subject matter and, in particular, for the speed of publication, there is inevitably a price to pay: spelling and typographical errors—'long-robbed figure', 'to a large extent'—are numerous; there is a serious displacement of plates illustrating Iacovou's piece—in her catalogue vase no. 4 is plate XIIc (not XIIIa), no. 5 is XIIIa (not XIIIb), no. 6 is XIIIb (not XIIIc), no. 7 is XIIIc (not XIId), no. 8 is XIId (not XIIIe), no. 10 is XIIIe (not XIVb), no. 11 is XIVb (not XIVc), on p. 64 vase no. 12 is plates XIVc and XIVd (not XIVd and XVa), and the kalathos discussed on p. 67 is plate XVa (not XVb), whilst plate XVb receives no acknowledgement in the text; plate XIIc is reproduced at XIXb but, once again, we miss editorial cross-reference; in Nota Kourou's Early Iron Age categorization of zoomorphic askoi (p. 90) her plates are XXIVa–d (not XIVa–d). At times these flaws can be distracting rather than merely irritating; and although the significance of the individual contributions offers adequate compensation, they collectively lack the cohesion which the importance of the subject so clearly merits.

University of Exeter

N. POSTLETHWAITE

J. B. RUTTER: *Lerna: A Preclassical Site in the Argolid: Results of Excavations Conducted by The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Vol. III: The Pottery of Lerna IV*. Pp. xxxvi + 780, 5 plans, 125 figs, 21 pls. Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1995. \$120. ISBN: 0-87661-226-5.

This impressive tome comes hedged about with mildly defensive background information about the history of its parent excavation, and the circumstances in which the work on its material was done; in fact the joins are not evident to anyone but those already possessed of the knowledge, and the difficulty of what Jeremy Rutter was asked to do is transparent, not least because archaeological method has moved on in the forty years since the original excavation.

Lerna, in the Argolid, is regarded as the type-site for the pre-Mycenaean period in southern Greece; Lerna IV, to which the pottery series typologized here belongs, is the Early Helladic III settlement which follows the destruction of the House of the Tiles. Lerna was originally excavated in the 1950s, and reported in *Hesperia* by John L. Caskey, the then Director of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens; ill-health and other commitments meant that he did not see the project to completion; *Lerna I* (1969) and *Lerna II* (1971) deal with fauna and people respectively, and the American School is now engaged in extending the series and particularly in initiating publication of the artefacts from the site. R. publishes the EHIII pottery here; his

particular interest in the nature of the change from EHII to EHIII underlies the project. Although views on this have changed since Lerna was dug, in the light of important excavations at other sites, the Lerna material is so voluminous that it must continue to play an important part in any understanding of the cultural shift implied in the chronological subdivision. Physico-chemical analyses of the pottery were undertaken by Sarah Vaughan, George Myer, Philip Betancourt, and Richard Jones, and appear here as extremely full appendices, liberally supported by tables and graphs, and given an archaeological analysis by R.

Elizabeth Banks provides a chapter of introduction to the nature and problems of Lerna IV, a phase defined by excavation of the area east of a tumulus over the burnt debris of the House of the Tiles. The phase is characterized on this site by continued use of apsidal buildings orientated east–west, and by rapid multiplication and evolution of its structures.

R.'s pottery analysis depends on rigorous classification by class, shape, and decoration, all extremely carefully defined, as are the other technical terms he uses—a serious attempt to make the language of artefact description objective. His catalogue is followed by a shape analysis, which he uses as a tool for discussion of the evolution of the types he identifies, and, as elsewhere, uses tables to look at comparative material from other sites. He is thus able to argue that the shape repertoire of EHIII Lerna is very different from the last phase of EHII, and also that it shows a mix of elements, some clearly indigenous, others imported. He regards the important intrusions as those from eastern central Greece and the eastern Aegean, i.e. along one natural trade route. The chapter on decoration supports the conclusions drawn from the shapes. He is also able to distinguish a late phase of Lerna IV in which he relates further abrupt changes of shape to internal reorganization, perhaps linked to some of the building phenomena on the site, and discards the possibility of the incursion of a new ethnic group as a probable cause.

This conclusion is likely to be a controversial one; the book itself is an outstanding example of a rigorous approach to the treatment of archaeological artefacts, and should serve as a yardstick for later volumes.

University of Glasgow

ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

N. C. STAMPOLIDIS: *Antipoina 'Reprisals'*. Pp. 253, 224 figs. Rethymnon: University of Crete, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 960-85468-4-2.

The focus of this archaeological study is a late Geometric funeral pyre (Pyre A) discovered in the cemetery of Orthi Petra at ancient Eleutherna in Crete. Although many more pyres, containing individual and multiple cremations, as well as a number of inhumation graves and inhumed child burials, have been found in the cemetery, S. has chosen to present the material from Pyre A separately because of the discovery not only of a cremated warrior and his companion but also of a beheaded, inhumed skeleton which, in S.'s opinion, is reminiscent of the scene described in the *Iliad* of the execution of the young Trojan captives at Patroclus' pyre. S. is persuaded by this and other similarities between Pyre A and Homer's description of heroic cremations that he has found sufficient proof that Homer was describing contemporary funerary practice (here dated *c.* 700 B.C.).

After a detailed description of the pyre's contents, S. embarks on a lengthy discussion, primarily of Homer's accounts of cremation burial practices and, to a lesser extent, of late Geometric/Archaic funerary iconography, with a view to determining whether similar rituals were performed at Pyre A. The main issues addressed include the preparation and building of pyre, prothesis and ekphora, funeral feasts, libations, and the binding and slaughter of the apparent 'sacrificial victim'. However, this synthesis of specialist scholarship does not promote his cause significantly, principally because many elements of the ritual are not archaeologically traceable. Moreover, evidence such as unguent vases and the remains of feasting found at the pyre is not peculiar only to Homer and Eleutherna but occurs at a large number of sites with differing chronologies and diverse burial customs. It should be emphasized that cremation burials of the Late Dark Age and Early Archaic periods exhibited a great variety of forms throughout Greece which are not only absent from the Homeric epic but are also in contrast to the cremations at Eleutherna. So even if one assumes that Pyre A and the epic have a number of features in common, an isolated case does not alone constitute sufficient proof that Homer was describing contemporary society.

In the final section S. offers alternative hypotheses concerning both the status of the warrior and his companion and the identity of the beheaded man. Although it seems a fair conclusion

that the warrior was of high social status, it remains uncertain whether the beheaded man was a local, presumably of inferior status, or a foreign captive, and hence the circumstances and significance of the execution remain equally unclear. Furthermore, uncertainty regarding the sex of the warrior's companion and his/her relationship to the warrior renders the remainder of the discussion conjectural. Prehistoric and proto-historic archaeological studies by definition encounter certain obstacles, namely, the lack of any independent means of assessment and insufficient evidence, which, when compounded, as in this instance, by an overreliance on the dubious merits of Homeric historicity and a deliberately circumscribed primary database, inevitably frustrate substantive conclusions.

Cambridge

STEVE TARLAS

K. SCHAUBURG: *Die stadtrömischen Erosen-Sarkophage: III Faszikel: Zirkusrennen und verwandte Darstellungen.* (Die antiken Sarkophagreliefs, 5.2.3.) Pp. 112, 64 pls, 190 figs. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1995. DM 142. ISBN: 3-7861-1688-1.

This volume of *ASR* catalogues scenes linked by the theme of circus racing: the largest group, 103 metropolitan Roman sarcophagi with cupids racing chariots in the circus, Schauburg categorizes as 'canonical', but a smaller group uses human charioteers, and there are also various idiosyncratic scenes (mainly on lids) showing preparations before and parades or sacrificial processions after the race, and races of *desultores* or of cupids riding wild animals. Also included are three sarcophagi from Italian workshops, eighteen Attic sarcophagi, and one from Asia Minor. On the eastern pieces cupids drive chariots drawn by wild animals and are often arranged antithetically, not one after the other as on the western sarcophagi, and the setting is less clearly identified as the circus. The scenes also occupy more subsidiary positions, on the back, above garlands, or as minor decoration.

The 'canonical' design has four chariots, usually horse-drawn *bigae*, racing from left to right, their drivers nude, mostly winged, cupids. One chariot (usually the second, sometimes the third) has overturned, though two pieces have two such accidents and some none. The first charioteer is the winner, signalled by a palm branch, wreath, or jubilant gesture. There may be *hortatores* riding in the background, and *sparsores* beneath the horses. The *metae* and a selection of the monuments associated with the Circus Maximus appear in the background. The canonical form allows for considerable variation: three pieces have eight chariots arranged in two tiers moving in opposite directions, some have clothed cupids, and one a charioteer with portrait features. The earliest are late Hadrianic, the majority Antonine, and the latest late third century. By contrast the sarcophagi with human charioteers are late and derive from the established design with cupids. Also early (late Trajanic/early Hadrianic) are three of the more unusual pieces, a chest with a ceremonial winner's parade, and two lids with cupids riding/driving wild animals. The earliest of the Attic sarcophagi dates to c. A.D. 150. The sizes of the Roman sarcophagi suggest most were for children, even those with human charioteers, but some are large enough for adults. It is not known whether the occupants were boys or girls. The *biga* may have been preferred over the *quadriga* because children did race *bigae*, but they are also technically easier to represent.

S. is predominantly concerned with two questions: origins and meaning. Others have located the origin of Roman circus iconography in Greece, but S. believes it was a specifically Roman development. Although cupid as a charioteer is found in Attic art, it was developments in south Italy and Etruria which influenced Rome. S. also briefly discusses the use of pattern books in transmitting designs, accepting their existence as a probability, but not ruling out other possibilities.

