

## NOTICES

C. H. WILSON (ed.): *Homer: Iliad: Books VIII and IX*. Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary (Classical Texts). Pp. x + 253. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1996. Cased, £35/\$49.95 (Paper, £14.95/\$24.95). ISBN: 0-85668-627-1 (0-85668-628-X pbk).

With the welcome appearance of this book, closely following upon Jasper Griffin's edition of *Iliad* 9 in 1995, students must now make a difficult choice between two thoroughly reliable editions of Book 9. W. gives us also Book 8, which is not perhaps the most obvious introduction to Homer for beginners, but it does provide an interesting contrast with 9, and the commentary on 9 does not require the reader to have already worked through 8.

The Introduction gives a competent account of the background and composition of the *Iliad*, and of the nature of oral poetry with its formulas and typical scenes. But nothing is said about the relationship of the poem to the *Odyssey*, and a beginner who reads (p. 5) that the text of the *Iliad* is basically the record of a *performance* of the poem may well wonder at the length of that performance. Helpful sections are devoted to the structure of the two books and to their position within the poem as a whole, and particular attention is paid to the problem of repetitions and inconsistencies in the narrative. On all of these, and most notably on the puzzling duals in 9, W. takes a sensible line: the text as we have it reflects 'different stages in Homer's own process of composition' (p. 24). The section on basic Homeric grammar will be invaluable for beginners but no attempt is made to explain why Homer has at his disposal so many different forms, or why Homeric Greek is different from Attic. A section on scansion completes the Introduction.

W. provides no apparatus criticus, but the Introduction and Commentary do draw attention to Alexandrian athetesis. Oddly, at 9.19 he prints Aristarchus' *τότε*, but in the Commentary seems to favour *πρόν*. In place of an apparatus the reader will find useful grammatical exegesis (some of it quite elementary: he parses *ένα*, *λαβών*, *φρένας*, *ἄντων*, but strangely not [9.193] *ταφών*; dual forms are regularly explained). This is linked by cross-references (a few of them inaccurate) to the grammar section of the Introduction. In the Commentary itself W. is thus set free to concentrate on other matters. The system works well on the whole, but it does lead to some repetition, e.g. at 8.335, where we are told on both pp. 86 and 197 that 'the Olympian' is Zeus. W. has succeeded on the whole in producing a translation that is both readable and accurate. If anything, he veers towards the latter, and is none the worse for that. But the reader may wonder why the frequently repeated *μῦθον ἀγασσάμενοι* (e.g. 9.694, 711) means now 'stunned by his words', and now 'admiring the speech', or why the same word *δαΐφρων* can mean both 'warlike' (8.152) and 'wise' (9.651). W. gives no indication that not all agree that *γλαυκῶπις* means 'grey-eyed' (8.30), and he has not made up his mind as to whether Achilles lives in a tent or a hut. *ἵπποδάμοιο* is omitted from the translation at 8.194, and *ὠκείων* (on which he rightly comments) at 197.

The Commentary presents in a succinct form a great deal of accurate information about customs, narrative techniques, typical scenes, similes, etc., and it is particularly good on characterization and style. But I do not understand how W. feels able to read so much into patterns of dactyls and spondees or of caesuras. One might have welcomed more on the relationship between Zeus and Fate (8.73–4 and 473–7). Instead of repeating on p. 239 from 154 the information that *Ζεὺς καταχθόνιος* is Hades, he might have tried to explain the significance of this title.

Misprints and wrong references are mostly trivial. However, (p. 40) VIII 244–5 should be IX 244–5, (p. 72) Nestor's shield has become a spear, (p. 86) the dative plural of *πούς* is not *πούσι*, (p. 136) *δεῖδιμεν* is not second person, (pp. 171 and 245) Phoinix has turned into Patroklos, and (p. 234) II 405 should be II 505.

University of Glasgow

A. F. GARVIE

© Oxford University Press, 1998

K. STANLEY: *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the Iliad*. Pp. xii + 470. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Nothing is more troublesome to critics who hanker for total integration of subject matter and theme than a masterly *ekphrasis*. S.'s recent contribution has been followed by A. S. Becker's *The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Ekphrasis* (Lanham, 1995). Both intuit that the *Shield* is the key to unlock the secrets of the *Iliad*. S. analyses the structure (ring-composition) of the scene in the first of many diagrams of the *Iliad*'s narrative geometry. Peace significantly balances war; the just king (18.550–60) is the centrepiece, and the dancing scene (18.590–606), to which S. would restore the *ἀοιδός*, is a personal comment that distances the author of our *Iliad* from the archaic *ἀοιδοί* who sang of Daedalus and Ariadne. For S. the *Shield* thus becomes an expression 'of the poet's view of his role and his relationship to his heritage', and the *Iliad* an indictment of a warring heroic society's pursuit of *kudos*, a reaction against the ideals of heroism, and a radical transformation of the genre of heroic narrative poetry. Up to a point, one might say: the *Iliad* is indeed a monumental epic, not a heroic lay, and its ethical complexity goes far beyond a naive song of triumph (*ἡράμεθα μέγα κῆδος, ἐπέφνομεν Ἐκτορα δῖον*, 22.393). But the depth of moral outlook of the *Iliad*, according to S. (p. 268), is foreign to 'extemporised poetry', and therefore cannot belong to the tale of Troy as it was sung in the eighth century, but reflects the concerns of a later and more literate age. Such is the thesis, sustained by 240 pages of analysis and 150 pages of close argument in the guise of notes and bibliography. There is of course no evidence, beyond the *Iliad* itself, for what is to my mind a less than plausible intuition. It is not to be rejected merely for that reason; there are even parallels, of a sort, to the transformation imagined by S.—'the outpourings of singers like Sagymbay and Sayakbay are in some ways clearly sub-literary, even at times theatrical, with innovations in style, content and characterization too massive for the traditional elements embedded in them to support' (A. T. Hatto, *The Manas of Wilhelm Radloff* [Wiesbaden 1990], p. xv). I leave it to the reader to decide whether the *Iliad* could be recognizably described by the words I have italicized. S.'s analysis into 'largely new material', 'older material revised', and 'older material reassembled' is given on p. 288. The discussion of the Sarpedon episode (5.471–710, pp. 81–4, 'new material') is perhaps best indicative of the points S. wishes to make: the civic virtues of Sarpedon versus the heroic egotism of Hector. A comparison with the work of H. van Thiel (*Ilias und Iliaden* [Basel/Stuttgart, 1982]) could be productive.

The bulk of S.'s work, however, is devoted to a systematic analysis of the narrative organization of the *Iliad* (pp. 37–247). The poem is a triptych, Books 1–7, 8–17, and 18–24, the book division being part of the design (some interesting argument here on pp. 249–61), not an invention for the convenience of Hellenistic editors. This is serious commentary stuff, and will be read as such and cited for many years to come. Its purpose here, however, is to tease out from a medley of traditional motifs variations significant of the poet's own standpoint. S. must therefore pronounce 'such well-marked architecture' also to be beyond the capacity of 'extemporised poetry' (p. 268). It could be argued, of course, with equal or greater plausibility, that the well-ordered pathway of song is precisely what preliterate narrative requires, see E. J. Bakker, *Poetry in Speech* (Ithaca, 1996). The persistent equation of S.'s term 'extemporized' with the 'oral' (implying the recreation in performance of a well-rehearsed narrative) of many Homerists is to be regretted in this context. 'Extempore composition' was a horse that died some time ago and flogging it does nothing to strengthen S.'s radical inference that the *Iliad* owes its architecture as well as its outlook to a sixth-century recension. In recent 'oralist' criticism there has been a shift to tradition from orality and to reception from composition, e.g. J. M. Foley, *The Singer of Tales in Performance* (Bloomington, 1995). It is tradition, or convention, rather than the mode of production, that in the first instance constrains the formal aspects of the poet's work, but it does not constrain the quality of his imagination. And that is one reason why the elucidation of the infrastructure of the Homeric poems and the appreciation of their achievement are different tasks. It is after all a critical commonplace that Homer got the better of the heroic tradition, even if we are not quite sure—and why should we be?—whether he saw the tragedy behind triumph (for instance), or preached a homily on the human condition or the nature of heroism. A sixth-century date for the reconstruction of an heroic *Iliad* chiefly rests on reports of the cultural activity of the Athenian tyrants. That Pisistratus should try to annex the greatest existing poem for the greatest of festivals is understandable, but it is hard to disinter more precise motives, hard to detect their support in the complex morality of the *Iliad* (see the long note on p. 414), and not

easy to reconcile its ambiguities with the reconstruction of an ancient narrative for the greater glory of the Panathenaea.

*New College, Oxford*

J. B. HAINSWORTH

M. L. PRIETO: *Ares en Homero: Función del dios de la guerra en la Iliada y la Odisea*. (Classical and Byzantine monographs, 35.) Pp. 450, 15 figs. Amsterdam: A. M. Hakkert, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 0-256-0638-5; 90-256-1046-3.

αἵματος ἄσαι Ἄρηα ταλαύρινον πολεμιστήν ('To glut with his blood Ares the god who fights under the shield's guard') is a formula denoting death in battle (11.5.289). The epithet *δηῖος*, used for Ares (*δηῖω Ἄρηϊ* [II. 5.241]) is also used of war (*δηῖον ἐκ πολέμοιο* [II. 7.119]). Ares is brazen, as are weapons (*χάλκεος Ἄρης* [II. 5.704]); he is intent on killing (*Ἄρης μαιφόνος* [II. 5.844]) and on destroying cities (*Ἄρηα πτολίπορθος* [II. 20.152]). His most common epithet is 'plague for men' (*βροτολοιγὸς Ἄρης* [II. 5.31]). However, despite this group of adjectives that give a clear image of Ares as a god of war, the god in the *Iliad* is defeated in scenes where he is acting as a warrior.

The book studies the way Ares is presented in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and points out the failure of the god's actions. The book is divided into two parts. The first, and longest, part is a philological study of the name of Ares, and its object is to search for the function of Ares in the pre-Homeric tradition. For this purpose P. studies in detail each epithet applied to Ares and studies the position of the name of Ares inside each formula. The second part of the book studies the peculiar ridicule that the god of war receives in both poems, which contrasts with the way in which he is described by his epithets.

P. studies the name of Ares outside the epic poems, concentrating on the discovery of the name of Ares in the Linear B tablets. Her study of the structure of the name of Ares focuses on two aspects: firstly, the vowel 'A' of the name *Ares* is sometimes counted as long and sometimes as short; the proportion in Homer (1:4) favours the short: Ἄρες Ἄρε̄ς βροτολοιγέ, μαιφόνε, τειχεσιπλήτα.

Secondly, she considers the four types of declension of the name of Ares which appear in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. (1) Theme in *-εϵ-* appears in the Aeolic dialect (*Ἄρεϵϵ* in Alcaeus L.PD12.8; *Ἄρεϵα* in Corinna). These forms with diphthong are related to the Homeric forms with a theme in *-ηε̄-* such as *Ἄρηα*, *Ἄρηος*, and *Ἄρηϊ*. (2) Theme in *-σ*, that appears in the Homeric vocative *Ἄρες*. (3) Name in *-ης -ητος*, *Ἄρης-Ἄρητος*, which has a parallel in *Φέρης-Φέρητος* (*Od.* 11.256), from whom comes the patronym *Φερητιάδης* (*Il.* 2.763). (4) Forms of the first declension; the Homeric *Ἄρη* and the genitive *Ἄρεω* appear in Archilochus (18 West: *παῖδ' Ἄρεω μνηφόνου*).

From the study of these variations of the name of Ares P. concludes: 'The name Ares belongs to a theme in *are* that explains the dialectal changes of the name, and which include the name Ares in the Greek and Indoeuropean group of names' (p. 44).

The aim of the book is to show the contrast between the god of war, as the study of the epithets for Ares has shown, and his failure when he acts as a warrior. In the *Iliad* he is defeated by Diomedes (*Il.* 5.846-74) and by Athene (*Il.* 21.391-434), and in a mythological story he is bound in a jar (*Il.* 5.395-7). In the *Odyssey* he is the laughing stock of the other gods when he is caught in bed with Aphrodite, and is once again ridiculed. P. considers this ridicule of Ares as an innovation of the epic poet, in contrast with the pre-Homeric tradition (p. 423).

It is a book with a meticulous linguistic approach, directed at specialists in Homeric studies. P.'s work shows a very interesting combination of the study of Homeric diction with the implications of formulaic language in the construction of the story.

*University of Warwick*

CARLA BOCCHETTI

G. M. WRIGHT, P. V. JONES (edd.): *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*. Pp. vii + 346. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-814732-5.

In his 1996 collection, *Reading the Odyssey*, Seth Schein included English versions of two distinguished German contributions; W. & J. have now taken the next logical step of producing a whole volume of writings from that important tradition of scholarship. Included complete are Strasburger on the sociology of the epics, two papers by Schadewaldt (Hector and Andromache; Achilles' Decision), Reinhardt on the Judgement of Paris, Burkert on the tale of Ares and Aphrodite, and the whole of Erbse's chapter attacking Page on the Continuation; there are also extracts from Lohmann on speeches, Klingner on the Telemachy, Fränkel on similes (the last sixteen pages of his book), and Reinhardt on the Adventures of Odysseus. The last of these is wholly translated in Schein, but presumably that was discovered too late to change the plan.

It would be superfluous to praise these wise and thought-provoking works, from which I have learned so much in the past. We shall all welcome the opportunity to use them in teaching. The balance in the selection between hard scholarship and imaginative criticism has been well calculated. The introduction (by J.) is intended 'to review or push forward' discussion of some of the subject matter of these essays: he considers especially Homer's narrative strategies, formulaic dexterity, folk-tale motifs, and conventions in *Od.* 9–12, and the relation between the two epics. This is all welcome, and on the second topic we must hope for a fuller treatment elsewhere, but some will feel that a synthesizing discussion of the German tradition and of its different emphases and development would have been appropriate.

Where I have checked it, the translation seems very accurate, though occasionally there are some obscurities—not surprisingly, I noticed these especially with the often elusive style of Reinhardt (some very odd renderings on pp. 229 and 230), and with the highly technical chapter by Erbse. Sometimes the translator clearly needed more aid from the classicist: e.g. p. 313 for 'a Molossian word' read 'a molossus'. P. 172 n. 5 for 'table' read 'plate'. On p. 223, Eumaeus is said to be the only one 'worthy to be addressed with the poetic "you"': this means that he is apostrophized by the poet, but I wonder if a reader who did not know this would take the point. Why are 'Stollen' and 'Abgesang' left in German (p. 154)? What is the unmusical reader to make of 'via the ostinato of his silence' (p. 240)? P. 179, 14 up: 'whenever' must be 'whereas'. The prize for infelicity in translation goes to p. 247: neither Homer nor Reinhardt could have begun a speech by Zeus to Poseidon with the expression 'OK'.

