culture (57); whilst N. Humble finds a Plutarchian admiration of Xenophon and a possible Calvinist affinity with the Spartan lifestyle reflected in early Renaissance publications of the *Spartan Constitution* (72, 83) and T. Rood demonstrates how the twin 18th-century English obsessions with French revolutionary menace and landscape gardening (95, 97) produced the familiar personification of Xenophon as retired general turned gentleman-farmer.

The editors note that this reimagining of Xenophon over earlier centuries makes him malleable and contested (5). This is perhaps most evident in Leo Strauss' controversial readings of Xenophon, and D. Johnson's entertaining citation of Strauss' letters provides engaging insights: 'Xenophon is my special darling, since he had the courage to disguise himself as an idiot and go through the millennia like that' (126). This he follows with a case study of Socrates on justice at *Memorabilia* 4.4 in which, whilst not entirely agreeing with Strauss, Johnson shows how the use of Straussian interpretative tools may nevertheless lead the reader to ask thoughtful questions of a text.

The late Michael Stokes, to whose memory the volume is dedicated, returns to the trial of Socrates, and using internal and external evidence establishes the order of writing of the various accounts, concluding that Xenophon's *Apology* followed Plato's. Polycrates' lost *Accusation of Socrates* seems to have appeared next and to have alluded to Socrates' association with Critias and Alcibiades, leading Xenophon to mount a further defence in his *Memorabilia*. Like R. Waterfield, who situates the trial within its political context in order to examine Xenophon's unsettling assertion that Socrates sought death (270), Stokes stresses the importance of the wider historical setting in understanding the trial verdict and points to popular prejudices about Socrates' religious practice evidenced as far back as Aristophanes' *Clouds*.

Discussing Xenophon's complex attitude to slavery, E. Baragwanath suggests that Xenophon uses the Herodotean discourse of wonders (632) to provoke reflections about the way that mastery may be taught to a slave and courage even to a slave girl, arguing that, for Xenophon, the distinction between the slavish and the morally free did not overlap with the division between slaves and free citizens. S. Schorn and J. Jansen both highlight Xenophon's emphasis on the care of slaves in the *Poroi*. Schorn's examination of the philosophy underpinning the treatise proposes that Xenophon's utopian goal for Athens was a transformation of the state along the precepts of Xenophontic-Socratic philosophy (719) within which even mine slaves would benefit from improved quality of life (709). Building on M.I. Finley's observation of statuses as a continuum rather than distinct categories (727), Jansen reviews the *Poroi*'s discussion of non-citizens and proposes that Xenophon intended the establishment of a slave community living apart in the Laureion with a status 'somewhere between chattel slave and free Athenian resident' (738), suggesting that by treating them as quasi-*euergetai* he was trying to incorporate the mine slaves into the city's *charis* economy in exchange for their support in the mines and the military (740).

The collection is beautifully ordered, and themes emerge, recede and echo throughout to promote, if not unity of opinion amongst scholars, a coherence of thought throughout the corpus, without doubt representing a significant addition to the field of Xenophontic scholarship.

JANET POWELL
Birkbeck, University of London
j.powell@history.bbk.ac.uk

GRETHLEIN (J.) and KREBS (C.B.) *Eds* **Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: The 'Plupast' from Herodotus to Appian**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. x + 257. £60. 9781107007406.
doi:10.1017/S0075426914001591

'Plupast' is the editors' coinage for the anterior past – events from a period earlier than that covered by a writer's narrative and adduced in that later context by the writer or (very often) by one of the characters. Whether or not the term catches on, no-one will be surprised by the insight that the earlier past was presented by historians as mattering a lot. This volume has its origins in a Freiburg conference of 2006, but it avoids many of the dangers of 'books of the conference'. The authors all keep their eye firmly on the same ball and the coherence of theme and method is very striking.