ASR volumes traditionally describe what is represented rather than discussing why, but S. devotes a large proportion of his commentary to the question of what the racing cupids meant to the purchasers of the sarcophagi. He rejects various interpretations, especially that racing cupids are associated with the Seasons, and hence the Cosmos, or with the cult of Sol. He is also unimpressed by the view that they represent those who die young, or by Cumont's interpretation based on Plato's *Phaedrus*. He does, however, raise as a central question whether the deceased would be identified with the winner of the race or with the charioteer who has had an accident, and also considers seriously that the race might be seen as an allegory. He notes that danger distinguishes these racing scenes from other cupid sarcophagi, but is reluctant to identify the

fallen cupids with the deceased, or to interpret the scenes as allegories of the perils of life. Rather, he reiterates his view that cupids on sarcophagi in general presage an idyllic afterlife and here are shown behaving in quintessentially childish ways which would appeal to the grieving parents. This rather disappointing conclusion is unlikely to be the last word on the significance of racing cupids than in Roman funerary art. S.'s volume, collecting together as it does a much larger catalogue than previously known (including many lost and fragmentary pieces), and with its excellent illustrations, is an invaluable resource for those wishing to take the question of meaning further.

University of Edinburgh

GLENYS DAVIES

M. DONDERER: *Die Architekten der späten römischen Republik und der Kaiserzeit: Epigraphische Zeugnisse*. (Erlanger Forschungen, Reihe A: Geisteswissenschaften, 69.) Pp. 355, 72 pls. Erlangen: Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1996. ISBN: 3-930357-08-9.

D.'s focus is the epigraphic testimony for architects and their activities. Such an undertaking might seem too *recherché* to warrant a substantial book, the more so as D. convincingly argues that it was the exception rather than the rule for architects to have their names inscribed on the buildings they designed (pp. 27–39). On the other hand, this same fact means that the relatively few epigraphic testimonies of architects which we do have (161 certain and four possible architects active between the late Republic and Justinian) are the more precious for that, and therefore deserve examination.

Whether the ground might not have been better prepared by a series of articles is a fair question. D. demonstrates that architects designated themselves and/or their professional activity through use of the terms ἀρχιτέκτων/*architectus* or the verbs ἀρχιτεκτεῖν/*architectari*. This is obviously necessary if one is to separate architects as a professional group from others in the building trade; but did ten pages need to be taken up proving this point (pp. 15–24)?

In the first part of the book, the general results derived from the analysis of the inscriptions are set out (pp. 15–78). The meat of the work follows: an epigraphic catalogue of the certain, possible, and problematic architects (pp. 79–312). Texts are set out according (as far as possible) to the original pagination, followed by translation and commentary. In addition each inscription's find-spot, current location (where known), and approximate date are given, together with a bibliography. In many cases (but not all) D. has included museum catalogue numbers, something for which all epigraphers should be grateful. Use of the catalogue is facilitated by nine separate and comprehensive indices (pp. 317–55).

D. has taken the trouble to supply photographs of his texts wherever possible (ninety-two photographs, supplemented by twelve drawings of lost or problematic texts). These photographs, mostly of high quality, are an invaluable aid to those wishing to conduct detailed analysis themselves: D. clearly recognizes that serious epigraphy cannot be done without sight (where possible) of the stone, its decoration, layout, and context. Not so useful are the eight photographs of inscriptions not in the catalogue but discussed in the analysis: no texts are provided!

The analysis is carefully handled by D., if at times a bit pedestrian. Some results are surprising: architects' 'signatures', as D. terms them, are rarely found on religious buildings; however, architects often give thanks to the gods for successful completion of the task in hand, not only out of piety, but also from a desire to get their names displayed somewhere. Such dedications were placed to bring the relevant work to the attention of posterity and of potential patrons (pp. 27–39). Concentrations of architects' inscriptions are rare: the significant void is Rome, the main concentration Campania (pp. 30–1); D. has convincing explanations for both, to which we might add the high level of urbanization in Campania. D. argues, surely correctly, that the architects who appear in these inscriptions are generally of comfortable means, sometimes of equestrian status; architects were more like doctors than artisans in terms of the place they enjoyed in society (pp. 68–76); in this context it is, however, notable that public honours for outstanding architects seem to be confined to the Greek East (pp. 65–8).

As D. himself admits, one cannot simply extrapolate from these conclusions to reach generalizations applicable to all architects. There are also many things that architects' inscriptions do not tell us, areas of professional and technical activity which are hinted at in literary sources which are not attested in inscriptions. There is only so far that one can go with this material. Here we return to earlier reservations: will an analysis of a group of inscriptions which were by their

nature rare yield far-reaching conclusions? The answer, I think, is 'no', at least not without a fuller integration of the literary sources than that attempted by D. That would have meant a different book, but, I think, a better one.

In the final analysis, however, it is wrong to wish authors had written other books when there is so much that is worthwhile in what they have written. D.'s book is thorough, and does not go beyond what the evidence allows. Historians of architecture, of urbanism, and socially oriented historians, as well as some epigraphers, will find this book full of learning and stimulation.

University of Edinburgh

EDWARD BISPHAM

P. DE LA R. DU PREY: *The Villas of Pliny: from Antiquity to Posterity*. Pp. xxvi + 337. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1994. ISBN: 0-226-17300-3.

The two letters in which Pliny the Younger describes his villas at Laurentinum (2.17) and in Tuscany (5.6) have teased and tested the imaginative powers of generations of philologists, architects, and archaeologists—as well as emulators of the idealized country living evoked by the letters. Despite their mass of detail, both letters allow enormous scope to any would-be illustrator. Du Prey's book looks at the many different 'restitutions' of Pliny's villas, from the construction of the Medici villa in Fiesole in the mid-fifteenth century to an architectural competition of the late twentieth (du P. prefers the term 'restitution' to 'restoration', arguing that it avoids the implication of physical rebuilding).

Different chapters focus on a variety of approaches to 'restituting' the villas. While the second chapter has a specific focus on Pliny's influence on the Medici villas, subsequent chapters pursue chronologically parallel strands over several centuries (with considerable overlap): attempts to locate and reconstruct the villas based on remains; attempts to illustrate the villas based only on Pliny's text; and lectures and exhibitions concerned with the villas. Some valuable points are made: du P. draws attention, for instance, to the perceptive but hitherto largely unrecognized restitution of the Tuscan villa based on archaeological evidence by Francesco Lazzari in the seventeenth century. Later, there could arise a conflict between the evocative spirit of Pliny's writing and the increasing information revealed by excavations; working in the mid-nineteenth century, Luigi Canina knowingly ignored some archaeological evidence to create an idyllic fantasy of the Laurentinum. For others, such as the French scholar Louis-Pierre Haudebourt, whose restitution of the same villa was published in 1838, archaeology and romanticism could be complementary; his scholarly engravings and accurate resumé of archaeological findings are accompanied by a seductive dream sequence in which Pliny, on the model of Dante's Virgil, takes the author on a guided tour.

Despite the confusing arrangement of chapters, suggestive contrasts emerge (often in line with the differences between particular architectural schools). Using much the same evidence, the early eighteenth-century French scholar Félibien produced restitutions whose concern with the rules of planning strongly prefigured the preoccupations of the later *École des Beaux-Arts*, while in Britain, his contemporary Robert Castell produced very different villas, whose gardens closely resemble the work of William Kent at Chiswick. Some have designed versions of the villas on a scale not much less grand than that of Hadrian's villa at Tivoli, while others put forward far more modest plans, wanting to see Pliny's life in the country as offering a simplicity in deliberate contrast with the grandeur of his public life in Rome. Others again have chosen to emphasize especially the villas' service areas which Pliny's descriptions conspicuously omit. The continuing fascination of Pliny's villas lies partly at least in the ambiguity with which they are described; the number of potentially 'correct' restitutions is virtually infinite.

This study can sometimes seem rather parochial. The first chapter, concerned with the history of villas in general, begins by referring briefly to Varro and Columella and then moves on to discuss a series of well known and influential examples of later villas, such as Palladio's villa Rotonda and the villa Orianda designed by Schinkel, before concluding with a villa near Lake Ontario of no obvious architectural significance, whose architect is unknown and whose first owner, while he may have desired an 'Italian villa', may well not have even known of Pliny or indeed Palladio. An inordinate amount of space is devoted to an exhibition (which the author was involved in organizing) for which prominent architects of the 1980s were invited to submit versions of Pliny's villas. It is striking that, apart from those undertaken by archaeologists (and a model created by a film set designer), du P. records virtually no restitutions between 1921 and

1981. While the earlier restitutions were produced within an architectural tradition which saw Roman antiquity as of central importance, those of the 1980s appear to be part of a marginal and short-lived attempt to resist dominant architectural trends.

Du P.'s book, in its conclusion at least, elegantly echoes the literary structure of the two letters, focusing, as they both do in their final sections, on Pliny's favourite spots within his villas, apartments termed *amores mei*. Intriguing questions are raised—though not explored—concerning the relationship between literature and architecture. On the whole, however, elegance is not a prominent characteristic of this rather rambling study.

University of Bristol

CATHARINE EDWARDS

R. BONIFACIO: *Ritratti romani da Pompei*. Pp. 146, 44 pls. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 88-7689-132-3.

Pompeii is famous for its wall painting, as can be seen from any book on Roman art; a subject of less interest to the art historian is its sculpture. This volume contains a catalogue of fifty-two portraits that still survive from Pompeii. Each portrait is described and given its provenance, and is accompanied by bibliography and, importantly, a photograph. Few of these images ever appear in works on Roman art in general, therefore the importance of the volume is the ease of access to this material. There is now one place to examine the portraits of Holconius Priscus, the *duumvir*, Norbanus Sorex, the supporting actor, Caecilius Jucundus, or Eumachia, and of those who remain anonymous to us.