The original page references are indicated at the point where the translated text reaches the original page break. Though proof-reading and indexing are more than competent, there are other ways in which the editors could have done more to help the reader. When Reinhardt cites a paper by Schadewaldt in *Die Antike*, it should be made clear that this is in fact translated in this volume (p. 186; p. 124 does not reveal that fact). Similarly Burkert refers regularly to Reinhardt's paper on the Judgement without cross-references being supplied (pp. 251, 255), and, annoyingly, to a version with a different pagination from that indicated in the translated text. The Erbse chapter cites at least ten works by author's name alone; these are elucidated elsewhere in his book, but not here: Spohn's 1816 dissertation at least is fairly obscure. No references are given to the English versions of works by Snell, Ehrenberg, Hasebroek, Otto, and others, nor to various scholars' *Kleine Schriften*; fragment references are not updated; and a more precise reference than 'Dresden pot', with a citation of a 1906 German book, would have been useful on p. 157.

Despite these irritants, the project was certainly worth doing, and has been done intelligently and well. These essays constitute a volume far superior to many newly commissioned collections.

Christ Church, Oxford

R. B. RUTHERFORD

C. A. VAN DUZER: *Duality and Structure in the Iliad and Odyssey*. (Lang Classical Studies, 8.) Pp. xii + 366. New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 1996. £39. ISBN: 0-8024-2845-0.

According to the blurb, Van D. is not a professional classical scholar, but a writer living in California. He knows the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* extremely well, though his sources for detailed exegesis are more or less confined to the Cambridge *Iliad* and the Italian/Oxford *Odyssey*

© Oxford University Press, 1998

commentaries. Throughout this long and discursive book he has three idiolects which occur again and again, and require explanation. They are 'duality', 'saving device parallel', and 'ritual substitute'.

Duality is not the duplication of characters so brilliantly pointed out by B. Fenik in his *Studies in the Odyssey* (*Hermes Einzelschriften* 30 [Wiesbaden, 1974]): Eumaïos and Philoitos, Antinoös and Eurymakhos, Eurykleia and Eurynome, Melanthios and Melantho. Rather it is the one-to-one balancing of details, sometimes supporting each other, but more often contrasting. It is closer to 'polarity' in G. E. R. Lloyd's book *Polarity and Analogy* (Cambridge, 1966). Van D.'s first example, chosen to prepare for later discussion, consists of the alternative divine and human names that are sometimes given, e.g. Batiëia/the tomb of bouncing Myrine for the hill at *Il.* 2.813–4 and Briareos/Aigaion for the giant who protected Zeus at *Il.* 1.403–4. The pleasure in a binomial balance, commonly utilizing the particles *μέν* and *δέ*, is of course a pervasive feature of the style of Greek authors, appreciated by everyone who reads them. This, however, is not the way Van D. presents it, but rather as a speciality of Homer's. He draws attention to the contrasted helmets lent to Odysseus and Diomedes in 10 and interestingly compares the contrasted rhetorical abilities of Odysseus and Menelaos in 3 (p. 98 n. 8), and has perceptive comments on duality in the cases of Scylla and Charybdis (pp. 221–3), the Sirens (pp. 223–4), and the Cyclops (pp. 250–2).

The term 'saving device parallel' appears to be a creation of Van D. himself. He has noted that quite frequently in the stories, particularly in the *Odyssey*, there are descriptions of special items, talismans, as it were, which protect the hero in a dangerous situation: for example, the plant moly, the giant Briareos/Aigaion, Odysseus' Ciconian wine. These are saving devices, and he associates their appearance in the story with duality and with certain thematic motifs, such as exclusiveness, difficulty, tying, hanging up, and particularly the fact that they mark boundaries, i.e. the beginnings and ends of episodes (p. viii). In addition, he finds that there are numerous objects, which in all other respects resemble saving devices (they mark boundaries, show duality, and so on), but are not involved in saving or protecting anyone. These he calls 'saving device parallels'. Examples are the spoils of Dolon hung on a tamarisk bush, Demodokos' song about Ares and Aphrodite, the Greeks' exchange of armour at 14.370–82, occasional rivers, hills, and other features.

The term 'ritual substitute' seems mostly to mean little more than substitute, ritual being a favoured term in modern scholarship. There are a lot of them: Odysseus is said to be a ritual substitute for Agamemnon in 2, Thersites for Akhilleus and also for Agamemnon, Diomedes for Akhilleus in 4–7, Dolon for Odysseus and Diomedes in 10, and also (surprisingly) for Agamemnon, Eurypylos (very surprisingly) for Sarpedon in 11/12, Asios for Hektor in 12, Poseidon for Zeus in 14, Patroklos for Akhilleus in 16, Aineias for Akhilleus in 20, the dog Argos for Odysseus, not to speak of Telemakhos and Penelope for Odysseus at various points.

The book is like a stream of consciousness, with no clear structure of its own. The author very often promises in a footnote that he will later deal with such and such a question (he never gives the page reference, but there is a good Index of Passages Discussed at the end of the book, so that the reader can, if he wishes, find out). He ranges over the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* selecting passages for discussion, and, after chapters entitled 'Divine Names, Saving Devices, and Dual Structures', 'The Poet's Role and Ritual Substitutes', 'Three Missions in the *Iliad*' (they are the Doloneia in 10, Hera's seduction of Zeus in 14, and Priam's visit to Akhilleus in 24), 'Landmarks and Openings', and 'The Underworld, the *Speciosa Miracula*, and the *Cyclopeia*', he adds on a mixed collection of thirteen passages (called 'Florilegium') and seven appendices.

In addition to duality, saving device parallels, and ritual substitutes, Van D. is strong on phallic imagery. The turning-post in the chariot race at *Iliad* 23.326–30 with the two stones at its base is 'obviously phallic'; so is Peneleos' spear-thrust through Ilioneus' eye (14.493), the olive stake through the Cyclops' eye, the arrow through the axes, the firebrand inserted into the ashes (*Od.* 5.488), the plant moly, and the mast (and keel) of Odysseus' makeshift raft entering Charybdis (*Od.* 12.431).

Van D. hopes that his approach will help to resolve some Homeric questions, such as whether the Doloneia is by the author of the *Iliad* and whether *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are by the same author. Although the book is pleasant to read, and by a very committed student of Homer, it is difficult to accede to this expectation.

University College London

M. M. WILLCOCK

Γ. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ (trans.), Δ. ΙΑΚΩΒ (ed., intro. & comm.): *Πινδάρου Πυθιονικοί. (Κείμενα Ἑλληνικά, 7)*. Pp. 377. Herakleion: Βικελαία Δημοτική Βιβλιοθήκη, 1994. Paper.

The core of this elegantly produced book is I.'s edition (see pp. 59–60, 11–12) of the translation of Pindar's Pythian odes from the legacy of the poet and critic Giannis Oikonomidis (1891–1974). I. published it facing a non-critical edition of Pindar's Greek (following the Snell–Maehler text), and added a substantial general introduction to Pindar and an extensive commentary on the individual odes. At the end of the book one finds a large bibliography and an overview of the metrical structures (reproduced from Snell–Maehler) of the odes commented upon. There are no indexes. The introduction includes informative sections on Pindar's biography (pp. 19–21), the history of the text (pp. 21–4), the conventions of the genre (pp. 25–7), dialect (pp. 27–9), metre (pp. 29–31), Pindar's *Auffassung des Dichterberufs* (pp. 31–7), his religious ideas (pp. 37–9), *Nachleben* (pp. 40–7), and the history of Pindaric criticism (pp. 47–58; see also pp. 12–15). It ends with a biographical sketch of Oikonomidis and an introduction to his translation (pp. 58–61). Oikonomidis' translation is not metrical, but 'attempts to preserve some rhythm' (p. 60). It is not easy for me to assess its aesthetic qualities. Judged purely on a scholarly basis, it has some shortcomings. Oikonomidis has a tendency to give explanatory paraphrases rather than literal translations. As a result, the translation takes one in fact quite far from Pindar's Greek: often it offers more explicitness than Pindar intended; at its worst it hides Pindar from view by giving a one-sided interpretation of the poet's words instead of the poet's words themselves. The commentary on every single ode is preceded by a brief interpretative essay ('εἰσαγωγή'). I. gives the most basic background information (concerning e.g. the date, the victor, the discipline, the historical setting, the story of the myth, alternative sources for the myth), draws attention to running themes, focusing predominantly on the myths, and proposes an interpretation of their relevance. These interpretations are thoughtful and balanced, but some times rather noncommittal. Like most commentaries, the strength of I.'s book resides in the specifics. The extensive commentary, aiming at a readership of specialists, offers copious notes on matters of detail. There is a lot of excellent and impressive scholarship in the commentary, which future critics will ignore at their peril. It is especially for I.'s commentary that this book certainly deserves a wider readership of specialists in particular than it is likely to attract owing to the language in which it is written.

Leiden University

ILJA LEONARD PFEIJFFER

A. BIERL: *Die Orestie des Aischylos auf der modernen Bühne: Theoretische Konzeptionen und ihre szenische Realisierung*. (DRAMA, Beiträge zum antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption, 5.) Pp. 124. Stuttgart: M&P, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 3-476-45170-4.

The performance of ancient dramatic texts in modern theatres continues to make a very strong contribution towards keeping the interest in Graeco-Roman culture alive outside schoolrooms, lecture theatres, and ivory towers. Also, modern *Rezeptionsgeschichte* is by now a firmly established item on the scholarly agenda (as is evident not least from Burian's and Macintosh's articles in the new *Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*). In 1991 Hellmut Flashar, to whom the short monograph under review is dedicated, published his handbook on the afterlife of Greek drama on the modern stage. Pioneering and indispensable as it is, Flashar's book is, despite some exceptions (notably his chapter on theatre under National Socialism), on the whole weak when it comes to putting flesh on the skeleton of the information gathered by exploring how specific socio-political settings and intellectual climates generate specific productions. B. has spotted this gap. Very aptly choosing the *Oresteia* as his test case for a diachronic survey, he embarks on demonstrating how theatre productions are variously ideologized in the course of the twentieth century. Naturally, *Eumenides*, with its inherently ambiguous ending, features prominently in B.'s analysis. Patterns emerge. Celebrating the foundation of a social institution, the *Oresteia* is frequently found in the repertory of foundation festivals, even state anniversaries (Switzerland in 1991) (p. 18 with n. 22). The Aeschylean evolution from chaos to cosmos is used affirmatively as the charter myth of the audience's

© Oxford University Press, 1998

current political system (Oberländer, Müthel, Stein). Marxist readings lay emphasis on the emerging power of the *demos* (Gassman/Lucignani), while in the early 1970s these affirmative interpretations start being denied, undermined, or fragmented (Ronconi, Parenti, Castellucci). On the other hand, the political dimensions can be suppressed, even ignored. Thus, *Eumenides* could be perceived as an irrelevant 'in-play' on Athenian politics, which results in the play's mutilation or straightforward banishment (Reinhardt 1911 and others, p. 24f.). Politics can yield to an emphasis on ritual, gender, and the alien character of Greek theatrical conventions (Hall), or to a delight in multicultural theatricality (Mnouchkine). Space forbids closer discussion of those productions treated by B. in some detail (British readers, by the way, may be disappointed that Hall's 1981 production is not one of them). I was most captivated by the core of the book, B.'s analysis of Stein's 1994 *Oresteia* in Moscow and Mnouchkine's *coup de théâtre* (pp. 46–77).

If anything, I would take issue with B.'s contention that the most important productions of the *Oresteia* during the twentieth century occurred at moments of great political change and discontinuity ('Sollbruchstellen', p. 23). True as this may be in some cases, as a generalization it nevertheless seems contrived, and I would endorse it only with some qualifications. Stein's 1980 production was conceived within a climate of high, though recently challenged (terrorism), political continuity. The same applies to Hall's *Oresteia*. And it is worth noting that some vital political discontinuities of this century have *not* generated 'their' *Oresteias*. Thus, there was, to my knowledge, no significant politically oriented production of the *Oresteia* in the post-Nazi West Germany of the late-1940s or the 1950s in response to the Fascist disaster (and, as B. interestingly points out [pp. 45f.], no production ever in communist East Germany or the Soviet Union). Nor did the movement of 1968 'trigger off' subversive *Oresteias* along its utopian and anti-authoritarian lines in Europe or the US (Ronconi's production of 1972 is already under the influence of early poststructuralism). I wonder whether these silences are accidental. The *Oresteia* can be ignored, or the challenges posed by it can seem such that societies refuse to attempt facing them.

This fine book is an advancement within the field of the *Rezeptionsgeschichte* of ancient drama. Well written, well annotated, and—any reader's delight—both stimulating and short, it deserves a wide international readership.

Magdalen College, Oxford

MARTIN REVERMANN

D. J. CONACHER: *Aeschylus: The Earlier Plays and Related Studies*. Pp. xv + 184. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1996. Cased, £37/\$50 (Paper, £12.95/\$17.95). ISBN: 0-8020-0796-1 (0-8020-7155-4 pbk)

C. has much experience of literary analysis: his first book, *Euripidean Drama* (Toronto, 1967), may serve as his own continuing paradigm. This volume, following those on *Prometheus Bound* (1980) and *The Oresteia* (1987), completes his commentary on the extant plays of Aeschylus. C. aims to provide a 'detailed running commentary' on *The Persians*, *The Seven Against Thebes*, and *The Suppliants* (correctly if somewhat loosely designated the 'earlier' plays), and to offer an analysis of their themes, structure, dramatic techniques, and devices. This is Part I of the book; Part II comprises two more general studies, one on Aeschylean imagery and one on dramatic use of the chorus. It will be evident from this summary that the level of detail in the commentary falls short of that in the earlier volumes. And as almost half of the space in the chapters on imagery and on the chorus is devoted to *PV* and *Oresteia*, the impression that the attention given to the other plays has been relatively scant is enhanced.

C. is splendid at what he does best: sensible, lucid analysis of the main issues of the plays backed up by judicious use of quotation and careful translation, and fair-minded summary of alternative views and treatment of other critical approaches. He is unashamedly traditional, and in disarming self-deprecation contrasts the work of structuralists, deconstructionists, and those concerned with visual or theatrical aspects with his own 'formal' approach, allegedly leading to 'more naive interpretations' (p. xiv). Unlike many traditional scholars, he is willing to relegate discussions of technical matters, such as textual problems, to notes and appendices, while indicating the importance of these to his total presentation. For this reason, his work is particularly useful for the Greekless; and they can at least glimpse the reasons for his judgements.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

If many of C.'s conclusions are unexciting, we ought perhaps to reflect that it is difficult to be both exciting and sound about Aeschylean tragedy.