The quality of the papers is uniformly high. D. Boedeker compares Herodotus' use of past and plupast with elegy and lyric: this is the only article to cast more than a sideways glance at other genres. E. Baragwanath sticks with Herodotus, discussing his use of (what we would call)

mythical examples and suggesting that we ought to distinguish a mythic narrative mode, shaping material in a particular traditional register, rather than obsessing about any difference between *spatium mythicum* and *spatium historicum*. J. Grethlein treats Thucydides' Plataean debate and T. Rood the use of the plupast in Xenophon's *Hellenica*. A. Feldherr offers a thoughtful reading of the speeches of Caesar and Cato in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*. C. Schultze gives some overdue limelight to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, discussing the value of the plupast for Roman self-definition. C. Krebs treats Livy's account of M. Manlius and his great Capitoline exploit and the rather different version that Manlius goes on to give when on trial. T. Joseph discusses the sombre reflections of Tacitus' Roman observers at *Histories* 1.50, prompted as they are by Galba's death to think of past civil wars. A. Zadorojnyi looks at the ways in which Plutarch's figures may model themselves on earlier exemplary characters and explores how far this might itself be a model for the inspirational effect of the *Lives* on his readers. L. Pitcher rounds off with a (rather brief) discussion of 'war-stories' and their use in Appian.

All these papers have insights that would repay detailed discussion, but one feature is how frequently the same themes recur, from the editors' introduction onwards. One concerns what they and many contributors term 'metahistory', which in paper after paper is pointed by the comparison, usually the gulf, between the past as treated by particular speakers and the past as it figures in the narrator's own voice. The implications of such contradiction and variation are less clear, in particular (to affect the same theoretical idiom) how 'metahistory', the presence of such contradictions and variations, interacts with 'metatextuality', the inferences for the historian's own narrative. Does such variation destabilize – a word used several times – any such inferences from history, including the historian's own text? Or is the point rather to validate the historian's account, as the non-partisan and insightful version that gets things right when there is so much self-interested rhetorical manipulation? Most of these chapters prefer the second option, though Krebs argues that Manlius' alternative version of his achievement may 'destabilize' Livy's own: in that case most readers would make the opposite inference. But most of the instances of 'destabilizing' (sometimes a lazy word) are less concerned with the past itself, more with its later distortions and variations when it becomes relevant to the present. There is a big difference here between casting uncertainty over one's own narrative version of the past, as D.S. Levene (*Livy on the Hannibalic War*, Oxford 2010, chapter 5) has recently suggested for Livy and the present reviewer (*Plutarch and History*, London 2002, chapter 7) for Plutarch's *Theseus and Romulus*, and acknowledging the varying practical inferences that can be, and often have been, drawn from past experience. Feldherr indeed makes the intriguing suggestion that the changing times might make it sensible to withdraw from any attempt to make the past applicable or useful, rather as Sallust himself withdrew from the political fray. Not all authors or audiences need be as pessimistic as that, but it is still historical lessons that tend to be 'destabilized', not history itself.

Another question, this time one the introduction gestures to but sidesteps, is how distinctive historical texts are anyway. The practical value of limiting a collection to a manageable corpus is clear enough, but the further claim that 'the historians' claim to veracity gives the plupast a special significance' (12) begs a lot of questions, especially as so many other genres – epic, tragedy, oratory – have so much of the past hanging over the events or issues they address. In tragedy in particular, the past – often a past whose details are rhetorically contested – is clearly often vital, but exactly *how* it is relevant is tellingly unclear. Still, that would require another volume, and editors can hardly be criticized for producing a book of such unusual coherence, especially when they have collected papers of such high quality.

CHRISTOPHER PELLING
University of Oxford
chris.pelling@classics.ox.ac.uk

PARMEGGIANI (G.) **Eforo di Cuma. Studi di storiografia greca** (Studi di Storia 14). Bologna: Pàtron Editore, 2011. Pp. 805. €66. 9788855531108.

doi:10.1017/S0075426914001608

Work on this book started in late 2002 with Parmeggiani's PhD dissertation and continued seamlessly until 2009. Such a long period of preparation is appropriate for the scope and size of the book, which is the first of its kind since G.L. Barber's 1935 *The Historian Ephorus* (Cambridge). This is not a critical edition, but a