Bonifacio has studiously identified the find-spots of the statuary in the volume. This allows us to fill out the empty ruin of Pompeii and begin to think about the placing of statues in public places. The statue of Norbanus Sorex was found, not surprisingly, close to the theatre, but it should also be noted that a similar herm, now lost, was located in the Eumachia building; Marcus Holconius Rufus' statue (in a pose akin to that of Germanicus) stood outside the Stabian baths; and a bronze equestrian statue was placed in front of the Temple of Fortuna Augusta. All these locations are close to or in front of major public buildings and it is the nature of the portrait, as B. points out, to honour the person commemorated. Statues from public buildings including the Macellum, the Eumachia, and the Temple of Isis also appear in the volume.

The funerary statuary seems a far cry from those images consistently reproduced in volumes on the topic of Roman art. In terms of use of materials, we find tufa and limestone alongside examples in marble—maybe such examples are not worthy to be associated with our perception of Roman art created by the Western Renaissance with its emphasis on marble statuary. For those wishing to understand imagery within its archaeological context though, here is a mine of information. How should we view these images in contrast to the familiar marble examples from the public spaces of the city itself? Or more to the point, what is the relationship between these images with a clear qualitative difference to our minds? These questions are not directly addressed in B.'s catalogue and will remain for others to consider.

Overall, B. has put together a useful catalogue, which allows easy access to his material for scholars to begin to formulate new questions in the field of Roman art in its archaeological context.

University of Reading

RAY LAURENCE

R. LAMBRECHTS: *Artena 3: Un 'Mundus' sur le Piano della Cività?* (Études de philologie, d'archéologie et d'histoire anciennes, 33.) Pp. 227, 107 figs, 4 plans. Brussels and Rome: Institut historique belge de Rome, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 90-74461-19-0.

The third volume devoted to the excavations at Artena in Latium concerns the largest structure found, a rectangular building (24 × 7 m) in the highest part of the city, destroyed in the early third century after a life of some fifty years. Despite its 'public' and 'monumental' character, absolutely no architectonic decoration was found.

The real importance of the building is singular. In a room at one end of the building was found a (tripartite) terracotta platform of 1.40 m², the border simply decorated with circles. This covered a clay-lined pit, below which were crevices in the rock of uncertain depth. L. is surely right that this natural geological feature was invested with religious significance, whence the man-made feature above it (pp. 136, 213). Also, he plausibly identifies an external open platform, added later, as the place where a public ritual, related to the character of the pit itself, was carried out (pp. 158–70). But what was the pit for? L. suggests that it was a *mundus* (pp. 208–22).

This is not impossible: the crevices under the pit may have been sacralized as passages to a lower world. Another characteristic of the poorly understood Roman *mundus* is that it can be opened: the pit at Artena could be easily uncovered.

It was, however, also hermetically sealed, not open to the crevices below. Some ritual pits were used for safe-keeping of symbolic objects; apart from a few animal bones, that at Artena contained only earth (pp. 135–6). Further, any explanation needs to take account of the importance of water in this building (it has a large cistern, and a monolithic tufo basin on the ‘sacrificial’ platform), and thus presumably the ritual carried out there. Overall a much more careful analysis of literary and archaeological data on similar phenomena was required than the cursory overview given here. On a less fundamental note, the almost total failure to discuss the stratigraphic relationships of different parts of the building was, especially in the case of the external ‘sacrificial platform’, unfortunate.

This well-illustrated and thorough volume will serve as a sound basis for further study as new data are acquired. The jury remains out on the nature of the enigmatic sacred pit, and may never return a verdict. Artena still offers many more questions than answers.

University of Edinburgh

E. BISPHAM

S. P. OAKLEY: *The Hill-forts of the Samnites*. (Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome, 10.) Pp. xii + 164, 145 figs, 1 map. London: British School at Rome, 1995. Paper, £35. ISBN: 0-904152-28-6.

This is a very traditional antiquarian study. Like a vintage car, it is painstakingly constructed, has many admirable features, but does not reliably take us where we want to go. In the course of producing a commentary on Livy’s account of the Samnite Wars, O. decided to visit the area and then to create a complete inventory of the numerous and ill-recorded hill-forts with polygonal walling there, in order to further his understanding of the wars and the Samnite pattern of settlement. The bulk of the volume is precisely this: a geographically ordered gazetteer of the more than eighty hill-forts which are currently known in ‘Samnite’ territory. This is the only comprehensive list of these structures available, and it is authoritative. O. has personally visited virtually all the sites, an epic ten-year feat of determination and endurance that only those who have tried the odd visit can appreciate (a Munro-type society would have barely a member!). Each site is carefully located in its geographical context, perhaps rather exhaustively so. Previous studies of, or references to, each site have been tracked down thoroughly. For most sites O. has been able to reproduce an earlier plan, and for almost all he adds photographs of his own; at the end is a fine fold-out location map of the sites. There are, however, some weaknesses in O.’s one-man-and-his-Livy approach. Above all, an archaeologically trained participant could have tried to date the surface pottery which was visible at a surprisingly large number of sites (even if what is really needed is stratified evidence from excavations). In his conclusions, O. argues, from the accounts of the Samnite Wars and the five cases of excavated evidence, that the peak period of construction and use of the hill-forts with polygonal walling was the fourth century B.C. (Samnite Wars), but that occupation of the sites may go back to the seventh century, and continued, with some rebuilding of the walls, down to the first century (Social War).

In the absence of public inscriptions, few of the sites can be matched to ancient toponyms (sadly O. casts doubts on the nice identification of Monte Vairano as Aquilonia), and so the hill-forts add little to the Livian narrative. O. sees the function of the hill-forts primarily as local refuges in times of trouble, but argues that many or most were also inhabited on a regular basis,

in the context of a mixed agricultural economy with local vertical transhumance. O.'s critique of previous views is careful and perceptive, and clarifies the possibilities of interpretation. He must be right to insist that there can be no one general explanation for the chronology, type, and function of all these hill-forts. But his discussion has some disappointing limitations. There is much more evidence for the Samnite pattern of settlement, which might affect our view of the hill-forts. For rural settlement there are the results of the Biferno valley survey (published fully in the same year, but already known in outline). Rural sanctuaries do get mentioned, but not the development of low-lying urban centres in the highlands, such as Saepinum and Bovianum, now known to be a pre-Roman phenomenon, or the fuller urbanization of the lowland Samnites; this might affect O.'s assumption that Livian toponyms refer to hill-forts. Romanocentrism is a factor too. The possibility of pre-Roman Samnite-organized long-distance transhumance is too abruptly dismissed. Little space is wasted on defining the Samnites and their states and territories, on which O. simply follows Salmon. Possible differences between the states are not discussed, such as why the Hirpini had so few hill-forts, or whether the history and function of hill-forts differed between the Pentri and Caudini. Other possibilities are that the distribution by size of hill-forts may offer some clues to Samnite political organization, and that the dating and function of the fortifications may owe as much to internal Samnite or Samnite-Greek conflicts as to the wars with the Romans. However, anyone who wishes to pursue such questions will be grateful for the extremely valuable path-clearance accomplished by O., and his meticulous presentation of the data.

King's College London

D. W. RATHBONE

A. ESCH: *Römische Straßen in ihrer Landschaft. Das Nachleben antiker Straßen um Rom mit Hinweisen zur Begehen im Gelände* (Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie). Pp. 161, 216 figs (199 in colour), 30 maps. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1997. Cased, DM 68. ISBN: 3-8053-2010-8.

How much will it matter—and to whom—if out-of-the-way portions of Roman roads continue to disappear at the present rate, without being recorded? As a Medieval historian E. regards the roads not only as antiquities but also as important for our own culture. His book is frankly aimed at inducing as many of us as possible, both scholars and lay, to get out and visit the roads while we can, so that the landscape may enhance our understanding of previous travellers (who include many seminal writers and painters of the late Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and the Enlightenment); so that the road, as a geographical feature sometimes used, sometimes neglected, may further our understanding of the landscape and its historical development; and so that, if we cannot prevent further loss, we can record what is still visible, as E. himself does.

The outcome is an attractively written and illustrated, and affordable, book that can be read and used on several levels. It is laid out as a field guide and companion to sections of five major *viae* (Appia, Cassia, Flaminia, Salaria, and Valeria) radiating from Rome. The advice on access has not been tested by the present reviewer, but it is both detailed and wide-ranging. Maps are reproduced from the 1/25,000 *Carta d'Italia*, and advice includes where, and when, to leave the car, opportunities for bathing, and lists of particularly rewarding sections of the road and/or of the landscape. Numerous notes, which have been updated to 1996, allow the reader to follow up comments in the text on archaeological, historical, topographical, literary, and artistic matters. The notes cover the full range of *Straßenforschung*, including the important technical studies emerging from Bologna. The style of E.'s commentary is companionable and his photographs are highly evocative.

The central argument of the book, showing the value of tracing and recording every road in detail, is broadly as follows. Firstly, the reason why a section of an old route is not part of the modern road system is always worth examining. Every deviation tells a story, as trunk routes decay into local roads, insecurity pushes settlements up into the hills, and new towns then act as magnets, drawing traffic away from the original line. Secondly, each road has an

individual character, resulting partly from the pattern of traffic along it and partly from the landscape. The windings of the Flaminia and parts of the Cassia have a very different feel from the starkly straight Appia; the sulphurous pools alongside the Cassia near Viterbo have an atmosphere all their own. Thirdly, the patterns of reuse are immensely various. The road may be reopened, sometimes with immense labour (as E. shows, a disused stretch tends to form a field-boundary, which then attracts trees, either planted or self-sown). Or, once it is firmly closed, it may be used as the foundation for a building. The uses of old milestones are endless, but they are all worth recovering and deciphering, because correlation with the very accurate indications of distance in the Itineraries can reveal early modifications in the routes. And local customs can be significant; E. records a country market which has taken place monthly, winter and summer, 'time out of mind' on a disused stretch of the Salaria. Finally, technical understanding may well be furthered by finds of untypical structures: Straßenforschung needs field study.