The chapter on *Persae* is an updated version of an article published in *Serta Turyniana*, a Festschrift (festschrift, *sic*, p. xv) for Alexander Turyn (Illinois, 1974). C. regards this as 'a fine play which has been much misunderstood and undervalued' and adheres to the simple view that the main theme can be summed up ethically in terms of the punishment of *hybris*, that is, in a *koros-hybris* conjunction (p. 6; cf. p. x, where there is a bad misprint, *choros* for *koros*), and that Aeschylus' artistic achievement lies in the way this simple theme is addressed and expressed. Much space is devoted to discussion of alternative views (especially those of Garvie, with some repetition, pp. 6 n. 7, 25 n. 40, and 30 n. 53; and there are other repetitions on pp. 10, 20, etc.); but matters viewed as not pertinent to C.'s own emphasis are excluded (for example, tactical and technical aspects of the battle are dismissed, though these are relevant to the nature and degree of dramatic adaptation).

The chapter on *Septem* ('one of the great "battle plays" in western literature') purports to deal with the trilogy; but only Section 1 addresses this question. And, while we could not expect detailed reference to Sophocles' *Antigone* and Euripides' *Phoenician Women*, the statement (p. 45), 'Seldom has an audience been more brutally assaulted by a barrage of battle clamour!', cries out for a footnote on similar (perhaps derivative) lyric lines in these other Theban plays. C.'s view of Eteocles' death comes close to the old 'Opfertod' line (cf. p. 35), but finds 'a blend of freedom with an inevitable doom' (p. 64, and here Lesky's name might appear). There are three useful appendices on three critical problems: the timing of Eteocles' assignments (problematical mixture of tenses); the nature of Eteocles' decision (problem of fate versus freewill); and the end of the play (problem of authenticity).

The chapter on *Supplices* begins with comments on the play's date and structure, and ends with an appendix on the nature of its trilogy (important also throughout, cf. p. 80). Here, C. departs somewhat from his professedly literary stance, devoting much space to the question of the motivation and justification of the Danaids; and to the possibility that the play has an aetiological bearing on the Thesmophoria.

The expression is in the main elegant as well as clear; but now and again C. falls into vague hyperbole, such as (p. 47) the 'fine untranslatable phrase' (just translated) or mixed metaphors, such as (pp. 47–8) 'great word-tapestry' and 'vivid cameos . . . paints a series of cameo-portraits'. The bibliography lists works cited, with a few additional items. Regrettably, there is no index.

Kyoto University

E. M. CRAIK

H. LLOYD-JONES, N. G. WILSON: *Sophocles: Second Thoughts*. (Hypomnemata, 100.) Pp. 147. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997. Paper, DM 40. ISBN: 3-525-25200-5.

The complexity of Sophoclean language and the faulty transmission of many passages continue to engage textual critics. R. D. Dawe presented the third edition of his Teubner Text in 1996, and now Ll.-J&W. give us their *Second Thoughts*, after publishing in 1990 their Oxford Classical Text and explaining their views in the companion volume *Sophoclea: Studies on the Text of Sophocles* (Oxford, 1990).

The format of *Second Thoughts* follows that of *Sophoclea*: separate notes on various lemmata, beginning with *Ajax* and ending with *Oedipus at Colonus*. The notes vary both in length and in kind. Some are brief references to an impressive variety of primary and secondary sources (one of the chief merits of the book is to provide up-to-date information about scholarship on the text of Sophocles), whereas others contain more extensive discussion, and while most of them are centrally concerned with the establishment of the text, others interpret a text that is securely established.

Ll.-J&W. are particularly interesting when the problems of a passage prompt them to discuss matters of wider relevance. On *El.* 379–82, for instance, they illustrate corruption of *ἐντός* to *ἐκτός* and such like, on *El.* 1322–5 they give instances of 'injunction to silence and the announcement of a new character's entry' by characters other than the chorus, and on *Tr.* 46–8 they suggest that tragedy uses 'article for relative' not 'only on account of metrical necessity'. As in *Sophoclea*, the authors diagnose corruption, and argue for specific emendations, in a number of passages. In some of them they may well be right (e.g. *OT* 790 *προῦφηνεν* Hermann: *προῦφάνη* MSS, with Jebb and others; *Ph.* 921 *ἀληθώς* Blaydes: *ἀληθῆ* MSS; *OC* 342 *σφῶν* is

© Oxford University Press, 1998



possibly corrupt). Other suggestions are less convincing. Three examples: *EL* 1193 τίς γάρ σ' ἀνάγκη τῆιδε προστρίβει (Wilson: προτρέπει MSS) βροτῶν; But expressions such as Aristophanes *Knights* 5 πηγάς . . . προστρίβεται τοῖς οἰκέταις suggest that the *accusative* of the thing 'rubbed' and the *dative* of the person afflicted (rather than vice versa) would be expected. *Tr.* 693–4 ἔξω (Lloyd-Jones: εἶσω MSS) δ' ἀποστείχουσα δέρομαι φάτιν | ἄφραστον . . . But there is no suggestion that Deianira 'had thrown it [= 'the lump of wool'] away outside the house'. On the basis of what has gone before, the allusive description of her movements makes better sense without the emendation: 688–92 fill in what happened after Deianira entered the house at 496, 692 ὅσπερ εἶδετε refers to the following scene in which Deianira gave the closed box (622) to Lichas (thus Jebb and others), and finally 693–704 describe the things Deianira saw after re-entering the house (εἶσω . . . ἀποστείχουσα) at 632. *Ph.* 577 ἔκπευσον αὐτὸν (Paley: ἔκπλει σεαυτὸν ξυλλαβῶν MSS) ἐκ τῆσδε γῆς. But to make the False Merchant suggest that Neoptolemus *help* Philoctetes and rescue him from his enemies is to deprive the emphasis on Neoptolemus' and the False Merchant's secrecy (574, 578–9) of much of its point.

More important than inevitable disagreement with particular views that Ll.-J.&W. put forward are questions concerning the purpose of the book. According to the introduction (p. 9), *Second Thoughts* is the result of 'a desire to correct errors and to communicate some new suggestions'. In some respects the correction of errors is a welcome project. Both the list of 'Corrigenda in *Sophoclea*' at the end of the book and the references in various individual notes to mistakes in the Oxford text are useful, and the authors' yielding to criticism is, in numerous passages, likely to meet with many readers' agreement (they have given up, for instance, Lloyd-Jones's 'στὶν ἀρμῶι at *Aj.* 245, Blydes's αἰτῶ at *OT* 163, and Tournier's 'κποδῶν at *OC* 113). Less welcome is the fact that a large part of the alleged errors are those of Ll.-J.&W.'s reviewers rather than their own. What is more, many notes contain little fresh material, expanding only slightly on the discussion in *Sophoclea* or summarizing the arguments of other scholars that prompted the authors to change or to maintain their views. All too often one is left with the impression that Ll.-J.&W. wrote *Second Thoughts* in order to inform readers whether or not they have changed their earlier views, rather than as a contribution to an ongoing debate. Perhaps either a longer book with more detailed new argument or a much shorter one, concentrating on the sections which offer most of the fresh material, would have been more satisfactory.

University of Manchester

FELIX BUDELMANN

S. A. BARLOW: *Euripides: Heracles: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Classical Texts). Pp. xxvii + 195. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1996. Cased, £35/\$49.95 (Paper, £14.95/\$24.95). ISBN: 0-85668-232-2 (0-85668-233-0 pbk)

This is B.'s second contribution (the first being the opening volume, *Trojan Women*) to the excellent Aris & Phillips series of Euripides commentaries. B.'s *Heracles* is one of the best, with a helpful introduction, a translation that is both accurate and readable, and an often acute commentary. Whilst professional scholars will still turn to Bond for textual discussion and accumulation of parallels, they, as well as school and university students, will find much in B.'s commentary that is stimulating and important on questions of imagery, structure, and literary interpretation. The introduction contains a section on structure which closely follows the argument B. outlined in her important article in *G&R* 29 (1982). Her case for a coherent structure is a plausible one, but some discussion of more critical judgements (such as those of Swinburne and Murray, quoted on the back of the book but not mentioned within it) would have been welcome. The introduction also contains some good discussion of the presentation of Heracles' madness in psychological terms. In the commentary, a feature to be particularly commended is the frequent reference to vase-paintings and sculptures (e.g. 153, 182, 348–411, 611, 673, 823). There are some good notes on the effects of different metres (e.g. 131–9, 735–62). B.'s commentary contains many stimulating observations, such as on the way Lycus' speech 'breaks the magic circle of belief' (140–69), on the isolation of the archer Heracles (203), on Megara's 'painfully laboured and wordy speech' (275–311), on the Labours stasimon (348–441), and on the imagery of Lyssa's speech (859–73). Inevitably, there are areas that would have benefited from further discussion: B. notes that 18 and 81 are the only classical appearances of

© Oxford University Press, 1998

ἐξευμαρίζω but does not follow this up. As with ἐφολκίδες (631, 1424), the repeated use of a rare word is surely intended to point to a contrast between two sets of circumstances. B. notes in the commentary on 523–636 the lack of naturalness in two-way stichomythia when three actors are present, but does not pick up on 534–5 as a possible admission of the artificiality of the form. B. has a good analysis of the structure and formal associations of the ode at 637–700, but could have said more on the rather surprising emphasis on the vulnerability of the old men rather than the strength of Heracles: a forewarning that they are to be of no use in the crisis to come? There could also have been some discussion of the whirling (cf. εἰλίσσοισαι, 690) dance on Delos and its possible connection with the Geranos. At 1146ff. B. notes that Heracles has no lyric outburst, but does not discuss why it might be inappropriate for him, as a heroic male, to burst into song. B.'s discussion of the 'wretched tales of poets' at 1340–6 is rather brief given the amount of scholarly ink spilt on these lines.

There are two major errors in the reproduction of Diggle's text: 1161–8 are omitted although they are translated and commented on and 1261 is misplaced after 1254. Another unfortunate error is in the introduction (p. 11): 'the messenger quotes Amphitryon as asking whether the blood of those children already killed has not driven him mad (966–7)': 'children' must be an unintended insertion. The translation is generally clear and accurate, with some pleasing passages (e.g. 164, 488–90, 779–80). However, it is unfortunate that a writer generally so sensitive to imagery should translate οἷς πεπύργωσαι λόγοις (238) as 'in your high-flown words', rendering an image of solid artifice in terms of insubstantial nature.

Exeter College, Oxford

JANE BEVERLEY

M. G. CIANI (tr.), D. SUSANETTI (comm.): *Euripide Medea*. (Il Convivio: Collana di classici greci e latini). Pp. 232. Venice: Marsilio, 1997. Paper, L. 22,000. ISBN: 88-317-6534-5.

D. SUSANETTI: *Gloria e purezza: Note all'Ippolito di Euripide*. Pp. 128. Venice: Supernova, 1997. Paper, L. 24,000. ISBN: 88-86870-10-8.

The *Medea* volume here is an Italian equivalent of an Aris & Phillips edition: introduction, Greek text (Diggle's OCT, minus apparatus), facing translation, commentary focusing on literary matters. C.'s eloquent translation, used for performances in Syracuse in 1996, shows the advantage of Italian over English for emotional outbursts. Compare her rendering of αἰαῖ, ἔπαθον τλάμων (111) as 'Ahimè infelice, io soffro' with Kovacs's 'Oh, what sufferings are mine'. 'Come scoglio' sounds an agreeably operatic note, as well as being an impeccably literal rendering of ὡς . . . πέτρος (28). The translation is impressively accurate, without obvious mistakes of the type that occur in Kovacs's new Loeb. The Greek is sometimes smoothed out a little too much (e.g. 135, 250f., 384, 482, 529f., 691, 696, 814), but otherwise there is little to criticize. 'Povera donna' is too weak for δὲ μῶρος (61), 'un abbraccio mortale' the wrong image for τὰς ἀπλάτου κοίτας (151f.), and ἀγών μέγιστος (235) should be 'the crucial issue' (so Davie in the new Penguin translation), not 'un rischio più grande'. οὔτοι δῶρα μεμπτὰ δέξεται (958) stresses the excellence of the gifts (see Page ad loc.), rather than the princess's reaction to them. Vellacott's 'She will find them all that such a gift should be' is rather free, but has the right emphasis. C.'s 'non potrà disprezzarli' is at least less clumsy than Kovacs's 'It will be no unwelcome gift she receives' or Davie's 'Once she has accepted them, she will find they are not to be despised'.

S. has written books on Plato, Plotinus, and Synesius of Cyrene, so it is no surprise that his commentary concentrates on the philosophical and discursive side of the play. He gives a clear account of its main themes, and is especially good on Medea's major speeches. He is conservative on textual issues, and opposes any deletions in 1056–80. He follows Diller's interpretation of 1079 (κρείσσων = 'in control of'), at variance with the translation's 'la passione dell'animo è più forte in me della ragione'. Key words and ideas prompt little essays at their first occurrence, informative in themselves though tending to overload some of the early notes. Coverage of other matters can be patchy, and the text could sometimes have been explained in a little more detail. Lines 715–85 are dispatched in a page, and it is quite common for ten or fifteen lines to go by without a note. The book has a rather superficial introduction by C., to which S. has appended a

© Oxford University Press, 1998

'Nota al testo' which goes over some of the same ground in more detail. There is a comprehensive bibliography, evidence of S.'s exemplary familiarity with recent work on Euripides in various languages.

The *Hippolytus* volume consists of a commentary by S., similar in scope and style to that in the *Medea* volume, with a brief introduction but no text or translation. This format rather limits the usefulness of the book, and raises the question of whether a commentary is really the most appropriate vehicle for what he has to say about the play. That said, his discussion is always sensitive and intelligent.

Italian students will be grateful for these competent and well-informed treatments of two of Euripides' greatest plays.

University College Dublin

MICHAEL LLOYD

C. COLLARD, M. J. CROPP, K. H. LEE (edd.): *Euripides, Selected Fragmentary Plays I* (Classical Texts). Pp. 280. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1995. Cased, £35/\$49.95 (Paper, £14.95/\$24.95). ISBN: 0-85668-618-2 (0-85668-619-0 pbk).

In recent decades Greek drama, both tragic and comic, has been well served by editions and translations, not least in the Aris & Phillips series, where the combination of Greek text, English translation, and notes lemmatized on the translation has forced editors to produce versions that do not take wing on poetical ego trips, and notes that in consequence should remain in the real world of the student. Dramatic fragments, on the other hand, with one or two notable exceptions, have fared much less well, no doubt as a result of the complexity of reading and interpretation that so often surrounds them. All too frequently claims made about fragmentary plays have been revealed as pretentious, if well-meaning, frauds once anything substantial has risen from the sands. For this reason alone the present volume, the first of two, is doubly welcome since it makes accessible both to those with Greek and to those without the often substantial fragments of otherwise lost plays that are of value in their own right and invaluable for extending and deepening understanding of the tragedian's dramatic technique. Accessibility is the keyword here, even for those who know Greek, since not everyone in this category has access to Nauck's nineteenth-century edition of the tragic fragments augmented by Snell in 1964 or to Austin's collection of Euripidean fragments on papyrus, just as not everyone will be able to afford Kannicht's edition.