E. makes a good case; it is to be hoped that he will receive a good response.

University of Reading

P. H. BLYTH

J. M. BLÁZQUEZ, M. P. GARCIA-GELABERT: *Castulo, ciudad ibero-romana* (Coleccion Fundamentos). Pp. 563. Madrid: ISTMO, 1994. ISBN: 84-7090-290-3.

The title of this volume is a little deceptive as it is in fact a collection of twenty separate articles, all but one previously published elsewhere, rather than a continuous work. The pieces concerned are of varying length, one being as short as five pages, others running to more than forty. The volume is divided into three parts: Castulo in the Bronze Age, Castulo in the Iberian period, and Roman Castulo. The two former, prehistoric sections make up the vast bulk of the book, with the final Roman part containing only four items. These latter consist of two lengthy general histories of the town in antiquity, a piece on the site's epigraphy, and one on the 'El Olivar' site, which appears to be a large private house, though no interpretation is given in this excavation report. Another problem with this last piece is a failure to note that the Roman remains, the first of which are datable to the Flavian period, were built above native structures. This is briefly alluded to in a prior chapter, 'Iberian Culture in the Town of Castulo'. Some consideration of the interrelation of the two sets of buildings is surely necessary if we are to trace the history of the town's physical and cultural development. It is also disappointing to have no discussion of whether we can relate this site to the general upsurge of building activity found in the Iberian peninsula during the Flavian period. The two general essays, which also in fact contain a large amount of prehistoric material ('The History of Castulo' has more prehistoric than Roman material despite appearing in the Roman section), more or less cover the same ground as each other. This tendency for repetition is an unfortunate, though perhaps inevitable, consequence of the format of the volume. Much, for example, of what is said in 'Castulo through its Latin Epigraphy' is then repeated in 'The History of Castulo', where a discussion of the pebble mosaics found on the site is also an echo of previous discussions of this theme in earlier sections, such as Chapter four, 'The Pebble Pavements of Castulo'. The division of the book also tends to mirror a conceptual divide in the minds of the authors. Although the title of the book is *Castulo, an Ibero-Roman City*, there is little discussion of how these two cultures flowed together and fused. Cultural transmission tends here to be regarded as a one-way process. The prehistoric pieces cover a variety of topics, some of which are only peripherally related to Castulo, such as 'An Analysis of the Arms Found on the Iberian Statuary of Porcuna' and 'The End of the Iberian Period in Baetica'. In general there is more for the prehistorian than the classical historian in this collection, which usefully collects a group of otherwise difficult to find articles, but cannot be said to succeed as a unified, single volume.

University of Keele

A. T. FEAR

D. F. MACKRETH: *Orton Hall Farm: a Roman and Early Anglo-Saxon Farmstead*. (East Anglian Archaeology, 76.) Pp. xvii + 255. Manchester: Nene Valley Research Committee, 1996. £35. ISBN: 0-9528105-0-6.

R. P. J. JACKSON, T. W. POTTER: *Excavations at Stonea, Cambridgeshire 1980–85*. Pp. 749. London: British Museum, 1997. £195. ISBN: 0-7141-1385-9.

C. W. Phillips, *The Romans in Fenland* (London, 1970), remains the basis for study of this area, supplemented by work conducted in the 1980s and 1990s reported in D. Hall and J. Coles, *Fenland Survey: an Essay in Landscape Persistence* (London, 1994). These provide the background for two new published excavations.

The Roman phases at Orton Hall Farm began in A.D. 175–225, after which it passed into official ownership, according to M. The site as a possible gathering point for official supplies is carefully considered in the wider context of the region, becoming 'Anglo-Saxon' without any break in occupation.

Stonea, c. 20 miles east of Orton Hall Farm, boasts considerable prehistoric, Roman, and Anglo-Saxon activity. Sometime between A.D. 130 and 150 a large stone tower-like structure, an associated settlement, with a partial road grid and a Romano-Celtic temple (to Minerva?), were constructed. Potter interprets the site as an administrative centre for the Fens, long regarded as a probable imperial estate, and as an attempt to create a market town in a rather rudimentary rural region. The plan failed, but after the demolition of the tower in c. A.D. 220 the settlement continued. As at Orton Hall Farm, the site was taken over by Anglo-Saxons with no visible break in occupation, and Potter argues for possible continuity from the Romano-British population.

The failure of the stone complex at Stonea Grange illustrates a major problem in the study of Roman Fenland. The imperial authority inserted a 'market' into an area traditionally considered as a poor backwater of Roman Britain. Failure of this 'grand scheme' is attributed to a combination of poor drainage and the natives, who had failed to take on the running of Stonea. The sense of Romanitas, Potter concludes, was 'wafer thin', but this privileges the Roman perspective. From the outlook of the Fenland natives, a thin sense of Romanitas may not represent a failure to participate in the grand sweep of Roman culture, but active self-affirmation.

This point applies to both reports, each of which is in part the product of an Empire-centred view—the argument for 'an official presence' at Orton Hall Farm masking any consideration of what a farm falling into 'official' hands means from an indigenous perspective. How did the workers at Orton Hall Farm come to be enmeshed in the system of Roman military supply, and what did this mean for the way they experienced the Roman Empire?

These volumes are a major contribution to archaeology of the region, but much has changed in the three decades since 'The Fenland in Roman Times' set the academic agenda. A reassessment is overdue, particularly in the light of recent scholarship on the reactions to Empire by subject peoples, most recently D. J. Mattingly (ed.), *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism* (Portsmouth, RI, 1997). Account must be taken of the many differing perspectives of all those who lived their lives within the vast spectrum to which we attach the simplistic label 'The Roman Empire'.

Both volumes are well-produced, and Stonea is compendious, the only drawback being the cost, which is prohibitive. The production of Orton Hall Farm suffers only from the inclusion of loose (rather than bound) maps, destined to be damaged or lost.

University of Leicester

G. R. FINCHAM

A. MASTINO, P. RUGGERI (edd.): *L'Africa romana: Atti del X convegno di studio Oristano, 11–13 dicembre 1992*. 3 vols. Pp. 502; 503–1059; 1060–1438. Sassari: Editrice Archivio Fotografico Sardo, 1994. L. 100,000 per vol.

The tenth conference in the Africa Romana series, which for the last fifteen years has considered

important themes relating to North Africa and Sardinia (although the title does not include the latter), was devoted to 'Civitas—the Organization of Urban Space in North Africa and Sardinia'. It was dedicated to the memory of the French epigrapher and archaeologist Marcel Le Glay. Not including the conference's introductory and concluding remarks, its three volumes contain seventy-six contributions in 1438 pages.

With volumes of this size, it is impossible to discuss individual articles thoroughly; this review will rather comment on the current state of the study of urban space in these regions. This perspective is justified because the papers reflect the approaches of the various scholars working here reasonably well, with the exception that no one from North America or England participated in the conference.

Let us begin by dividing the papers into some of the broad categories of 'urban space' which they address: the phenomenon of urbanization (6), municipal decrees (7), citations from ancient authors (10), city planning (5), public buildings (24), and private houses (1). These categories, especially the discrepancy between research on public and private areas, indicate that the volumes take a rather traditional approach to issues of urban space. Newer approaches to urban space in classics and classical archaeology have yet to be fully integrated into North African and Sardinian studies, as the following breakdown of papers in the volume shows: social status of houses (0), imperial or public ideology (0), 'gendered' spaces (0), Roman/indigenous spaces (2). A recent review of research on Roman Africa by David J. Mattingly and R. Bruce Hitchner reached a similar conclusion (*JRS* 85 [1995], 165–213).

Nonetheless, there are a number of important papers, many of which cannot be easily categorized. Five studies provide evidence for re-dating the monuments of Volubilis, showing there is much to be gained from the re-examination of early investigations at this site. Other contributions indicate the same holds true for Lixus, Dougga, and Nora.

In separate papers M. Khanoussi and M. Cataudella reject the thesis of earlier scholars that some Roman towns in North Africa were organized as 'double communities' in which Roman citizens and indigenous Africans lived apart from each other. Khanoussi's excavations at Dougga suggest that it is not possible to identify different quarters within the town while Cataudella notes a 'tendency toward assimilation' in the epigraphic sources for the territory of Cirta. The (at least partial) dismissal of this thesis should provide the impetus for a more objective investigation of the relations between Romans and Africans.

Several studies, although preliminary, offer avenues for further development. M. Mayer examines the distribution of decorative marbles on urban sites, a subject which needs more systematic research. Y. Le Bohec writes a similarly interesting review of the rôle of the military in North African cities, a topic with implications for the source of labor involved in the construction of monuments, the uses of public buildings, and the extent of the military's integration into local society.

All of these issues are indicative of the fact that the epigraphic and archaeological data from North African cities are extensive, but demand broader consideration using multiple sources of evidence. For Sardinia, although the quality of the data, particularly the textual sources, may not be as abundant, the substantial portions of major coastal cities revealed by excavations still deserve greater examination. There also appears to be room for theoretical inquiries, and comparison between the provinces. If North Africa and Sardinia were two of Rome's main sources of grain, but underwent very different levels of urban growth in antiquity, can any rôle in urban development be ascribed to the extraction of surplus produce by the state?

Keeping all of the contributions within the confines of 'urban space' was clearly difficult; articles stray to cover topics such as 'Roman Mosaics with Nereids and Tritons', 'New Christian Inscriptions', 'African Influences on Roman Religion in Dacia', and 'Wilamowitz's Journey to Libya'. One of the more interesting, by M. Dondin-Payre, concerns a previously unpublished map of Roman sites in the Aures mountains produced by a French military officer during the 1830s and 1840s. While he had a profound curiosity for exploring Roman ruins, this interest did not sit well with his superior officers and it ultimately led to his dismissal.

In summary, these volumes indicate the largely traditional focus of many current approaches to North African and Sardinian studies, as well as the rather exceptional quality of the data on cities in these regions, at least from epigraphic and archaeological standpoints. The outlook must therefore be mixed, and readers suitably encouraged yet forewarned.

University of Michigan

DAVID L. STONE

P. ZSIDI, A. R. FURGER: *Augusta Raurica/Aquincum. Out of Rome: das Leben in zwei römischen Provinzstädten*. Pp. 337, 314 ills. Basel: Schwabe, 1997. Cased, DM 54. ISBN: 3-7965-1040-X.

A new political order is soon evident in official promotions that involve museum collections and ancient monuments. Less strident in tone than some of the shows that used to arrive from eastern Europe with overt nationalistic messages, some current promotions are no less political. Promotion of a common European heritage has included a Franco-German exhibition presenting the Franks as 'pathfinders of Europe'. The Swiss-Hungarian exchange has seen the abbey of St Gall on show in Budapest and the emperor Marcus Aurelius displayed in Geneva. Now we have an integrated show of remains from the two countries' major Roman settlements, the colony of Augusta Raurica (Augst) on the Rhine a few miles upstream from Basel, and the great fortress and city of Aquincum, whose remains now lie among the northern suburbs of Budapest. The theme is the impact of permanent Roman occupation, a cultural process still conveniently described as Romanization, and is linked with the famous passage in the *Agricola* (c. 21) of Tacitus describing how a governor of Britannia sought to encourage the native élite of his province to adopt a Roman lifestyle. Both exhibition, in Budapest during 1997 and in Augst during 1998, and this accompanying volume adhere closely to the comparative theme.

The first chapter ('Im Wandel der Zeit') presents in outline the course of Roman occupation in the two countries, its impact on the Celtic Helvetii and Eravisci, and the presence of the Roman army—temporary at Augst, permanent at Aquincum—and concludes with the traditional scenario of Roman 'departure' and 'aftermath'. The other five chapters hang from the traditional subject pegs of Roman provincial archaeology: Town Planning and Building; Urban Life; Trade and Economy; Religious Cults; and Belief, Death and Burial, the last labelled 'Everlasting Darkness' ('Ewige Finsternis'). Lack of any annotation or direct reference to items in the bibliographies supplied for each chapter (pp. 323–29) is frustrating for those seeking to know more about recent discoveries. Illustrations have full captions but there is again no guide to further reading, nor are cross-references provided to the text that sometimes describes the same material (e.g. the tombstone of the centurion Castricius at Aquincum on p. 211 and fig. 178). Significant evidence for the early history of the colony Augusta Raurica is furnished by three fragments of an inscription on bronze discovered in 1967 which appear to name Lucius Octavius, most likely a relative of Augustus, and the name-giver (*nuncupator*) of the colony at the time of its refoundation c. 15 B.C. The reconstruction presented here differs significantly from the earlier publication by Hans Lieb (*Chiron* 4 [1974], 415–23, cf. *Ann. Ép.* 1974.435), notably because here two separate texts are reconstructed from the three inscribed fragments (pp. 46–7 and figs 7–8). Another recent find deserving fuller presentation is the shrine of Mithras excavated during 1978–9 in the legionary commander's residence at Aquincum. This contained a remarkable group of altars dedicated late in the second century (p. 121), notably one representing a serpent coiled around a circular altar (fig. 70). One might have hoped also for a fuller presentation of an earlier but still unique find from the civil town at Aquincum, the 52-pipe portable water organ (figs 129–30) presented to the association of cloth-workers (*collegium centonariorum*) in A.D. 228. The find is in itself of exceptional interest and reminds us, in the context of any discussion of Roman life, of the rôle of accompanying music in Roman public events, not merely athletics or games of the arena but also all manner of religious ceremonies and observance.

Overall one cannot say that the contributors to this volume have been well served by its production, with an ungainly format and bilingual text, and captions in monochrome tints. Many illustrations are too small, while others suggest that a preference for the picturesque (e.g. fig. 7) has triumphed at the expense of instruction. Yet the comparison between these two major Roman settlements close to the northern limits of the empire but 650 miles apart has produced a valuable and instructive portrayal of differences and similarities between the two places. The one (Augst) began life as a Roman settler colony with a formal 'deductio' of veterans, the other originating as a settlement in the vicinity of the legionary base on the Danube constructed at the end of the first century A.D. Between the early second century and the late third an abundance of epigraphic and archaeological evidence has provided a detailed picture of the legion and the two civil communities, the 'camp town' (*canabae*) in the immediate vicinity of the fortress and the civil town a few miles upstream, organized as a municipium by Hadrian (fig. 33) and later granted the title of colonia by Septimius Severus, with whom the frontier communities of Pannonia enjoyed a special relationship after their support in the civil wars (A.D. 193–7). Much less is known of the later and more 'provincial' development of Augst, though the planning and components of its

public architecture completed during the first and early second centuries have remained one of the classic models for Roman cities in the western provinces. But, with such a meagre harvest of inscriptions recording its inhabitants, comparison with Aquincum amounts to little more than a pallid reflection. Might it not have been worth considering the inclusion of the legionary fortress at Vindonissa, near Brugg some miles to the east, within the scope of the exhibition? Although legionary occupation there ceased at the end of the first century A.D., when Aquincum was just starting, Vindonissa remained an important settlement at a strategic crossroads behind the Rhine, and had its own bishop in the fifth century.

Still, for all these minor complaints, this joint venture, carried through with Swiss thoroughness and Hungarian *élan*, has proved a valuable contribution to Roman studies, not least in its permanent record offered by this volume.

University College London

J. J. WILKES

B. BRENK (ed.): *Innovation in der Spätantike: Kolloquium Basel 1994*. Pp. 445, figs, maps, ills. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1996. Cased, DM 148. ISBN: 3-88226-879-4.

This is an exciting collection of material which puts a few further nails into the now discredited (but still surprisingly oft-repeated) view of late antique art as being in decline. While it may be hard to find people who still admit overtly to the model of stylistic decline espoused by art historians in the early and mid-twentieth century (most notably Bernard Berenson), and while scholars of every other aspect of late antique culture are now openly questioning such hallowed 'truths' as the third century crisis, the rise of feudalism, and the onset of the Dark Ages, it is nonetheless the case that—at least within art history—late antiquity has suffered from being the opening of the Middle Ages, that low point between the high-water marks of the Classical world and the Renaissance.

The papers collected here by Beat Brenk range from very general interrogations of the question of innovation in late antique art (e.g. by Josef Engemann) to very detailed analyses of capitals and other ornamental features in architecture (e.g. from Tebessa in North Africa, in the paper by Christine Strube which completes the volume). This makes for a rich and varied mix. Like most such edited books, the result is hardly a coherent argument, and any attempt at coherence is scuppered by the editor's choice to present the essays in alphabetical order of their authors' names. But together the papers—by many of the leading German scholars in the field—make a vivid case for the innovative nature of late antique art.

The papers are the following. Achim Arbeiter discusses architecture in late antique Spain. Sible de Blaauw explores the interesting question of the *fastigium* over the high altar of the Lateran basilica. Beat Brenk studies innovations in the coordination of buildings in late Roman élite residential complexes. Gudrun Bühl examines the image of Constantinople, mainly on coins. Johannes Deckers contributes an interesting paper on early Christian sarcophagi. Georges Descoeurides looks at monasticism and art in early Christian Egypt. Arne Effenberger offers the most up-to-date analysis of the great obelisk and base of Theodosius in Constantinople, with an afterword by Karl-Heinz Priese on the hieroglyphic inscriptions of the obelisk itself. Josef Engemann attacks the question of innovation in late antique art (without resorting to a single illustration!). Tomas Lehmann explores the origins of the triconch basilica. Hans-Rudolph Meier explores the problems of the adaptation of temples to Christian cult. Eckhardt Reichert looks at aesthetic theory in late antiquity. Monika Scheide discusses Cassiodorus. Sabine Schrenk examines the theme of typology, which she has made her own in an important book (*Typos und Antitypos in der frühchristlichen Kunst* [Münster, 1995]), and Christine Strube looks again at the dating of Tebessa.

The theme of innovation is not particularly apparent in the methodologies and styles of the papers. Rather, they exhibit the traditional strengths of German scholarship in the field—in particular, a great command of the material culture and a willingness to go in depth into a single monument or category of monuments. The quality of production and of the illustrations is excellent.

Courtauld Institute of Art

JOHN ELSNER

H. W. PLEKET, R. S. STROUD, J. H. M. STRUBBE (edd.): *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Vol. XLII (1992). Pp. xxxvi + 655. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1995. Hfl. 230. ISBN: 90-5063-376-5.

In this volume of *SEG*, J. H. M. Strubbe joins H. W. Pleket and R. S. Stroud as a third editor. *SEG* continues its invaluable rôle in ordering and making accessible new work on inscriptions, a publication no ancient historian can afford to do without. Volume 43 issues a warning about the crisis in its funding, but the threat to *SEG* in its present form has been averted for a period. The possibility is raised that it might eventually be published on CD Rom alone, but it is to be hoped that book publication will continue as long as possible: tracing the complexities of epigraphic publications is hard enough without a further technological filter: browsing through *SEG* is as essential as more focused searches.

From this volume one may pick out the particularly rich number of entries for the North coast of the Black Sea and Chersonesos (681–728), including evidence for the Scythians' use of script (681) and an early sherd letter found at Olbia (710); the early fifth-century Thasian law published in 1992 about proper behaviour in the streets and their upkeep (785); the inscriptions involving the *temene* of Athenian deities in the land of their fifth-century subject-allies (84); and a sixth-century law on wrestling at Olympia (375: cf. 376). From an entry on indigenous Carian names on Greek inscriptions (987), to work on vase inscriptions from Ai Khanoum (1326) or on the edicts of Asoka at Kandahar (1327), *SEG*, with its word indexes and section on Varia, is an indispensable organizer and clearing house for epigraphic work. One can only express gratitude to the *SEG* team, and hope that *SEG* in present form, perhaps with CD Rom in addition, can continue.