In a general introduction the editors deal with such topics as the nature of the evidence: the fragments themselves and how they have survived, be this in literary form as citations in other ancient works or on papyrus; the supplementary evidence in the form of official records, descriptions, or allusions; even vase paintings have a rôle to play here. From this they turn to the importance of the fragments for gaining a fuller understanding of Euripides' dramatic technique and treatment of myth—the way the fragments at times anticipate or reflect what the extant plays develop, features such as the mirror scenes of *Ion* foreshadowed in *Stheneboea*, the murder of Polyphontes in *Cresphontes* reflected by that of Aegisthus in *Electra*, or the prophetic voice of Cassandra in *Alexandros*, which was later to be echoed in *Troades*. In terms of character, too, analysis of presentation in the fragments adds to our awareness of what is more familiar elsewhere, the same with theatrical effects such as the timely arrival of a saviour character or the appearance of ragged heroes like Telephus and Bellerophon, who were to become notorious in antiquity. Even our appreciation of the language and style of speeches or choral odes in the extant plays benefits from study of the fragments: the patriotic rhetoric and lyrics found in *Erechtheus*, or those of *Phaethon*, for example.

The plays contained in this first volume include *Telephus*, *Cretans*, *Stheneboea*, *Bellerophon*, *Cresphontes*, *Erechtheus*, *Phaethon*, and *Melanippe* (both *Melanippe the Wise* and the *Captive Melanippe*). In each case the structure of approach remains the same: initial bibliography, discussion of the mythic background, interpretation of the fragments' location within the action, investigation of further clues which might help to re-establish the structure of the play (e.g. references to *Telephus* in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* and *Thesmophoriazusae*, vase painting, versions of the myth given by other sources), consideration of the themes dealt with, characterization, date, and staging. Throughout the editors are scrupulous in recognizing the limitations imposed by the nature of the evidence, something that keeps their discussion firmly

© Oxford University Press, 1998

rooted in reality. Following the initial observations comes the Greek text with facing translation and then the commentary itself. A crucial characteristic of fragmentary texts, especially those preserved on battered pieces of papyrus, is often the insecurity of readings and incompleteness of even individual lines. An optimistic translation of such material can all too easily impose on our minds a sense of confidence in interpretation that is far from justified. Here, however, the editors have skilfully avoided the danger by reflecting those uncertainties within the English version. True, at times this can make following the thread of development (if there is one to follow) more difficult, but this is a more honest approach than what has sometimes been the case elsewhere. At the same time it would be wrong to claim that the editors have made the plays patently transparent and easily accessible to the general reader; the material itself contains too many complexities and ambiguities, and this is exacerbated by the fact that even when whole lines have survived, these are often without much context. Yet there is enough in the text here, especially when supplemented by the excellent introductions and notes, to indicate their value in expanding what we already know from the surviving works and in revealing our loss in not possessing more.

University of Warwick

STANLEY IRELAND

J. ASSAEL: *Intellectualité et théâtralité dans l'oeuvre d'Euripide* (Publications de la faculté des lettres, arts et sciences humaines de Nice). Pp. 197. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1993. Paper. ISBN: 2-251-62047-8.

'Pour Euripide, le sentiment du tragique est d'ordre intellectuel.' ' . . . peu à peu aussi, il [Euripide] fixe la place de l'intellectuel à l'écart, en marge.' Well, it may be that these generalizations are true (although the latter hardly takes account of the lost *Antiope*, assuredly one of Euripides' later works), but I do not believe that they are established by the work under review. A. never really comes to grips with the problem that her work's title promises it will. She does not address properly the central question: 'are Euripides' personal views recoverable from his plays?' and its corollary 'if they are, by what method are we to recover them?'. It is naive to believe, as A. does, that in certain of the plays someone is acting as Euripides' spokesperson (Hecuba in *Hec.*, Theonoe in *Hel.*), or, to state without argument, 'Euripide semble suggérer son profond dégoût du discours' (p. 143). Equally naïve is the suggestion she makes on p. 163 based on the biographical tradition. Nor is this a comprehensive study of the intellectual background and intellectuality of Euripides, dealing as it does with only seven plays, *Alcestis*, *Medea*, *Troades*, *Helen*, *Phoenissae*, *Orestes*, and *Bacchae*.

Even so, I must admit that I found this book, if not a profound contribution to the criticism of Euripides, enjoyable to read and sympathetic. It is mercifully free of jargon and vividly written, perhaps too vividly for non-francophones (I had more recourse to *Le petit Robert* than I would normally expect when reading an academic work written in French). The writer has a genuine sense of 'théâtralité' and makes many good detailed observations on the action of the plays she discusses. I warm to a work on the Greek theatre that quotes the sayings of 'les grands comédiens' (in this case Jean-Louis Barrault and Louis Jouvet) rather than those of 'les suspects de rigueur' who one might have expected to have been trotted out in a French book containing in its title the word 'intellectualité'. It is unfortunate, nevertheless, that, like many others before her, the author succeeds in transforming that exquisite soufflé which is the *Helen* into an omelette (Spanish rather than French, hélas!). There is relatively little silliness or pretentiousness in the book. I single out, however, the assertion (p. 54) that the constant presence of the nurse in *Medea* suggests 'le dédoublement et le déchirement du personnage principal'. A. lays great stress on *Helen's* being set on the island of Pharos rather than mainland Egypt, but see Kannicht on *Hel.* 5.

It is a pity that the book is so sloppily produced—something very odd has happened regarding the alignment of many of the pages, most notably on pp. 138f., 142, 144, 146, 150—and has been carelessly proof-read. A. W. Verrall appears persistently (it might be doubted whether he should appear at all) as 'A. M.' (once, p. 148 n. 70, he gets his correct initials), E. Valgiglio as 'Valdiglio', Gennaro Perrotta loses one of the 'r's in his surname, and Theodor Kock becomes 'Korch'. Umlauts do not fare well either.

Although A. could never be accused of chauvinism in her bibliography, which is eclectic, she might with profit have cast her net wider. There is no mention of works by Mary Lefkowitz, Ann

© Oxford University Press, 1998

Michelini, or David Kovacs, all of which would have been of assistance to her. M. L. West's *Orestes*-commentary appears to have escaped A.'s notice.

It is not entirely my fault that this notice is so late in appearing. The book, despite its 1993 cover date, was sent to the journal as late as May 1996.

University of Manchester

DAVID BAIN

M. KRIETER-SPIRO: *Sklaven, Köche and Hetären: Das Dienstpersonal bei Menander; Stellung, Rolle, Komik and Sprache*. (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 93.) Pp. xvi + 329, with 21 statistical tables (many unpaginated). Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1997. DM 124. ISBN: 3-519-07642-X.

Its title clearly expresses the scope of this thoroughly researched book: status, dramatic, and comic functions, and language of slaves, cooks, and *hetairai* in Menander's comedies. Based on a Basel dissertation supervised by J. Latacz, it usefully assembles all the relevant information that we possess about these characters in Menander, discussing both the papyrus texts and the book fragments, but highlighting particularly *Aspis*, *Dyskolos*, *Epitrepontes*, and *Samia*. K.-S. is remarkably thorough and up-to-date in her analyses and use of material; she is able to refer to the new Michigan papyri of *Epitrepontes*, and seems to have read virtually all the appropriate secondary literature, although it was unfortunate that some important new publications (e.g. *MNC*<sup>3</sup> and Pompella's *Lexicon Menandreum*) came out too late even for incorporation in her bibliography. K.-S. controls her material well, and assesses its problems judiciously and with insight. She is always aware of the difficulties of dealing with lacunose papyri and contextless book fragments, and realizes that sometimes positive solutions cannot be achieved. Although at times repetitive and top-heavy with bibliographical footnotes, this volume provides a valuable tool that will be of service to all students of Greek New Comedy.

It divides into four sections. The first discusses the social standing of slaves, cooks, and *hetairai*. The evidence from Menander is judged against non-dramatic sources, and the poet's alleged realism shrewdly evaluated against theatrical conventions. K.-S. is particularly good on two sorts of slave: privileged members of rich households (like Getas at *Dysk.* 608–9) who can look down on free men who are poor; and slaves (like Syros or Syriskos in *Epitr.*) who live independently away from their masters' houses; and at times she is able to provide important new information (e.g. that the disputed presentation of Sophrone as a mute in *Epitr.* seems now to be confirmed by the new Michigan fragments).

The second section deals with the dramatic functions of slaves, cooks and *hetairai*. Here K.-S. especially emphasizes two aspects of their presentation. They habitually play a major rôle in the resolution of difficulties that primarily concern their masters but not themselves, and at times are chosen to deliver 'poetic justice' to free old men in the fifth act. 'Poetic justice' is handed out as punishment to Knemon at the end of *Dysk.*, for example, but at the end of *Sam.* the *ex-hetaira* Chrysis is not considered worthy of even an apology from Demeas for her previous ill-treatment.

Thirdly, the comic functions of slaves and others are examined with equal thoroughness and perhaps oversubjective categorization, but there are many *aperçus* (e.g. on Onesimos' sermon at *Epitr.* 1084–209, on the fact that in extant Menander women rarely feature as figures of fun). K.-S. rightly stresses the fact that Menander's humour more often evokes smiles than outright laughter, but occasionally she underestimates the multivalence of a comic situation; e.g. at *Aspis* 407ff. she ignores the fact that Daos' list of tragic quotations acts also as an amusing delaying tactic.

The final section investigates the language of slaves and other characters. Here K.-S.'s exhaustive study shows that Menander's Greek, whether spoken by slaves or by free characters, is homogeneous, just as the Plutarch epitome (*Mor.* 853d–f) claims. At the same time K.-S. is able to confirm the existence of individualized speech patterns in many of Menander's characters; see also now F. De Martino and A. H. Sommerstein (edd.), *Lo spettacolo delle voci 2* (Bari, 1995), pp. 147–64. Here K.-S.'s carefully compiled lists and tables of Menandrian forms, usages, and vocabulary will be of permanent value.

The book has useful registers of slave characters and their occupations, a full bibliography, and indexes. I append a few comments on details. Page 28: on [Alexis] fr. 25 see now my commentary (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 819–30. 264 ('*Mis. An.2*): Chrysis is now known to be the nurse's name,

© Oxford University Press, 1998

Syra that of the slave; see the Loeb Menander, II.294 n. 1, and *P. Oxy.* 4408. 268f.: on Menander's Leukadia see the Loeb Menander, II.220ff.

Leeds

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT

R.V. ALBIS: *Poet and Audience in the Argonautica of Apollonius* (Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches). Pp. xii + 155. Lanham, Boulder, New York, and London: Rowman & Littlefield, 1996. Cased, \$52.50 (Paper. \$21.95). ISBN: 0-8476-8315-X (0-8476-8316-8 pbk).

As Gregory Nagy mentions in the preface, A., emphasizing throughout his study the influence of the conventions of the genre of epic, makes use of the modern theoretical approaches of narratology (Genette, cf. especially p. 53; see also Fusillo) and especially of reader-response criticism. Concerned above all with questions about the poet's voyage and his manipulation of the central theme of divine inspiration, recently much-discussed issues such as the Muse invocations, the closure of the *Argonautica*, and the dual rôle of Apollo, god of poetry and prophecy, are, as was to be expected, studied in detail (cf. in this respect especially Simon Goldhill's *The Poet's Voice*). Besides references to the Homeric epics and *Homeric Hymns*, further illustrative material is taken from Pindar, Plato's *Ion* (pp. 12–15), and *Phaedrus* (p. 78f.), Virgil's *Aeneid*, and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (e.g. pp. 71ff.). The author's interest in narratology is exemplified by his analysis of the rôle of the narrator and the function of focalization (cf. 2.818–25), indirect speech (p. 35), digressions (pp. 55–66: similarity in experience for character and audience), and *praeteritio* (pp. 61ff.; but cf. also 1.648–9). Most attention is, on the whole, paid to the third and fourth books of the *Argonautica*.

In the first of the six chapters the author argues how by means of the Muse invocations with their hymnic flavour the 'lack of original context (i.e. of performed epic poetry) is now built into the text' (cf. also, however, the proems to Hesiod *Theogony* and *Works*).

In the second chapter, the main thesis, 'one of the poet's essential narrative devices' (p. 95), is presented: the assimilation of the poet's narrative persona to his characters (e.g. Jason; Phineus [pp. 28–9]; Orpheus [p. 30]; Apollo). But *is* the audience encouraged to believe in the truth of Apollonius' 'prophecies', because Phineus' prophecies turn out to be true? Similarly, A.'s interpretation of the effects of indirect speech at 4.145–8 seems somewhat forced: 'Apollonius' narrative persona is possessed, as it were, by his character . . . Apollonius creates the impression that he has lost some of his own identity and has become *ἐκφρων* . . .' (p. 35). The analysis of Apollo's rôle here (pp. 21ff.) is continued in the final, sixth chapter in which a comparison is made between Callimachus' and Apollonius' treatment of Apollo.

In the fourth chapter, containing above all an analysis of *θελξις*, a 'leitmotiv for the power of love and of poetry' (p. 81), A. tries to demonstrate his thesis that Medea's experience is assimilated to that of the narrator and his audience, 'since by likening Medea's lovesickness to the experience of composing poetry or witnessing a performance of poetry, Apollonius makes Medea, the narrator, and audience to be involved in analogous activities' (p. 92; cf. also his interpretation of 3.897–8, p. 86). Similarity in vocabulary is used to show that Medea's reaction to love is modelled on Penelope's (*Od.* 1.332–43) and Odysseus' reaction to poetry (*Od.* 8521–31) (pp. 76ff.). Considering the effect on the audience, A. concludes: 'Since the poet is in many ways merely a mouthpiece for the Muse, the ultimate object of Erato's power is the audience' (p. 71). I am afraid I fail to be persuaded by some of the arguments put forward in this section of the book particularly. For example, the theory that veiling of the eyes and poetic inspiration are somehow to be linked seems somewhat far-fetched (cf. also his interpretation of 4.1314 on p. 110). Alternatively also, one could argue that the frequent use of *θελξις* is so effective because the 'bewitcher' will be 'bewitched' herself. It would have been good if material from the first and second books had been taken into account to complement the arguments (cf. 1.27; 1.777; 2.772).

In the fifth chapter, the idea, put forward in Chapter 3 (pp. 43ff.), that the voyage of the Argo could be interpreted as the poet's voyage is further developed in detail (*οἴμη* ~ *οἶμος*; but see also 2.1; 2.1090; 3.2). Here I am not convinced by A.'s arguments that every occurrence of *οἶμος* in the epic is a 'self-reflective reference to his poetry' (p.103; cf. 4.41–6; 4.294–7: association between Hera and the Muse?; 4.838–41: Thetis assuming the rôle of Muse?; 4.1508–12: death of Mopsus?).

© Oxford University Press, 1998

Having said this, even though I may not always agree, the issues raised are certainly interesting and challenging.

University of St Andrews

MIRJAM PLANTINGA

A. S. F. GOW, A. F. SCHOFIELD (edd.): *Nicander. The Poems and Poetical Fragments*. Pp. vii + 247. Bristol: Bristol University Press, 1997 (first published 1953). Paper, £13.95. ISBN: 1-85399-528-2.

Proper understanding of Nicander requires a range of expertise available to few—the interpretation of a complex and corrupt manuscript tradition emended from as early as the first century A.D., philological rigour in the analysis of erudite Alexandrian scientific poetry, the skills of a naturalist combined with an interest in the identification of plants and creatures described by ancient sources, pharmacological training in the properties of drugs, and, as an extra desideratum, proficiency in the traditions of illustrated scientific manuscripts. It was Nicander's skill in versification, rather than his technical precision, which secured his place in the scientific curriculum until the Renaissance—modern technical assessments are dismissive—and it is in the learned literary tradition that the most fruitful field for progress with this intransigent author lies: Heather White's textual and interpretative *Studies in the Poetry of Nicander* (1987) offers a starting-point. Nicander belongs with the more abstruse Alexandrians, Euphorion and Hermesianax, but random soundings suggest that his influence on later texts such as pseudo-Oppian's *Cynegetica* and the pseudo-Orphic *Lithica* (edd. Halleux and Schamp, 1985) would repay investigation. His own *sphragis* 'So now you will treasure ever the memory of the Homeric Nicander, whom the snow-white town of Clarus nurtured' (*Ther.* 957f.), may have been too optimistic, but Bristol Classical Press's reprint of the standard Gow–Schofield edition of forty years ago offers the opportunity for further work on an author who may not be of the first rank, but who undoubtedly has more to yield.

Royal Holloway, London

MARY WHITBY

M. S. ORTIZ DE LANDALUCE: *Estudios sobre las Argonáuticas Órficas*. (Classical and Byzantine Monographs, 36.) Pp. xxiii + 274. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1996. ISBN: 90-256-0638-5; 90-256-1103-6.

The book is a revised version of the author's doctoral thesis. It is neither an edition, translation, nor commentary on the *Orphica Argonautica*; rather, it breaks down into three sections of unequal length and miscellaneous import. The first is the longest. In it, the author offers a series of *miscellanea critica* on the text of the poem, using as his basis the edition of F. Vian (1987) with its revised stemma of the manuscripts. The avowed aim is to defend, wherever possible, the readings of Ω, the common archetype, against Vian's sometimes interventionist editorial policy, without falling into the ultra-conservatism of the earlier editor, G. Dottin (1930). In practice this means that O. has selected a list of passages where he feels he can agree with Dottin against Vian, or, more rarely, can adopt a less drastic emendation than Vian's. With place names and personal names he prefers to attribute factual error, deliberate innovation, or perversity to the poet rather than scribal error to the copyist. Sometimes his own conservatism is in defiance of grammar or common sense (just to take the first three examples, line 21 *θητείαν τε Ζηνός* can hardly be an objective genitive without telling us whom this service was rendered by; in line 24, how does O. propose to explain the grammar of the connectives if he retains *καὶ μύλου τε καὶ Ἡρακλέος?*; in line 31, he postulates a nocturnal rite in which Orphic *μύσται* dance in armour round an oaken Palladium: is this even remotely plausible?). The second section claims to be an exhaustive analysis of the poem's narrative technique based on the narratological models developed by Tomas Hägg for the novel and by Massimo Fusillo for Apollonius Rhodius. O. discusses the author's selection of episodes *vis-à-vis* Apollonius, both those narrated within the main framework of the poem and those outside it that the poem adumbrates; the length and ordering of the individual episodes, again with respect to Apollonius; various aspects of the

© Oxford University Press, 1998

action, especially narrative pace and the various categories of scene, summary, description, pause, direct speech, and 'narrativised discourse'; and the narrator's shifting point of view. Save that it makes little use of the concept of focalization, and that O. appears not to know the work of de Jong on Homer, this section is indeed exhaustive, often to the point of repetitiveness. It is, though, a fair and accurate description of the poem, based on a limited number of narratological models, and one that does not attempt to claim more than mediocrity for its subject. The last section, much the shortest, is devoted to the question of the author's Orphism. The author assumes the character of Orpheus to confer an obvious patina of antiquity and authority on his poem, but apparently not a genuinely Orphic religious character; O. surveys the various Orphic titles which the author name-drops in the course of the proem with a view to determining whether knowledge of any of them need be more than superficial.

This is, in short, a work of patchy quality; its origins in the thesis genre are not worn lightly. It serves as a supplement to Vian's introduction to his text. It is most original where it applies new critical methods to the poem, yet even here one wonders what has been gained from such protracted exposition of this 'limitado genio poetico'. Beautifully typeset it is not.

*All Souls College, Oxford*

J. L. LIGHTFOOT

H. SENG: *Untersuchungen zum Vokabular und zur Metrik in den Hymnen des Synesios*. (Patrologia. Beiträge zum Studium der Kirchenväter 4.) Pp. 454. New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 1996. Paper, £48. ISBN: 3-631-49724-5.

Synesius of Cyrene (c. 370–413 A.D.), pupil of Hypatia, local magnate, man of letters, court politician, and finally bishop and metropolitan, ranks high amongst gifted and versatile intellectuals at the end of antiquity. Recent work in English has focused on his political activities, but understanding of Synesius' public life cannot be dissociated from difficulties in the interpretation of his work, not least his precise religious affiliations. Alan Cameron (*Barbarians and Bishops at the Court of Arcadius*) argues on historical grounds that Synesius was born Christian. His theological pedigree is, however, complex—witness the nine lyric *Hymns*.

S.'s philological study unravels this web. Its core (Chapters 1–6, pp. 45–320) analyses vocabulary according to source: hymnic formulas, the Mysteries, the Chaldaean Oracles, the philosophical—especially Platonic and Neoplatonic—tradition, language of Christian provenance, and specific literary reminiscence. Results show the pervasive stamp of hymnic formulas, the Chaldaean oracles, and the philosophical tradition, but more limited use of terminology linked with the Mysteries and Christianity. Distribution varies significantly over the corpus, the retraction of Chaldaean and Neoplatonic elements in favour of Christian underpinning S.'s chronology (on the principles established by Terzhagi), giving the probable order 9, 4, 1, 2, 5, 3, 7, 8, 6 (pp. 324–6), all but the puzzling 9 and 4 within a relatively compact timespan: 1 belongs probably to A.D. 401, 7 (part of a metrical sequence with 8 and 6) not later than 404. S. illuminates other aspects of this slender but meaty corpus (1530 stichic verses in anapaests, spondaic paroemiacs, and lesser ionics; p. 340): their exquisite literary artistry (substantiated by metrical analysis, Chapter 7), the theological stamp of Porphyry, modified by idiosyncratic distinctions such as identification of the One and *nous*, and transferral of characteristics of the One to the Trinity (p. 333). For Synesius the hymn offered a medium for the soul's approach to God through contemplation: his poems were composed for a limited, like-minded circle (pp. 337f.). The final chapter vindicates S.'s close philological method through a case study of *Hymn 8*: Synesius characteristically draws on multiple traditions to exploit ambiguities, dense associations of terminology offering a means of expressing the inexpressibility of Godhead.

This is a meticulous study, coherently planned and presented, with excellent summaries and indices. Synesius' Neoplatonic hermeneutic of the secrets of Divinity (p. 389) is unlikely to find a clearer or more hard-headed analyst.

*Royal Holloway, London*

MARY WHITBY

© Oxford University Press, 1998



F. VIAN (ed.): *Nonnos de Panopolis: Les Dionysiaques: tome X* (chants xxx–xxxii): Texte établi et traduit (Collection des Universités de France, publié sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. xiii + 172 (62–112 text double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997. 285 frs. ISBN: 2-251-00457-2.

A surge in the 1990s has now produced the tenth volume of V.'s great Nonnian opus and even the master, himself also the chief contributor, cautiously predicts the end in sight early in the next millenium, although sadly contemplating relinquishment to a younger pilot.

Books 30–32 mark the heart of Dionysus' Indian war, in a sequence replete with Iliadic motifs centred on Hera's deception of Zeus. The Indian Deriades' second-in-command Morrheus dominates 30 with a triple *aristeia*, interrupted by the exploits of Tectaphos, although the book ends with Dionysus routing the Indians. Hera's machinations against Dionysus, which underlie 30, surface in 31 with her scheme to divert the vigilant watch of Zeus by seduction, framed by a trip to Hell to enlist the support of Megaera, who subsequently (32.98–150) drives Dionysus mad; 32 ends with the intervention of Ares, after the manner of Poseidon in *Iliad* 14, to rout Dionysus' troops in his absence—a rout, however, more amusing than tragic, transmuted to mock-heroic and finally bucolic mode (pp. 98–100).

The techniques both of Nonnus and of his admirable French editors are now familiar. Interplay with Homer is fundamental to the Iliadic *apate* and its associated battle-scenes (e.g. 32.15 Hera's toilette incorporates the Nonnian *hapax περόνη*), the emphasis as ever on Nonnus' prolixity and cheeky individuality. A string of elaborate rhetorical appeals in 31 sets up the seduction as Hera ranges the universe: Homer's humorous allusion to Zeus' many other loves (*Il.* 14.315–28) is deployed amongst Hera's allies as well as in its original context. Individual tableaux appear in novel juxtapositions or frameworks: in V.'s view desire for *poikilia* rather than the influence of Latin poetry is likely to have prompted the juxtaposition of Hera's trip to Hell with Zeus' seduction (pp. 43–5). The bizarre or piquant detail is highlighted: Hephaistos' flame licking around Morrheus' body (30.76–85); Morrheus' taunting of the dancer Phlogios (30.105–25); father suckled by daughter (30.145–85); Hera's choice of her bloodied bridal robe for Zeus' seduction (32.32–5); Echelaos setting alight his own hair in death with his Bacchic torch (32.199–208)—a probable debt to Cypriot *patria* here (p. 96).

V. gives his usual attention to the structuring and balance of individual speeches and episodes, and (although Nonnus naturally privileges the individual scene above wider coherence) argues (pp. 3–7) for the overall unity of Books 30–6 against any remoulding of the original scheme, even in 30 with its intrusive Tectaphos sequence (127–86) and the five lines on the Telchines rejected by Keydell (226–30). Equality of length between speeches in Nonnus and Homer is the basis for transposition of lines at 32.65f. and 32.88f. At 30.285f. the possibility of a later addition by Nonnus is entertained, although misplaced scribal insertion is equally likely, as postulated for 31.236f. (humorous allusion to Aphrodite's bigamy preferred to Keydell's athetization).

Despite the manifest deficiencies of the Laurentianus, V.'s text continues both confident (avoidance of obelus) and conservative (cf. Hopkinson in *CR* 45 [1995], 14f.): several conjectures accepted by Keydell are rejected ('trops hardies') in favour of L's reading (30.201, 32.202, 272); repetitions and etymological doublets are defended (30.319–24, 31.22f., 38, 61f.), personal conjectures seldom printed (32.15, 32.201; accent corrected at 30.192, 32.134; explicitly rejected, 30.116). 'Notices' and notes repeatedly pinpoint Nonnus' own erudition (e.g. 30.197 Hera's pomegranate), his passion for local legend and genealogy (Cretan material in 32, perhaps derived from Dionysius' *Bassarica*, pp. 94–6), and his humour (p. 52 and *passim*).

This volume does not surprise, but continues to illuminate and to stimulate.

Royal Holloway, London

MARY WHITBY

J. A. MADDEN (ed.): *Macedonius Consul: The Epigrams*. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary. (Spudasmata, 60.) Pp. xviii + 321. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Georg Olms, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 3-487-10059-2.

Madden's edition of M.C. contains: four introductory chapters (The Life of M.C., pp. 1–26; The Personality of M.C., pp. 27–50; The Poetry of M.C., pp. 51–78; Macedonius, Paul and Agathias, pp. 79–105), Texts (with Translation) and Commentary, three appendices (The Earlier Macedonius, pp. 281–3; Metre, pp. 284–94; The Drinking Songs of the *Cycle*, pp. 295–9), and finally a bibliography and an *index verborum*.

The first chapter is largely concerned with chronology, e.g. linking the somewhat tasteless although presumably humorous epigram 39 (*AP* 11.375) with Justinian's anti-divorce laws. The results cannot by the nature of the evidence be very precise. But Madden adds some points of his own. The one thing that baffles me in this chapter is the uncertainty about *Μακεδόσιος* versus *Μακηδόσιος* that haunts editions of these epigrams, and is discussed at length by Madden on pp. 3–6. Apart from the headings in the anthology, not a single case in prose of *Μακηδων-* or *Μακηδον-* in whatever sense or context exists (prose cases of *Μακεδων-* and *Μακεδον-* of course run into thousands), whereas there are a number of poetic cases (Callimachus, Hermesianax, *trag. ad.*, Paul. Silent. *AP* 7.604 v. 5, etc.). It seems quite clear to me that the man was called *Μακεδόσιος*, and that the *Μακηδονίου* usually given by P and occasionally by Pl is a *Verschlimmbesserung* based on epigram 28 (*AP* 9.649) v. 4.

M.C. was not a great poet, although his technical skills were superb (cf. Appendix II). He covers a variety of subjects: pliable and less pliable ladies, dedications and descriptions of art, sympotic epigrams, his own house, which is hospitable and was not built with ill-gotten gains or by badly treated workmen, praise for the city of Sardis, etc. It all contains a great deal of subdued humour, but probably not as much 'depth of real feeling' as Madden would have us believe on p. 78 with n. 52.

The commentary contains a wealth of well-ordered detail including parallels and sources, ranging, in addition to Nonnus, from M.C.'s contemporary fellow epigrammatists Agathias and Paulus Silentiarius right back to Homer. This is highly relevant in an author as heavily anchored in tradition as M.C. Usually Madden gives the references, and wisely leaves it to the reader to decide on the likelihood of conscious or unconscious imitation of the passages quoted or cited. As my special interest is epigrams inscribed on stone or other materials at or near the beginning of the genre, I would not on the whole wish to make personal assessments of probabilities. One particular point that seems to have wider application in M.C. as well as elsewhere caught my eye on p. 122, relating to M.C. 4 (*AP* 5.227) v. 3 *ῥοδόπηχυν*: 'had M. been aware of the vile pun by Strato . . . he might have avoided this "Homeric" adj. . . . Here, however, he was probably influenced by Nonnus, . . .'. Having declined in 1995 and 1997 to review no fewer than *two* editions of Strato, I obviously do not disagree with M.'s talking of 'the vile pun' in *AP* 11.21 = 12.242. But I do very much doubt that Strato's abuse of *ῥοδόπηχυν* some four hundred years earlier would have stopped M.C. from using this otherwise entirely respectable adjective. I do not think we can assume anything about M.C.'s knowledge of Strato or lack of it on this basis.