Royal Holloway, London

ROSALIND THOMAS

R. S. BAGNALL, D. D. OBBINK (edd.): *Columbia Papyri X*. (American Studies in Papyrology, 3.) Pp. xii + 234, 50 pls. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996. ISBN: 0-7885-0275-1.

This new volume of Columbia papyri contains forty-three texts, mostly read by graduate students of B. and O., of which sixteen are re-edited from previous publication in articles. In exemplary fashion, each text has a translation in English, full commentary, and plate, and the volume is fully indexed. The texts are all documentary, of Roman to Byzantine date (first to sixth century A.D.), and of various provenance. Some texts are additions to known archives; of Harthotes (249) and of Ptolemaios (260), both from Theadelphia, and of Claudia Isidora alias Apia (276); also 259 has links with other texts, and 284 is part of a duplicate of *P.Heid.* V 344. In general the texts have been read and published to a high standard. As always, some improvements can be suggested. There is no reason to restore Philadelphia in 249.4; Philagris, for example, was nearer; the village in 267.9 must be Tuchinnehotis. In 260 the low rent of 14 artabas of wheat on 7 out of 14 arouras of land is probably an error through repeating 'fourteen'. A more general problem, common to most publications of papyri, is that the editors tend to give where the text was (probably) written, rather than where it was (probably) found, as its 'provenance', but fail to be consistent in this, sometimes going for a place referred to in the text instead (but 285 is not 'Arsinoite' in any sense). The volume contains much of historical interest. The introduction to 251 gives a useful discussion of the registration of ownership (see too 274). Confiscation of land by the state appears in several texts: in 252, 'the thirty' to be purchased, which need checking for liens or confiscation, must be arouras of land; 257 adds to our knowledge of the bidding process; 265 is a case of distraint for private debt, interesting in itself, and prosopographically fascinating once the date is corrected. The writer of the incomplete text (a bid to purchase, or claim to ownership?) is an Alexandrian citizen through his mother only, and also *kosmetes*-designate and *bouleutes* of Oxyrhynchus, so another example of the emergence of an élite bridging Alexandria and the *metropoleis*. His position as *bouleutes* shows the text dates from or after 200/1, when the *metropoleis* had *boulai*. The property had been distrained in a year 14 from another Alexandrian, Alkimos son of Hermias, who after gaining Roman citizenship was called Marcus Aurelius Alkimos alias Hermias. Since the other people mentioned do not have Roman citizenship, the text must predate the *Constitutio Antoniniana* of 212. Since the same official is involved, the text must date a year or

two after the year 14, which must be of Septimius Severus, that is 205/6. Alkimos may be another Egyptian case of a recipient of Roman citizenship under Septimius Severus who took Caracalla's assumed *gentilicium* 'Aurelius' (cf. 273.7n., although here *aut[on]* is preferable), but the use of 'Marcus' too is very rare, so his grant may have come from Commodus or Marcus Aurelius. 273 is a rare attestation of the intensive cultivation of pears, along with peaches and roses. 274 is a rare example of a *charis anaphiretos*, 'irrevocable gift'. 281, of 287, reveals a family monopolizing the komarchy at Karanis for three years. 285, of August 315, provides the earliest evidence for the division of the province of Egypt. 288, of December 330, is the first known fourth-century declaration of camels, but in the exceptional circumstances of the *fiscus* wanting to commandeer a fifth of them.

King's College London

D. W. RATHBONE

TH. BAIER, F. SCHIMANN (edd.): *Fabrica. Studien zur antiken Literatur und ihrer Rezeption*. (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 90.) Pp. 191. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1997. DM 68. ISBN: 3-519-07639-X.

This volume does not present studies in antique technology but a collection of products from the philological *fabrica*, dedicated to the *Faber Friburgensis* Eckard Lefèvre by his younger disciples, in honour of his sixtieth birthday (cf. p. 9).

Reviewing books of this kind in a few words is a difficult task, their heterogeneity making it impossible to do justice to each single contribution. As the subtitle suggests, the nine essays cover a broad range of subjects, from Sophocles by way of the allegorical technique of Bernardus Silvestris to the nineteenth-century forgery of a *Φοινικικὴ ἱστορία*. Even so, Baier's contribution about the ambivalent attitude of medieval man towards antique statuary—though it makes for stimulating reading—seems a little out of place here, showing no apparent relation to antique literature ('L'art pour l'art im Mittelalter', pp. 149–64).

Four essays have direct reference to Lefèvre's own work, dealing with authors (Sophocles, Horace, Valerius Flaccus) or questions (the oral culture of the Romans) also investigated by the honorand. S. Kaiser, in 'Philoktet auf Lemnos', compares the motif of the hero's solitude and its appraisal in Sophocles, André Gide, and Oscar Mandel (pp. 11–33). Maya Asper, 'Catull, Mamurra and Caesar', argues quite plausibly that Catullus' invectives against public men were possibly performed by the poet before an audience (pp. 65–78). M. Holtermann re-examines the question of 'Adressat und philosophische Konzeption in der Licinius-Ode des Horaz', failing, however, to present any fresh views (pp. 79–90). F. Schimann, in 'Feuer auf Lemnos', explores the important rôle of the motifs 'fire' and 'fury' in the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus (pp. 103–28).

The other contributions (which I can only name here) are: C. Oser-Grote, 'Romantik in der Antike? Die Motive "Abend" und "Nacht" in Gedichten des Ottocento und der augusteischen Zeit' (pp. 35–64); U. Auhagen, 'Nero—Ein "Phaethon" in Rom? Eine politische Deutung des Apennin-Exkurses in Lukans *Bellum Civile*' (pp. 91–102); Markus Asper, 'Silva Parens. Zur allegorischen Technik des Bernardus Silvestris' (pp. 129–47); and S. Faller, 'Der "neue" Sanchuniathon oder Die Anatomie einer Fälschung' (pp. 165–78).

The volume is completed by an impressive bibliography of Eckard Lefèvre's publications.

University of Trier

JOHANNES SCHWIND

R. KATZOFF WITH Y. PETROFF, D. SCHAPS (edd.): *Classical Studies in Honor of David Sohlberg*. Pp. ix + 510, ills. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1996. ISBN: 965-226-182-3.

This collection of papers is intended to reflect the varied interests of David Sohlberg. The subjects considered are wide ranging and include the literature and culture of Greece and Rome,

history, philosophy, numismatics, papyrology, archaeology, and the modern reception of myth. Although the parameters are broad, there is a concentration on Judaic matters, making this collection valuable to scholars of Judaism and its relations with the classical world. Even they, however, will suffer from the lack of focus of the work generally. This is the weakness of any *Festschrift*, but is particularly so in this case.

That is not to say, however, that there is nothing of interest in the volume. Levine's lengthy paper on Bernal and the Athenians argues that the Athenians developed a model for thinking about the origins of their civilization, but does little to allay feelings of discomfort with Bernal's approach. Two papers on literature follow: Neuberger-Donath on the characterization of male and female in Homer, and Meron on tragic and philosophic dialogue. Then an interesting paper by Schaps considers the administration of building projects in Greece, setting it in its political and social context. He argues that building contracts were assigned on merit to able contractors, and were available to men of relatively modest means.

A group of papers on philosophy follows. First is Baumgarten's article considering Euhemerus' two classes of gods (eternal and mortal). Euhemerus' theory was violently opposed by Plutarch; but B. argues that both approaches, which were competing answers to the same basic question, serve to illuminate each other. Glucker then considers *συνήθεια* in his paper, 'Consuetudo Oculorum', which is followed by a short account of the coining of the Achaean League in the Kadman Numismatic Museum, which hardly serves to whet the appetite of numismatists. Petroff then considers LXX translations for the Minor Sacral Instruments in a lengthy article.

Philo's *Spec. Leg.* 4.137–8 is discussed by Cohen using the novel method described as "listening" to the text as is'. Feldman then considers Josephus' treatment of Aaron and suggests that, although Aaron's virtues of wisdom, piety, and capacity as a prophet are stressed, he is never allowed to eclipse Moses. An interesting paper by Ben-Zeev discusses Josephus' presentation of *senatus consulta* in *Ant.* 14.186–267. Greek and Jewish marriage formulae are then considered by Katzoff, before Gilula discusses the allocation of seats to senators at the *ludi Romani* of 196 B.C. Price's discussion of attempts on Cicero's life during the conspiracy of Catiline is interesting but avoids the problems of whether we can really say Catiline was planning a 'coup' before the elections for the consulship of 63 B.C., and that there is little good evidence for Catiline's relations with Manlius before they join forces. On the whole it seems to avoid the problems of Cicero's evidence. A rather perversely footnoted paper on the cycle of Arval offices by Behr precedes a discussion by Rabello of civil justice in Palestine from 63 B.C.–A.D. 70.

A note on the size of the Jewish population of the Roman Empire by Wasserstein follows. Demographic statistics are notoriously difficult and suspect, and this paper does little to further our knowledge. In the next article, Fischer and Grossmark discuss the import of marble into Roman and Byzantine Palestine, placing their emphasis on the rabbinic sources. Sperber then discusses the treatment of bath-houses in rabbinic literature.