The commentary also discusses and assesses readings and conjectures, and it contains a generous but not overpowering amount of *Realkommentar*.

It is very satisfactory that Madden has not attempted some ingenious arrangement of his own, but simply follows the order in which the epigrams are found in *AP*.

We can all share Madden's enthusiasm (p. viii) for Jacobs's first edition of the *Anthology*, and it is a great pity that Madden did not save his readers the trouble of finding the commentary on each epigram, since this requires looking in vols. 5 + 4 + 11 (in that order) each time. Perhaps the following might be useful: the commentary on M.C. is found in vol. 11 pp. 206–40 (with the two exceptions listed below), and the numbers are Madden 1: Jacobs 9, 2: 8, 3: 6, 4: 1, 5: 10, 6: 11, 7: 2, 8: 3, 9: 12, 10: 14, 11: 4, 12: 7, 13: 13, 14: 5, 15: 28.a, 16: 28.b, 17: 26, 18: 22, 19: 23, 20: 25, 21: 24, 22: 27, 23: vol. 13 p. 641 no. 30, 24: 41, 25: 30, 26: 32, 27: vol. 12 p. 75 adesp. no. 357, 28: 31, 29: 35, 30: 39, 31: 40, 32: 18, 33: 19, 34: 20, 35: 21, 36: 34, 37: 15, 38: 16, 39: 37, 40: 38, 41: 28.

In a book of this very high standard, bibliographical inaccuracies are bewildering: I limit myself to examples from the abbreviations pp. xiii–xviii: Lampe is one volume (albeit published in five fascicles). 'Kretschmer' is simply Locker's work, not just 'completed' by him. 'Kühner–Gerth' cannot be used to cover both Kühner–Blass and Kühner–Gerth. Lobeck's book is one volume.

'Pape' (better Pape-Benseler) was published 1863–70 (unaltered reprint 1911). The information on *RE* is obsolete, and on 'Schmid-Stählin' wrong and deficient.

The last two paragraphs must not detract from the fact that this is an excellent edition: Madden chooses the right readings and interpretations, and shows much restraint and sound judgement. It would have been very easy for him to deteriorate into lengthy stylistic analysis and theorizing.

21 Leckford Road, Oxford

P. A. HANSEN

J. M. COOPER (ed.), D. S. HUTCHINSON (assoc. ed.): *Plato: Complete Works: edited with introduction and notes*. Pp. xxx + 1808. Indianapolis, and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing, 1997. ISBN: 0-87220-349-2.

This volume presents English translations of all the works transmitted from antiquity under Plato's name: the thirty-five dialogues and the set of thirteen letters established as canonical by the Thrasyllan edition, as well as the short works Thrasyllus designated spuria, the collection of Academic *Definitions*, the *Halcyon*, and the eighteen epigrams attributed to Plato in the Greek Anthology.

In his masterful introduction, C. explains the principles governing the presentation of the works and their translation, discusses questions of chronology, comments on the nature of the dialogue form, and offers some advice on how to approach the reading of Plato. The volume aims to be both unobtrusive in matters bearing upon interpretation and yet as helpful as possible to the reader new to Plato. Thus C. avoids imposing a biased, modern view of the dialogues' likely order of composition by following Thrasyllus' (for us) neutral arrangement, while reserving for the introduction a cautionary discussion of the customary classification of the dialogues into early, middle, and late periods of composition. The individual dialogues are prefaced by brief introductions by the editors. These are concerned in the first place with describing the scene, providing information about the characters and background, and presenting basic summaries of the dialogue's contents. They also seek to situate the dialogues in relation to one another thematically, and to indicate key questions and problems of interpretation. While there is some risk here of undermining the editorial aim of unobtrusiveness, these introductions generally steer clear of the danger by remaining suggestive rather than dogmatic.

Many of the translations themselves are newly revised versions of ones previously published (in most cases by Hackett). Some have already become classics of the genre, including the Levett-Burnyeat *Theaetetus* and Trevor Saunders's *Laws*, while others such as Nehamas and Woodruff's *Phaedrus* deserve such status. The *Cratylus* and *Timaeus* are the only major dialogues for which new versions have been specially commissioned. C. D. C. Reeve has successfully employed a combination of translation and transliteration to manage the formidable task of making the etymological intricacies of the *Cratylus* intelligible to the Greekless reader. Despite a sentimental attachment to Cornford's *Timaeus*, I must admit that Donald Zeyl's version marks an improvement in both accuracy and readability. There are also new versions of the *Lesser Hippias*, *Menexenus*, *Critias*, and *Epinomis*, as well as of the fifteen works of doubtful authenticity whose preparation has been supervised by the associate editor, H., and for which he has assembled a distinguished group of translators (including Jonathan Barnes, Anthony Kenny, and Malcolm Schofield). C. makes it clear in the introduction that his primary objective in overseeing preparation of all the translations has been to produce versions 'as correct as was humanly possible' that precisely reflect the movement of Plato's philosophical argumentation in natural and straightforward English idiom. Although one presumes such might be the aim of any translator of Plato, rival versions too often sacrifice readability for accuracy (e.g. the Clarendon Plato) or accuracy for readability (e.g. Waterfield's *Republic* in the Oxford World Classics). The translations are accompanied by sparing but useful notes, and there is an index of names and topics at the end of the volume.

Its completeness alone would be enough for the volume to supersede other readily available English collections (in particular, Hamilton and Cairns's in the Bollingen series), but coupled with the generally high quality of the translations, the work stands as a real achievement. It will be used by students of Plato for years to come and will rightly take its place on many shelves alongside the Revised Oxford Translation of the works of Aristotle.

Clare Hall, Cambridge

JOHN A. PALMER

© Oxford University Press, 1998

F. ILDEFONSE: *Platon. Protagoras. Traduction inédite, introduction et notes*. Pp. 265. Paris: Flammarion, 1997. ISBN: 2-08-070761-2.

This excellent addition to the admirable GF Flammarion Plato collection presents us with a rather old-fashioned *Protagoras*. I. does not spend time agonizing over the literary strategies of ancient Greek fiction or the relationship of form to content in the Platonic dialogue. He takes it for granted that *Prt.* is good evidence for Protagoras' own anthropology, and his ethical and political theory (cf. p. 17). With rather more in the way of argument he maintains that the positions adopted by Socrates in the dialogue—e.g. on pleasure (n. 355), the nature of *σωφροσύνη* (n. 125), or the analysis of virtue in terms of psychological capacities (pp. 34–46)—are more authentically Socratic than those Plato attributes to him in middle-period dialogues. I. is accordingly inclined to date *Prt.* before 390, although he is no mechanical developmentalist, as witness his subtle intervention in the debate on the relative dates of *La.* and *Prt.*

I. evidently warms to Protagoras and to what he interprets as his theoretical elaboration of Athenian direct democracy. He invests particular care in the exposition of the myth, which is the subject of two fascinating 'annexes': one on the way the ambiguities in the Hesiodic versions of the Prometheus story are ironed out in its fifth-century retellings, the other on the meaning of *αἰδώς* (rendered 'Vergogne' by I.) and *δίκη*. Socrates, on the other hand, leaves I. cold. I. sees his conduct of argument in *Prt.* as the evasive and tricky performance of someone playing the sophists at their own competitive game of making the weaker argument the stronger—as notably in his treatment of the opinion of the many in the sustained refutation of the possibility of *ἀκρασία*. *Prt.* is not therefore a dialogue from which we can extract much coherent Socratic philosophy, not even on the issue of the unity of virtue. Later traditions might dignify the intellectual approach taken by the Socrates it portrays as midwifery or *docta ignorantia*, but I. is evidently suspicious of such retrospective justifications (p. 62).

Following the series' house style, I.'s translation is supplemented generously with notes (366 of them, running to seventy-five pages of small type) on philological, historical, and philosophical questions. To take just one example, I. cites numerous parallels from Xenophon's *Memorabilia* which might otherwise have gone unnoticed. One thing I miss is an adequate response to the humour of *Prt.*: you would scarcely guess from I. that the dialogue is a comedy. Like other GF Flammarion editors, I. is in command of the large literature in English as well as in French, and he relies heavily on Christopher Taylor's Clarendon edition (for detailed analyses of the arguments and their structure one is best advised to stick with Taylor). There is an extensive and well-organized select bibliography. The notes and the introduction together provide orientation on pretty well all the main issues debated in *Prt.* scholarship over the last 40 years, and I. proves himself a sober and discriminating guide.

*St John's College, Cambridge*

MALCOLM SCHOFIELD

S. HALLIWELL, D. RUSSELL, W. H. FYFE, D. C. INNES, W. RHYS ROBERTS (edd., trans.): *Aristotle: On Poetics; Longinus: On the Sublime; Demetrius: On Style*. (Loeb Classical Library, 199.) Pp. 533. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1995. Cased, £11.95. ISBN: 0-674-99563-5.

This volume completely supersedes its predecessor, whose translations and texts long needed updating. The Loeb editors have chosen the world's best scholars on these difficult authors for the revisions. H.'s *Poetics* offers a new text and a careful, readable translation of this crucial essay, which is different from that he has published elsewhere. R. has updated and revised the text of L. and reworked Hamilton Fyfe's old translation rather than offering us a reprint of his own earlier translation, thus allowing us to compare versions. I. similarly updates the text of D., again revising the older translation by Rhys Roberts. Each ancient text is given a clear, informative introduction, outlining for general readers and specialists alike the basic problems and concerns of each essay, backed up with helpful bibliographical notes. The explanatory footnotes for the translations greatly improve the value of the work throughout, especially the Demetrius. In sum, this is an excellent, if overdue, revision of seminal criticism which is now

© Oxford University Press, 1998

available for e.g. university courses on ancient literary criticism where knowledge of Greek is required. Congratulations to the contributors and to the series editors for another splendidly produced volume which any scholar of classical literature should now possess.

Royal Holloway, London

RICHARD HAWLEY

**T. HIDBER:** *Das klassizistische Manifest des Dionys von Halikarnass: Die Praefatio zu De oratoribus veteribus: Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar.* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 70.) Pp. xii + 157. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1996. Cased, DM 64. ISBN: 3-519-07619-5.

Knowing that the *Preface* with which Dionysius introduces his critical essays on the Attic Orators consists of a few pages only, the reader will be prepared for the depth and scope of the subject-matter in the text which precedes this excellent commentary. In it, after noting the retarding effect which the mainly adverse nineteenth-century view of Dionysian criticism had on the study of his literary essays, H. examines all the pertinent questions. These include the composition of his literary circle: here the significance he attaches (pp. 6–8) to the presence of Roman patrons may be excessive, since D.H.'s critical writings can surely only be intended to help those who wrote in Greek. Before discussion of the Atticist–Asianist controversy there is a good account of the historical and political background to the 'three steps' (past greatness, degeneration, and recovery) through which oratory passed until D.H.'s time, and the consensus about it among critics. The character of the above controversy is also considered thoroughly from several angles, from which it is made clear that, whereas among its Roman originators the two adjectives were used as more or less personal weapons of criticism, Dionysius mentions few individuals, Hegesias of Magnesia being an exception. All this is well-trodden ground, but H. re-explores it effectively. Next, *mimesis*. Dionysian *mimesis* is not Aristotelian *mimesis*, but eclectic imitation of various models. Again H. furnishes many passages which illustrate D.H.'s method in action, including one in which Demosthenes is found to have used this kind of *mimesis* himself (*Dinarch.* 6).

The commentary itself maintains the high standard, though H. may have missed the likely source of the idiom in the first sentence (Dem. 5 *Phil.* II28: *Ἦν μὲν οὖν δίκαιον . . . καλεῖν*). His explanation of the meaning of *politikoi logoi* in Isocratean terms is a sensible and convincing solution to a perplexing problem: indeed, Isocratean influence explains much in the *Preface*. But the source of the personifications of the Two Rhetorics cannot easily be traced: perhaps it is D.H.'s invention, and even H.'s passages from *Ant. Rom.* are not close parallels. But he is right to stress the moral contrast which they represent. H. has a good discussion of the only textual problem at 2.3, obelizing *ἤρξαυτο* and introducing a singular subject (diese Bewegung 'this movement, action') to accommodate the singular *παρεσκεύασε*. But perhaps Radermacher's *παρεσκεύασαν* is the best solution. H. does not fully endorse the view that Dionysius was interested only in Greek literature (p. 123); and he underlines the protreptic spirit of the concluding paragraphs with timely parallels from Livy's *Preface* as well as Isocrates *To Nicocles*. The bibliography is up-to-date, though W. R. Roberts's *Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Literary Composition* (London, 1910, repr. 1987) is surprisingly missing. H. expresses regret at the absence of commentaries on most of D.H.'s literary essays: he is himself well-placed to remedy that deficiency.

Royal Holloway, London

S. USHER

**A. STROBACH:** *Plutarch und die Sprachen.* (Palingenesia, 64.) Pp. 258. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997. DM 96. ISBN: 3-515-07007-9.

S.'s book, in origin a thesis, contains a good deal of useful factual information and secondary literature, but is almost devoid of analysis or commentary, and is indiscriminating in its accumulation of modern opinions.

After charting P.'s family and career, S. reviews a limited number of approaches to ancient

language contact and a somewhat random selection of works on P. Next comes a section on the chronology of P.'s writings, designed to prepare the ground for S.'s idea of P.'s developing attitude to language (see below). Unfortunately she gets no further than efficiently listing scholarly views. The chapter on P.'s Latin is satisfactory. He knew the language well enough; we cannot decide exactly what Latin he had read. She goes on to treat the term *barbaros*. Various modern interpretations are reported. Plutarchan passages are listed without analysis of micro- or macro-context. Chapter 6 on P.'s etymologies forms the bulk of the book. S. lists Greek etymologies, Latin etymologies, Latin words derived by P. from Greek, Latin derived from Latin, and finally etymologies of barbarian languages. The footnotes contain details of modern etymologies (often as imaginative as P.'s). Good analysis would have been refreshing. For example, it is unlucky to be able to say little more about *Table Talks* 726b–727a (where P.'s circle joke using bogus Greek etymologies of Latin words) than that etymology was a 'Thema bei den Symposien' (pp. 83–4). Again, though P. derives only a quarter of his c. 130 Latin etymologies from Greek (p. 87), S. insists (*pace* Swain) that he regarded Latin as a descendant of Greek (pp. 84–7). All P. actually says is that Greek words were once very common among the Romans, but are now less so (*Romulus* 15, *Marcellus* 8, *Numa* 7). More to the point, S. should have noted that P.'s Latin etymologies are often explicitly reported ones (e.g. *Romulus* 15 'most commentators including Juba', where S. fails to quote the gloss, 'if that is not a false explanation'; *Marcellus* 8 'as some say'; *Numa* 7 'as they record'). The idea that Latin derived from Greek was a product of the political set-up of the Late Republic, and was not important by P.'s day. Indeed, he dismisses an earlier generation's determination to turn Latin into Greek (*Marcellus* 22.7, *Numa* 13.9–10).