Brashear publishes an interesting marriage contract from Alexandria on papyrus. It is rare to find Alexandrian papyri, so this is of some importance especially in that it preserves on one side a rough draft, and on the other the final version, permitting observations about scribal practice to be made. Cohen's edition of a birth-notice for a girl from Socnopaiou Nesos in the Fayum then follows. The paper includes a useful chart listing the different formulae for such texts and an up-to-date (in 1995) list of similar declarations. Lewis then considers the 'black silver' coins of the Babatha papyri, rightly arguing that black is not the colour of the silver, but designates a monetary unit which cannot be identified with Roman *denarii* in any way. Fikhman provides a survey on onomastics in Graeco-Roman Egypt, before Baharal discusses Macrinus and the *Gens Aurelia*, seeking to explain Macrinus' failure to hold on to imperial power. The paper is abruptly and inappropriately interrupted by a series of plates.

Gershit then provides an iconographic study of Roman copies of Greek and Hellenistic art found in Israel, and argues that they should be considered to be variations rather than copies. The penultimate paper, by Segal, discusses public plazas in the cities of Palestine and Arabia, and how they illuminate the process of urbanization in the first three centuries A.D. Finally, Elata-Alster considers Freud's rendering of the Oedipus myth and Lacan's reading of Plato's *Symposium*, classing them as 'testimonial allegories'.

Like any collection of its type, there are a number of valuable contributions, but some weaker papers and a general lack of focus rather spoil the whole work.

I. SEVCENKO, I. HUTTER: *AETOS. Studies in Honour of Cyril Mango. Presented to Him on April 14, 1998*. Pp. xx + 378, 83 tables. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 3-519-07440-0.

This volume brings together thirty offerings from distinguished academic associates of M. The subjects are diverse and extend beyond even M.'s range of Byzantine interests (though these are naturally well represented). After a list of M.'s publications to 1997, the contents are as follows: C. Bouras, 'The Daphni Monastic Complex Reconsidered'; S. Boyd, 'Ex-voto Therapy: a Note on a Copper Plaque with St Hermolaos'; Alan Cameron, 'Basilius, Mavortius, Asterius'; P. Canart, 'Deux témoins de la "chypriote bouclée": le Vaticanus graecus 578 et le Monacensis graecus 284'; A. Cutler, 'Mistaken Antiquity: Thoughts on Some Recent Commentary on the Rosette Caskets'; G. Dagnon and O. Callot 'Les bâtisseurs isauriens chez eux: notes sur trois sites des environs de Silifke'; J. Durliat, 'L'épitaque du pape Honorius (625-638)'; V. von Falkenhausen, 'Zur Regentschaft der Gräfin Adelasia del Vasto in Kalabrien und Sizilien (1101-1112)'; D. Feissel, 'Deux épigrammes d'Apamène, et l'éloge de l'endogamie dans une famille syrienne du VI^e siècle'; B. Flusin, 'L'empereur et le Théologien: à propos du retour des reliques de Grégoire de Nazianze (*BHG* 728)'; C. Foss, 'Byzantine Responses to Turkish Attack: Some Sites of Asia Minor'; A. Guillou, 'Inscriptions byzantines d'Italie sur tissu'; H. Hunger, "'Aristophanes" in margine: versus exotici'; I. Hutter, 'Theodoropolis'; E. Jeffreys, 'The Novels of Mid-twelfth Century Constantinople: the Literary and Social Context'; A. Kazhdan and L. Sherry, 'Anonymous Miracles of St. Artemios'; J. Lefort, 'La brève histoire du jeune Bragadin'; P. Magdalino, 'Constantinopolitana'; C. Maltezos, 'Byzantine Legends in Venetian Crete'; D. Obolensky, 'Toynbee and Byzantium'; N. Oikonomides, 'Liens de vassalité dans un apanage byzantin du XII^e siècle'; L. Ryden, 'The Date of the *Life of St Symeon the Fool*'; P. Schreiner, 'Die topographische Notiz über Konstantinopel in der Pariser Suda-Handschrift: eine Neuinterpretation'; I. Sevcenko, 'The Lost Panels of the North Door to the Chapel of the Burning Bush at Sinai'; I. Shahid, 'Miles quondam et graecus'; J.-P. Sordini, 'Les paons de Saint-Polyeucte et leurs modèles'; P. Speck, 'Ohne Anfang und Ende; das *Hexaemeron* des Georgios Pisodes'; R. Thomson, 'The Defence of Armenian Orthodoxy in Sebeos'; W. Treadgold, 'Observations on Finishing a General History of Byzantium'; D. Wright, 'The Persistence of Art Patronage in Fifth-century Rome'. The unattributed photograph used as a frontispiece is inaccurately described and wrongly dated. I took the photo in 1979: M. was standing outside the mosque in the village of Yürme (Germia), attempting to rest after a hot day but instead forced to endure a long harangue from the local expert on the village's history and antiquities; a characteristically grumpy look spread over M.'s face as, realizing there was no escape, he looked askance at the villager. The honorand will decide how far this image is appropriate for the collection.

University of Warwick

MICHAEL WHITBY

A. CATALDI PALAU: *Gian Francesco d'Asola e la tipografia aldina: la vita, le edizioni, la biblioteca dell'Asolano*. Pp. 831, 83 pls. Genoa: Sagep, 1998. Cased, L. 200,000. ISBN: 88-7058-679-0.

Aldus Manutius is the most famous name in the history of publishing; one might even say that he was the first person who deserved the title of publisher rather than printer. Much less is known of the men who continued the activity of the Aldine press after the founder's death in 1515. This monograph is designed to remedy our ignorance of Aldus' immediate successor, and is to be warmly welcomed as a substantial contribution to knowledge. It is very thorough and comprehensive, and is fully illustrated with instructive plates.

The starting-point of the inquiry was the realization that almost all of Gian Francesco d'Asola's extensive library of Greek manuscripts, which are identifiable by his ex-libris, passed into the collection of the king of France in 1542. Examination of all these manuscripts, some of which were inherited from Aldus, throws a good deal of light on the history of publication and Greek scholarship. In particular, Dr Palau has been able to find the printer's copy used for a

number of *editiones principes*, and in this respect she has produced valuable results analogous to those of Martin Sichelr whose *Griechische Erstaussgaben des Aldus Manutius* appeared in 1997.

The book is divided into three main sections: (i) the biography and publications of Gian Francesco d'Asola (pp. 21–266); (ii) relations between Aldus' sons and the Asola family (pp. 267–381); and (iii) the library of Gian Francesco (pp. 383–592). Appendices list all the books published by the Aldine house in its various phases of management from 1515 until 1589; P. has examined a copy of each title and some of them are very rare and hard to locate (pp. 593–714).

The biographical investigation is thorough and includes a survey of the publisher's friends, with much quotation from primary sources set out in full. One interesting suggestion is that the publisher's date of birth should be brought down from c. 1480 to c. 1495–8. This may be right, but if he studied with Demetrius Chalcondyles, who died in 1511, a late date implies that he was sent away to study at a very tender age.

Apart from the identifications of printer's copy (see especially pp. 424, 429ff.), there are numerous interesting sidelights on the history of scholarship. Gradually publishers and editors learned how to make their books more useful to readers (see e.g. pp. 99 and 126 *variae lectiones* are offered to readers of a Greek text for the first time in 1520; pp. 134–5 numerals are used to link text and marginalia, and better page references are given [1521]; p. 147 Paolo Manuzio adds a list of Greek words found in Cicero's *Letters* and there are marginal asterisks to mark additions to the text in Lactantius). Statements by the publisher that he had used ancient manuscripts or had the advice of the best scholars are assembled in pp. 238ff.; it might perhaps have been remarked that not all of them would have stood up to searching inquiry. The remarks on pp. 118–20 about the use made of manuscripts and the conservatism of the textual criticism practised at the time need to be seen in context: in the early sixteenth century few scholars and fewer readers had the expert command of the Greek language that would have allowed them to excel in emendation, whereas in Latin the position was quite different.

I mention a few points that caught my eye. P. 95: it is not quite true that the editions of medical texts here listed are still 'uniche edizioni'. P. 106: if the text cited can be taken literally it proves that Aldus began operations in 1494. P. 109: a student handbook issued in 1526, an introduction to Greek, seems now to be extant in one copy only, a fate which often overtakes such manuals. P. 167: Navagero seems to have thought that lost works of Cicero, or better manuscripts of known works, could be recovered if Greece were retaken from the Turks. P. 205: it would have been worth expounding Andrea d'Asola's comments on the style of Simplicius. P. 473: Musurus gives a fine proof of his energy and industry when he says that while giving his course on Homer in Venice in 1514 he read the whole of Eustathius' commentaries.

This book will take its place as a classic study of the history of publication.

Lincoln College, Oxford

N. G. WILSON

M. PICONE, B. ZIMMERMANN (edd.): *Der antike Roman und seine mittelalterliche Rezeption* (Monte Verità: Proceedings of the Centro Stefano Franscini, Ascona). Pp. vii + 350. Basel, Boston, and Berlin: Birkhäuser, 1997. Sw. frs. 98. ISBN: 3-7643-5658-8.

This is yet another collection of articles on the ancient novel and other relevant genres, which originates from a conference in Ascona in 1995, and covers a wide range of topics related to Greek, Roman, Byzantine, and Medieval fiction.

The articles published here lack a common theme and were written by well-known experts in the ever-growing field of the ancient novel (e.g. Tatum on the novelistic qualities of Herodotus, Hunter re-examining Longus' sophisticated use of Plato, Slater on the intriguing concepts of 'vision' and 'perception' in the Roman novelists, Hofmann on the complicated narratological issues connected with Apuleius' text); they also vary considerably in scope and methodology, though most of them are irritatingly burdened by a tremendous amount of overlong footnotes, which could have been shorter, had there been a general bibliographical index at the end of the book (Lefèvre's interesting and concise discussion of the Milesian Tale of The Pergamene Boy is a happy exception).

The contributions are arranged roughly in the following order: Greek fiction (apart from the aforementioned articles by Tatum and Hunter, there are good general observations on

intertextuality and narrative techniques in the Greek romance by Zimmermann and Effe, respectively, as well as a study of the rôle of the gods in Chariton's novel by Weißenberger)—Petronius and Apuleius—Byzantine Romance (Harder on the function of epistles in the romances of the twelfth century)—*The Alexander Romance*—Medieval fiction (Godman's informative account of verse romances in the Latin Middle Ages; Pittaluga on the possible influence of Apuleius on Late Latin comedy; Picone's analysis of a novella from the *Decameron* in the light of ancient fiction; these are particularly welcome, since collections of articles on the novel tend to stop at *The Alexander Romance* or at *The Story of Apollonius, King of Tyre*). The lion's share belongs to Apuleius, since six out of the sixteen lengthy contributions of this elegantly produced but poorly proof-read volume discuss aspects of *The Golden Ass* (if I need to single out a couple of them, I would especially recommend the stimulating analysis of *ekphraseis* and the identity of their narrator by van Mal-Maeder, and the thoroughly documented account of legal themes and their function in Apuleius' narrative by Keulen; I am looking forward to the publication of their commentary on Book 1 (Keulen) and Book 2 (van Mal-Maeder) of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*).

Word-limit does not allow me to present in detail the arguments put forth by each of the contributors to this collection, especially since there is no thematic unity in its contents. Academics and graduate students will need to consult it according to their research interests. There is a wealth of information here, ranging over a wide span of time, but the absence of an *index rerum* and (most importantly) an *index locorum* at the end of the volume makes it very difficult for the reader to trace a discussion of a specific passage in various papers; this problem is exacerbated by the fact that there are not even cross-references between articles which deal with similar topics; at least five of the six articles on Apuleius would have profited from cross-references.

University of Glasgow

COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS

M. FORREST: *Modernising the Classics. A Study in Curriculum Development*. Pp. 200. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996. Cased, £22.50. ISBN: 0-85989-486-X.

Forrest sets the major changes in Classics teaching over the past thirty-five years against political changes in British education, particularly the reorganization of secondary education, the after-effects of Callaghan's 'Ruskin' speech of 1976 and the introduction of the National Curriculum.

The author was a member of the Cambridge Schools Classics Project team and has continued to be associated with it. He has drawn on carefully researched archive material and his inside knowledge to provide valuable insights into the project's origins and workings up to the publication of the Cambridge Latin Course in 1970.

F. takes as his starting-point the two crises that threatened Classics in the 1960s—the abolition of GCE Latin as a compulsory entrance requirement to Oxbridge and the reorganization of secondary education. These crises acted as a catalyst for a major reappraisal of the rôle of Classics in the curriculum and for ways of making the subject more attractive.

He reveals academic politics during both the negotiations to set up the project and its first phases, and the effects of the reluctance of the Nuffield Foundation, the original funders, to locate a curriculum development project in a university department of education.

F. brings to life many of the personalities involved, as proposers, advisors, and members of the project team, and highlights a number of tensions. Firstly, that between research and development, which resulted in pressure to produce materials for trial in schools at the expense of research into a sound theoretical linguistic base for the Latin course. Secondly, the small team worked under enormous time pressure partly as a result of the initial failure to set realistic targets. Thirdly, production of Classics in English courses was delayed as a result of differing priorities between those who saw the potential of Classics in the curriculum for all pupils via the introduction of non-linguistic alongside language courses and those who wanted attractive Latin language courses to meet the situation where compulsory Latin was under threat. Fourthly, there were issues of management, the initial missed opportunity to make effective use of the resources

of the advisory group, and the lack of communication between the linguistic consultant and the writers.

In this context the achievements of the team in producing materials and providing in-service training are impressive. The author conveys their enthusiasm, dedication, inevitable frustrations, and sometimes audacity, and the courage of the teachers in seventy-four pilot schools who committed themselves to using materials which they had not seen.

Subsequent chapters look at the way the CSCP has continued its work by revising and disseminating its materials in both the UK and the USA, and producing new materials to meet changing demands.

F. then looks at the impact of the changed climate following the 'Ruskin speech' and the implications of the National Curriculum and the Dearing Review. Although he rightly expresses concerns about the effects of the National Curriculum on Classics, which he terms the 'third crisis', the book ends on a note of cautious optimism. For he shows the commitment and resilience of Classics teachers of vision, their willingness to meet challenges and to turn threats into opportunities.

The book should appeal particularly to Classics teachers in schools and universities for its careful documentation of the project that has had so much influence on Classics teaching for nearly thirty years. It also provides an interesting example of the workings of this type of research and development project in the 1960s and 1970s. It will be useful to students working on higher degrees. Students on Initial Teacher Training courses will find parts of the book are readily accessible and provide a good overview of Classics teaching in the context of changes in education, but may have more difficulty with the chapters on the Cambridge Latin Course until they have acquired familiarity with the course and its theoretical linguistic base.

King's College London

BRENDA GAY

J. PELIKAN: *What Has Athens to Do with Jerusalem? Timaeus and Genesis in Counterpoint*. Pp. xvi + 139. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997. Cased, \$27.95. ISBN: 0-472-10807-7.

This book is a revised version of P.'s 1996 Thomas Spencer Jerome Lectures on the relationship between Plato's *Timaeus* (*T*) and the texts and interpretations of *Genesis* (*G*). Its first half consists of three chapters that each compare and contrast various aspects of what the author terms the 'counterpoint' existing between the texts. The exact purpose of making such a review becomes clear in Chapter Two, where—endorsing Jowett's claim that the influence of *T* on posterity was partly due to the Neoplatonists mistakenly finding in it Jewish and Christian doctrines 'quite at variance with the spirit of Plato'—P. describes the book as 'devoted to the history of that misunderstanding' (p. 24). The actual task of addressing 'the ongoing process of reading each of the two cosmogonies in the light of the other' (p. 65) is, however, only taken up in the book's second half, with Chapter Four examining Philo of Alexandria's interpretation of *G* in light of his understanding of *T*. Chapter Five then goes on to cover the approach to *G* and *T* taken by the Christian theology of New Rome as represented by Clement, Origen, Athanasius, Cyril, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil of Caesarea, and Gregory of Nyssa. The last chapter concludes with a study of Catholic Rome's account of both texts as exemplified in the work of Augustine and Boethius. The book ends with a useful bibliography, but unfortunately lacks an *index locorum* (and other indexes).

As one would expect, P.'s scholarship is detailed and thorough throughout. Readers will, however, find the first three chapters somewhat tangled, long-winded, speculative, and seemingly disconnected from the task at hand. For example, Chapter One's excursions into Lucretius' *De rerum natura* reveal that 'both Lucretius and *Genesis* could have formulated the purpose of their cosmogonies in the words of the . . . *Timaeus*' (p. 20; my emphasis) and that Lucretius 'could have said' that at a particular point in time God ended His work of creation (p. 21; if, that is, we merely substitute the word 'Earth' for 'God'), but such observations take us nowhere very useful. The next two chapters' explorations of the contrasts and 'elective affinities' (p. 25) existing between *G* and *T* are nevertheless of interest, and contain cogent discussions of (a) how the epistemological distinctions present in Plato's presentation of *T* as a 'likely account about Becoming' importantly differentiates it from *G*'s account; (b) the problem of plural Gods implicit in both texts (although

P's assumption that monotheism is an 'all-encompassing presupposition' of *G* seems unwarranted); (c) *T*'s portrait of an artisan Maker God and its implicit rejection of *G*'s *creatio ex nihilo* and the Hebrew Begetter God; (d) the problem of relating *T*'s metaphysical distinction between sensible particulars and intelligible Forms to the accounts in *G*; and (e) *G*'s and *T*'s parallel use of the notion of creation according to a divine image and their notions of moral wrong as due to ignorance of good and evil.

Again, however, the substance of the book lies in its last three chapters, where we get an accurate, albeit brief, overview of the actual way in which *T* influenced the interpretation of *G*. The author mentions, for example, how Philo first used *T* to associate the goodness of the Demiurge with *G*'s God the Creator (p. 71) and then employed *T*'s distinction of perceptible copy and original Form to account for the hiatus between *G*'s creation of light on the first day and the subsequent creation of the sun on the fourth (postulating two distinct creations of *κόσμος νοητός* first, *κόσμος αίσθητός* next; pp. 78–9). We also see how Philo could then explicate *G*'s two versions of the creation of man (the invisible soul being that which was created first [in the image of God] with the visible body [formed of clay] coming second [*G* 2.71; pp. 79–80]). Next, the author shows how Augustine and others were able to answer the question of why the Christian God had created a universe in the first place by employing *T* 29d–e's claim that since 'the Creator is good, he is free of jealousy, and must consequently desire all things to be as like himself as possible'. Finally, these chapters also trace out the interesting connections that exist between Plato's notions of Unity, Being, and Demiurge and later Christian conceptions of the unity of the Godhead and the Trinity.

In sum, although scholars familiar with both texts will not find the first half of the book to be especially useful, the second half can be recommended to those desiring an introduction to the way in which readings of the *Timaeus* played themselves out in the beginning phases of Christian theology.

The University of Maine at Farmington

MARK McPHERRAN

Note to readers

It is not the policy of the editors of *Classical Review* to publish correspondence or promote debates about particular reviews, since there are alternative venues in which academic disagreements can be pursued. We would, however, like to clarify certain issues of a non-academic nature in the notice in *Classical Review* 1998.2, pp. 525–6, of R. Stoneman, Alexander the Great (Lancaster Pamphlets; Routledge, 1997).

(1) Mr Stoneman, the Classics editor at Routledge, was not involved in commissioning this volume, which forms part of a series designed for A level students that is organized by the Routledge History editor.

(2) Routledge has not abandoned the publication of Hellenistic history: it will shortly be producing a substantial textbook on the Hellenistic world, and Mr Stoneman is interested in receiving scripts which will be assessed on their merits.