The section on barbarian etymology is more rewarding. S. explores in detail the *Isis and Osiris*, noting well P.'s derivations of some Egyptian terms/names (e.g. *Isis*) from Greek. His explanation (*Mor.* 375e–f, cf. 362e) is that Greek immigrants spread their words around (cf. his view of Latin). As with the rest of the book, S. is now well placed to do something interesting with the material she has gathered, e.g. on P.'s thoughts on the vexed question of the relative antiquity of Greeks and Egyptians, or his philosophical views of the common divinities which languages obscure.

Chapters 7–9 contain P.'s and others' attitudes to those who spoke foreign languages, to interpreters, and (very briefly) to language learning. Finally, the concluding remarks contain an original idea: as a result of learning Latin P. became interested in etymology and 'sprachliche Probleme' in general. S. bases herself on the (rather loose) chronology of P.'s writings. Perhaps she is right: no one can say. She might also have enquired about the rôle of etymology in an age of linguistic purism (a vast area she fails to mention), and about the expected linguistic interests of one so steeped in Platonism and Stoicism.

Warwick

SIMON SWAIN

E. AMATO: *Studi su Favorino: Le orazioni pseudo-crisostomiche*. Pp. xvi + 165. Salerno: Edisud, 1995. Paper, L. 29,000. ISBN: 88-85224-55-5.

The worst thing that can happen to a textual editor is to be confronted with a text whose paternity tells only half the story. That is what has happened to A. in this worthy collection on Favorinus and Dio of Prusa, which certainly deserves to be better known. For he spends his introduction rebutting a somewhat mischievous article about Favorinus published in *ZPE* 79 (1989): the shameless imitation of Syme might have evinced a lighter touch in an editor of the most bizarre intellectual of the Roman Empire.

The reason behind A.'s work is that Favorinus is 'today almost totally neglected' (p. 3). A. should have known Holford-Strevens's chapter on the cryptorchid in his wonderful *Aulus Gellius* (London, 1988). But he could not have foreseen a significant recent interest: Gleason's book, *Making Men* (Princeton, 1995) (the dissertation basis of which is mentioned in A.'s bibliography), an important article by Opsomer in Mossman's *Plutarch and his Intellectual World* (Oxford, 1997), an equally important piece by Holford-Strevens in Barnes's and Griffin's *Philosophia Togata II* (Oxford, 1997), and further observations by the same in Swain's and Edwards's *Portraits* (Oxford, 1997). These are studies of Favorinus as a cultural figure: there is still work to be done on the text of his two speeches preserved in the *Corpus Dionium* and his many fragments including *On (?his) Exile*. This is A.'s task. His first chapter examines the MSS of the *Corinthian Oration*, with observations on the text of Dio (pp. 23ff.). Next come critical and

© Oxford University Press, 1998

explanatory notes on the *Corinthian Oration* and *On Fortune*. The third chapter contains details of two unutilized MSS of Dio in Toledo, one belonging basically to the P branch, the other to the UB tradition. The results are not exciting, but they are worth having. Finally an appendix of translations is enhanced by a reprinting of Kirchmeyer's elegant Latin of 1585.

Warwick

SIMON SWAIN

E. CATTIN (trans. and notes), L. JAFFRO (intro. and appendix): *[Arrien]: Manuel d'Épictète (Texte Intégral)*. Pp. 161. Paris: Flammarion, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 2-08-070797-3.

Epictetus' *Manual* or (in Greek) *Encheiridion* purports to be a digest of that philosopher's teaching based on the *Discourses* and compiled by his pupil Arrian of Nicomedia. Those looking for a convenient summary of Stoic ethics amid the jumble of surviving sources, one written by an actual Stoic, have often resorted to it, and interest seems to be growing along with interest in later ancient philosophy in general. It must be used with care, however, as it neglects important issues (such as the nature of virtue, and the distinction between target and end), and does not even do complete justice to Epictetus, whom it represents at his most sententious. But because the *Manual* touches on many philosophical issues *en passant*, it can serve as a handy introduction to Stoic ethics and moral psychology when equipped with some sort of comment.

That is essentially what this modest volume offers, with a 58-page introduction, 32-page translation, and 65 pages of notes. J.'s introduction does a reasonably good job of highlighting the most distinctive elements in Epictetus' thought—the right use of impressions and preconceptions, the order in which the parts of philosophy should be studied, a functionalist ethics based on social rôles. There is little that is new here, and I was unconvinced by the defense on pp. 55–8 of Shaftesbury's attempt to discern an order behind the arrangement of the *Manual's* fifty-three chapters based on rhetorical principles. Though the interpretation of Epictetus bodied forth here has a decidedly Gallic slant (with echoes of Sartre and Foucault), it is generally in line with the emerging consensus in this area.

The translation of C. is straightforward and reliable, only sometimes expanding on the original for clarity's sake. The decision to render consistently *prohairesis* by 'volonté' is a bit disappointing, however; it not only shirks the responsibility of finding the right translation of this multivalent term for the particular context, it introduces too many misleading associations, anachronistic when they are not downright antithetical to the Stoics' rationalism.

For many readers C.'s notes will be the most important part of the book. They rely to a large extent on parallels quoted from Diogenes Laertius, Cicero, Sextus, and other Stoic sources, but these are aptly adduced. What references there are to secondary literature are all to French sources, with the exception of ancient passages cited from Long–Sedley's *Hellenistic Philosophers*. In a 32-page appendix J. considers the influence of the *Manual* on the thought of four moderns: Guillaume Du Vair, Pascal, Shaftesbury, and Foucault.

This book seems intended for French students coming new to the study of Stoic ethics in general, and Epictetus in particular; as such it will make a reliable introduction. Others may be better served by the edition with commentary of Cicero's *De finibus* by M. R. Wright (Warminster, 1991), or by the recent translation of Epictetus' complete works edited by Christopher Gill (London, 1995).

Berkeley

ROBERT F. DOBBIN

R. HARD (trans.): *Marcus Aurelius, Meditations (Introduction and notes by C. Gill) (Wordsworth Classics of World Literature)*. Pp. xxii + 200. Ware: Wordsworth Editions, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 1-85326-486-5.

At least four good English translations of the *Meditations* are currently available, but no doubt we can always do with another. The present volume forms a kind of sequel to the version of Epictetus published by Everyman with introduction and notes by G. (1995), in which the 1758 translation by Elizabeth Carter was updated by H. Marcus, however, has been translated anew. The introduction gives a lucid account of his work and of the essentials of Stoic doctrine; this

© Oxford University Press, 1998

is supplemented by a 20-page essay on Marcus and Stoicism which goes into more detail and quotes at considerable length from recent work by Sharples and Asmis. The book is filled out further by reprinting Matthew Arnold's essay originally published in 1863. The juxtaposition of these essays is curious, given their very different style and preoccupations—Arnold concerned above all with the comparison of Stoicism and Christianity, G. and his sources with the historical development of the Stoa and Marcus' relation to it. It does seem odd that nothing is said elsewhere in the volume to put Arnold's essay in context or to present a modern view of the Christian–Stoic antithesis.

In general the translation reads smoothly, though we might feel doubtful about the translator's aim of presenting Marcus' Greek in English which is 'lucid and attractive throughout, and largely free of philosophic jargon' (p. xix). One improvement on Farquharson is the elimination of excessively Christian phraseology, conspicuously at the end of 12.36: where F. had 'for He also who lets his servant depart is reconciled', H. writes 'he who is releasing you shows a good grace'. The text translated is said to be Farquharson's, but this is not the uniform practice. F.'s transposition in 9.29 is not adopted, and the rendering of 2.17.1 suggests that ῥεμβός, not ῥόμβος, is being read. If F. was not used, the natural choice would be Dalen's Teubner, but another point in 9.29 makes clear that H. is not using him consistently either, as Dalen prints *ὄ μικρόν*, not *μικρόν*. Either translator or printer has made at least one glaring error in one of the most famous of all Marcus' *pensées*, the last chapter of all, in which the first two sentences have been simply omitted.

The notes are on much the same scale as those I contributed to the reissue of Farquharson's translation in OUP's World's Classics. Inevitably the two volumes often duplicate one another, especially in the identification of names and quotations. Where the notes here are new they are usually concerned with detail of Stoic doctrine, and G. is freer with citations of secondary matter, especially Long and Sedley's source book. The philosophic reader is well served.

The bizarre cover illustration of a detail from Gauffier's *Cleopatra and Octavian* should not be laid at the door of G. and H., since inspection of other Wordsworth Classics volumes reveals even more grotesque choices: Thucydides is adorned with a painting of Leonidas at Thermopylae, while Herodotus is favoured with a rendering of the death of Viriathus! Perhaps the publishers should encourage their picture editors to gain some acquaintance with the content of their books?

Christ Church, Oxford

R. B. RUTHERFORD

L. PERNOT: *Éloges grecs de Rome*. Pp. 199. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997. ISBN: 2-251-33931-0,

This volume comprises annotated French translations of two key Greek orations of the Roman period, Aelius Aristides' *Ad Romam* and the pseudo-Aristidean *Ad principem*, together with detailed introductions, bibliographies, appendices on dating and authorship, and indices. Extraordinarily enough, given its centrality to scholarship on not only the 'Second Sophistic' but also Roman ideology in general, the *Ad Romam* has never hitherto been translated into French. This fact alone makes *Éloges grecs* worthy of notice; but what will attract the additional attention of English-speaking readers to this book is the detailed and attentive care given by P. to the text, and to its interpretation, rhetorical structures, and social context.

P.'s enthusiasm for later Greek rhetoric is already well-known from his formidable two-volume analysis of the encomium, *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde greco-romain* (Paris, 1993). There, P. concentrates primarily upon formal rhetorical aspects, and many of these concerns resurface in *Éloges grecs*. He is excellent on the 'structure' of the speeches (pp. 22–8, 123–9), which he profitably compares and contrasts with generic patterns established by the literary classics (notably Xenophon's *Agésilas* and Isocrates' *Evagoras*), expounded in rhetorical handbooks (Quintilian, Hermogenes, and especially Menander), and practised by later panegyrists (Julian, Libanius, and the *Panegyrici Latini*). On the down side, for all that epideictic rhetoric is indeed in certain respects fundamentally schematic, this approach can at times lead to reductionism: the *Ad principem* fares particularly badly here, with P. giving the impression that it consists of little more than a checklist of conventional *topoi* (pp. 125–9). For P., the sole value of this text lies in its exemplariness (p. 125).

On the cultural and political background of *Ad Romam* P. has much to say which is new and interesting (pp. 29–53). He reads the speech as a 'mythe politique' (p. 40), a vision of Rome's

© Oxford University Press, 1998



contemporary excellence as the summation of a series of phases of world history; despite this, he is not unaware of the cultural 'distance' between Greek and Roman, signalled by Aristides' repeated reference to the Romans as 'vous' (pp. 42–3). Not everyone will agree with his conclusion that Aristides' praise of Rome is based upon 'une conviction authentiquement ressentie' (p. 51), or indeed with the notion that sincerity can be gauged in a literary text; nevertheless, this section contains important and perceptive insights into the complexity of relations between Greeks and Romans in the period.

The notes are full and excellent, covering a century's worth of bibliography, as well as historical, interpretative, and textual problems. P. translates Keil's text (Berlin, 1898), but (rightly) considers him to have been too keen to emend and propose lacunae: many of the notes argue persuasively for restorations of the MS readings. The translation is crisp and generally sound, although P. tends to underplay the nuances of particles and word order. This is not the place for detailed discussion of the meaning of the texts; suffice it to say that P. is a judicious and learned interpreter, whose only occasional failing is an overconfidence which he nevertheless allows his readers to judge for themselves.

This is a serious contribution to the study of later rhetoric, in particular of Aristides' *Ad Romam*, which will be enjoyed by anyone with interests in the field. *Éloges grecs*, one hopes, will underline the need to replace Keil's text and Oliver's idiosyncratic *The Civilising Power* (Philadelphia, 1953) with a decent Greek edition of and commentary upon *Ad Romam*. P. himself would be an excellent candidate for this job.

*St John's College, Cambridge*

TIM WHITMARSH

P. N. SINGER: *Galen: Selected Works: Translated with an Introduction and Notes* (World's Classics). Pp. lii + 448. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Paper, £7.99. ISBN: 0-19-282450-3.

Galen has left us more material than any other writer in the ancient world. Yet surprisingly few of the works that survive not only in Greek, but also in a variety of oriental languages, have been translated into English. Then this volume of translations appears; for the historian of ancient medicine, the equivalent of fifteen buses coming along at once. In addition to the translations, S. has supplied a valuable 36-page introduction providing a clearly structured and concise outline of the main themes of Galen's medicine, setting him within his medical and social contexts. The historical Galen is properly separated from the subsequent development of the highly systematized 'Galenism': Galen's own views mix humoral theory, and the theory of faculties, with a view of the body as containing substances, organs, and spirits, but in which the structure of each part is best explained by its purpose. Texts such as 'My own books'—one of those translated here—suggest that Galen did not reject any of his earlier treatises as being superseded by his later work, but rather tried to see a pattern emerging from his *oeuvre*, based on themes and on the need to educate those who wished to learn about medicine. But there is never a single 'Grand Theory' bringing together all the different explanatory devices he uses in his work. Some of the differences must relate to the nature of the audiences for which he was writing, and the content of previous work on a topic which he needed to discuss, but S. argues that the main conflict remaining unresolved is that between Galen as teleologist and as materialist. He organizes the introductory material around a set of oppositions; in addition to teleologist and materialist, these are philosopher and doctor, scholar and anatomist, and systematist and innovator.

S. has avoided translating anatomical texts, which are already well represented in English, and has chosen to emphasize those of historical and philosophical interest. He organizes them as follows. First come Galen's own accounts of how he saw his work as forming a sort of medical curriculum. Then come treatises on the art of medicine, the soul, humours, concepts of health, dietetics, and practical medicine. The treatises on the soul are selected in order to show how Galen moves between seeing the soul as influenced by the humours and regarding it as being in some ways independent of the body. Kühn page numbers are given for reference purposes, but where more satisfactory editions of the texts exist these are the basis of the translation itself. Brief explanatory notes are used where English is unable to capture something in the Greek, as well as to explain technical terms and choices in translation. They also account for authorial decisions

© Oxford University Press, 1998

such as the inclusion (p. 107) of the passage in *The Affections and Errors of the Soul*, excluded in the Teubner, where Galen appears to say that it is acceptable to hit servants if one does it carefully so that one's hand is not injured.

This is a valuable collection, particularly useful for teaching purposes.

*University of Reading*

HELEN KING

A. FILIPPO SCOGNAMILLO: *Massimo di Tiro: L'arte erotica di Socrate: Orazione XVIII*. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento. (Università degli Studi di Lecce, Dipartimento di Filologia classica e di Scienze filosofiche, Testi e studi, 10.) Pp. xxxii + 156. Lecce: Congedo, 1997. ISBN: 88-8086-6174-3.

Maximus *Or.* 18 confronts a problem with the image of Socrates: the difficulty of finding a coherent (and creditable) explanation for the fact that the same man is—apparently—depicted as both a paragon of virtue and an unembarrassedly enthusiastic pursuer of pretty boys. Only a preliminary defence is offered, to the effect that erotic expertise pervades the whole canon of Greek authors from Homer to Anacreon, via Hesiod, Archilochus, and Sappho. A deeper answer, in terms of Platonic psychology and ethics, is left for the three further pieces (*Or.* 19–21) which complete Maximus' account of Socrates and *eros*. S.'s text, translation, and commentary (accompanied by a brief introduction, a full bibliography, and indexes) concentrates on just the first element in the sequence; coverage of all four orations would have been welcome, since they make a connected whole, but commentaries on Maximus are so rare that one should be properly grateful for what S. provides. Her text is conservative, excessively so in a number of cases, where the MS reading, or something very close to it, is retained in defiance of what Greek usage and/or the context seem to require (e.g. pp. 20.15 [18.4], 20.17 [18.6], 22.2 [18.6], and 26.4 [18.7]). The main strengths of the commentary are: its explanations of Maximus' mythological, historical and literary references; its provision of bibliography on the philosophical and sociological concepts involved in his account of *eros*; its careful analysis of vocabulary and sentence structure, with useful parallels (though nothing on the tricky but important issue of prose rhythm); and some good incidental notes on imagery (esp. on the gold-assayers of 8.5ff. [18.3]). Other interesting issues—such as the overall rhetorical structure and strategy of the *Oration*, and the cultural context in which such a speech makes sense and has interest—are less fully considered.

*King's College London*

M. B. TRAPP

J. BINGEN (ed.): *Pausanias historien*. (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 41.) Pp. vii + 353. Vandoeuvres-Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1996. Cased, Sw. frs. 68.

Pausanias has had a somewhat different history in Renaissance and modern times from that of other major Greek writers of the second sophistic. No one was especially interested in him until he began to prove useful to eighteenth-century travellers. Then, when travellers turned into archaeologists, a fashion arose for bashing P. and for exposing his weaknesses as a guide and as a recorder in the broad. During this century the trend has been reversed. Following Regenbogen's great *PW* article (1956; Suppl. VII., 1008–97) and Habicht's excellent 1985 monograph, there is now no room to doubt either that P. did travel or that his observations were careful and intelligent. Another difference in treatment is that P. has never proved useful to Roman historians. Not even potentially Graeco-Roman like Plutarch, nor obviously political like Dio of Prusa, no encomiast of the 'Antonine Peace' like Aelius Aristides, nor a paid-up official of the Roman administration like Lucian, P. has offered few opportunities for orthodox Graeco-Romanism. Moreover, he is disappointingly unprosopographical. Thus for scholarly uses he has often been reserved for classical Hellenists in need of illuminating the history of Greek religion some six or seven hundred years before.

The present volume is a most welcome addition to current serious research on P. himself. It is

© Oxford University Press, 1998

particularly valuable for focusing on him as an historian, a professional enquirer, and recorder, rather than an above-average cicerone. The contributions (taken in order) will have different levels of interest for different readers. Musti begins with the tough job of evaluating P.'s 'historical discourse', suggesting that he 'homogenizes' Greek history and culture. Chamoux is more promising on P.'s eye for the mythological and Hellenistic stories which others had ignored, and good on the way he weighs his myths' plausibility. Moggi's examination of P.'s excursus on Ionia in Book VII is extremely thorough on P.'s relation with sources, especially his rivalry with Herodotus and Strabo. Ameling, in the discussion section of this chapter, cuts through much of his argument by pointing out the real reason for the excursus: second-century pride in one's home region. Ameling himself makes one of the best contributions, on P.'s great interest in the Hellenistic period, specifically its history. He discusses the question of the 'decline' in art and in history, concluding (pp. 129–30) that P. was unworried by the former. Nor in fact was he worried by the 'end' of Greek freedom: that he avoids events after 150 is a matter of historiographical form. P. says much on Greek resistance to the Gauls to praise Athens and better Herodotus. The contrast between resistance to Gauls and to the recent incursion of the Costobocci is a swipe at the Roman-sponsored fake unity of the Panhellenion. In a word, P. did not like Roman rule, but saw no alternative (pp. 158–60). Lafond's chapter on P.'s view of the Peloponnese since the coming of Rome is also of a high standard, arguing for the thematic rôle of Corinth throughout the work and for P.'s careful elision of marked aspects of Romanization in the Peloponnese. Bowie next addresses the fundamental implications of P.'s avoidance of the present and his general ambivalence towards Rome, despite his exceptional warmth to Hadrian (though even here there are significant 'silences'). Alcock takes up the cue by pressing the case for reading P. as a resistance text (e.g. the use of the heroic Persian Wars as a structuring device), for which purpose she deploys the heavy weaponry of collective memory theory (provoking some good old-fashioned trench warfare in the discussion session). Finally Knoepfler comes down to earth with a careful analysis of P.'s mistaken interpretation of a key monument of the Athenian public cemetery. He makes a good point about modern scholars' 'docilité' in trusting P. too far (p. 309; cf. Alcock, p. 272): P. did not expect readers to use him on site, but in the library before they set out. Finally P. is 'Pausanias historien'—so long as we remember his limitations.

Warwick

SIMON SWAIN

D. A. RUSSELL: *Libanius: Imaginary Speeches: a Selection of Declamations Translated with Notes*. Pp. viii + 232. London: Duckworth, 1996. £40. ISBN: 0-715-2715-5.

'When we look at statues, it is allowed that some of us should admire, others not; we can find fault with parts, or indeed with the whole' (Lib. *Decl.* 1.63). Waiting to inspect a new book from an acknowledged master is always exciting, and R.'s long list of the highest quality scholarship, particularly in this context *Greek Declamation* (Cambridge, 1983), raises expectations that *Libanius: Imaginary Speeches* will be another volume to be admired. We are not disappointed. Also as one would expect of R., the book is far more than the translations themselves, though these are elegant and help to make Libanius' declamations, written in sometimes difficult Greek, highly readable.

In an excellent introductory chapter R. discusses concisely, but most informatively, the life of his subject (rather more favourably than the late Robert Browning in the third edition of *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*), the genre of declamation and Libanius' practice of it, and the rhetorical theory of 'invention'. Intending students of *stasis* theory, before progressing to Malcolm Heath's *Hermogenes* (Oxford, 1995), could do far worse than begin here. There is also a short paragraph on the *Nachleben* of the declamations. Each piece has its own introduction, providing the rhetorical and literary background, and an analysis of its division; the extensive notes help more than adequately to clarify the many literary allusions in the declamations. The book ends with a bibliography, a list of textual differences from Foerster's Teubner edition (though the Greek text is not included here), a useful index of Greek rhetorical terms, and a general index.

The selection of fourteen declamations is nicely varied, including examples from each of the five groups into which Foerster divided the corpus. Both the Socrates declamations are included, and there is one piece on a mythological subject (the defence of Orestes), followed by two on subjects from Athenian history (Timon's love for Alcibiades and Demosthenes' proposal to

© Oxford University Press, 1998

remove the Altar of Mercy—called the Altar of Pity on p. 9) and one from Corinth (against the recall of the prostitute Lais). The remaining eight come from the fifth group containing the various stock characters and standard themes of Greek declamation (the two 'morose' pieces, one 'parasite', three 'miser', and the father in conflict with his son and with a tyrant concerning his son). The pieces from this final group neatly illustrate Libanius' skill at humorous writing.

It would be hard for even the most determined critic to find faults with R.'s 'statue', and I have no such determination. My only complaint is that this is a selection rather than a translation of all fifty-one surviving declamations (which become fifty-four on p. 8; R. usefully lists the various 'conflict' declamations that he has not included in the selection on pp. 10–11). Despite Libanius' importance as the leading orator and teacher of the fourth century A.D., comparatively little attention has been devoted to him by modern scholars, as is borne out by a brief examination of the bibliography. R.'s volume begins to remedy this deficiency and certainly fulfils its purpose of supplementing *Greek Declamation* in offering students of classical rhetoric a very fine introduction to both the author and the genre. I sincerely hope that more is to follow.

Queen Mary and Westfield College, London

M. J. EDWARDS

**C. MANGO: *The Correspondence of Ignatios the Deacon*. (Dumbarton Oaks Texts, 11.) Pp. xi + 244. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 1997. \$30. ISBN: 0-88402-243-9.**

It is a pleasure to welcome the publication of the first proper edition and English translation of the letters of the Deacon Ignatius almost a century after their existence was reported. The only previous editions, both by Manuel Gedeon (1903, 1914), suffered bizarre fates at publication and are virtually unobtainable (as well as being inaccurate), as M. explains in a preface which discusses our information about Ignatius. He was one of the more educated Byzantines in the early ninth century, being consulted on metrical questions in an important poem of iconophile propaganda (32), or laying down the grammatical law on the length of vowels (36). Several hagiographies and other works can reasonably be assigned to him, but of greatest interest to classicists is the attribution, highly plausible if not absolutely certain, of an alphabetical collection of biographical notices of Christian and secular authors which was exploited in the *Suda*. His sixty-three letters (plus one reply from his most frequent correspondent, Nicephorus) illustrate the literary conceits which oiled the mechanisms of intellectual exchanges: much of the correspondence is devoted to the delights of friendship, complaints about slow responses, abject confessions of unworthiness, and occasional requests. Tortuous witticisms are standard, though these were not always appreciated by their recipients (15). Factual material is rare, though it is noticeable that the letters datable to Ignatius' occupation of the see of Nicaea (1–18), perhaps in the middle of his career, tend to have more specific content, with various tax-related pleas. Other letters can be allocated to a period of penance towards the end of his life, probably because of an earlier accommodation with imperially sponsored iconoclasm, but several letters cannot be attached to a specific context.

M.'s primary interest in the letters, as reflected in the commentary, is for their historical information, on the operation of imperial administration in the provinces, the historical geography of Bithynian monasticism (which ties in with M.'s earlier work on Theophanes and Saint Ioannicius), and ecclesiastical disputes during the second bout of iconoclasm. On all these issues the notes are clear and thorough (the threat at 10.27 is presumably removal from the diptychs). Literary matters are of less concern to M., though of more to Ignatius: for example, more might have been made of the choice of proverbs, especially since Ignatius was responsible for compiling a collection (50), and instances of assonance, alliteration, or rhyme might have been noted (e.g. 12.5). Allusion to the poisoned robe of Nessus (51.14) is unhelpful to those unfamiliar with the story of Deianeira, and, more importantly, the phrase is proverbial. The Iliadic simile of the well-fed horse (40.25–29) is probably meant to apply to the recipient Nicephorus, or even Ignatius himself: the passage is obscure, possibly corrupt, but it should refer to someone who has broken certain bounds but then been brought back to his proper status through study—i.e. a man who had migrated from iconodule orthodoxy to iconoclasm and then back again, the doctrinal trajectory of both Nicephorus and Ignatius.

The translation is, as one would expect, generally accurate. Conjunctions, especially the repetitive γάρ, but also ἀλλά, are often omitted; sometimes their retention would have clarified the sense. Comparatives and superlatives are also dropped. There is a surprising lack of

© Oxford University Press, 1998

consistency in the rendition of many words: common words such as *δριμύς* and *λήθη* are translated in a variety of ways, while *μειλίχιος* is given a different sense on each of its five appearances. Exact correspondence would be too rigid, but there seems no point in this fluidity (e.g. 'pain' and 'torments' for *βάσανος* at 42.41, 53) and the result may be confusing: thus *ἀνεμαῖος* (1.2) would be better translated 'windy' (as at 34.5) or 'empty', not 'vain', which might be misinterpreted; *οἰκονομούμενος* (16.13) should be translated the same as *οἰκονομήσει* (16.15), 'regulate' or 'control'. 'Your most ready help' (7.30–31) is preferable to 'ready and helpful as you are', 'drought and thirst' to 'dry thirst' (34.10). There are a very few misprints: prefect for perfect (15.9), Peleas for Peleus (27.15), behaviour (31.8), a superfluous comma at 45.24, Phinehas (62.55). There are occasional unwarranted omissions: *καὶ αὖραις ἀπορριφθήτω* (28.14), *εἰς παντελεῖς* (33.44); 'all' is added at 40.18.

The volume is rounded off by various indices, including a very useful but not quite comprehensive *index verborum*. In all, if not perfect, this is a most welcome publication of a difficult text, which is unlikely to find another English translator for a long time.

University of Warwick

MICHAEL WHITBY

J. F. HALDON: *Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions*. Pp. 342. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990. Cased. ISBN: 3-7001-1778-7.

H.'s translation and commentary of three tenth-century texts on military organization, preserved as an introduction to the *de caerimoniis* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, have much of relevance and interest to students of strategic and logistical issues in the Roman imperial period. Text 1 is a very brief statement of the mustering procedures for a campaign into Asia Minor; text 2 (B), plausibly attributed to the general Leo Katakylas from the early tenth century, presents various practices attributed to Constantine the Great and Julius Caesar; text 3 (C) was compiled by Constantine Porphyrogenitus himself for training his son Romanus, and the first part constitutes an expanded version of B. The focus of all three texts is contemporary campaigning on the eastern frontier, but there is also material of direct interest to late Roman historians in the account of Justinian's triumph in 559 (C.707–33), as well as of generic triumphal arrangements (C.667–706).

The connection in B. of practices with Julius Caesar is certainly anachronistic, but H. may be too confident in rejecting the attribution to Constantine: the material has been updated in terms of official titles, but otherwise the information could date from late antiquity. Constantine did have a reputation for strategic thinking (John Lydus, *de mag.* 3.33 on the best way to defeat the Persians); the sort of detailed interrogation about possible campaign theatres resembles Justin II's questions to envoys from the Turkish Chagan (Menander Protector fr. 10.i Blockley); the need to avoid revealing the intended direction of a campaign would have been appreciated by Gratian, whose strike against the Lentenses was foiled by a talkative bodyguard (Ammianus 31.10). If the information is not Constantinian, it is at least relevant to consideration of military issues by late antique historians, for example the discussions of Isaac (*Limits of Empire*), Whittaker (*Frontiers of the Roman Empire*), or Rankov and Austin (*Exploratio*) about the collection and exploitation of information by military planners. There are also numerous interesting details: the emperor's campaign library contained, in addition to military manuals, books on dreams, chance happenings, and weather signs (C.196–204), any of which might help the emperor maintain morale among his troops: after all, Eunapius regarded Valens' lack of education as the cause for defeat at Adrianople (fr. 44 Blockley); the emperor's table might be graced with sturgeon, shellfish, or carp, as well as the more expected meats and pulses (C.144–9); expeditions had their own lost-property office (C.587–90). H. occasionally misses late antique parallels or discussions (e.g. the Chester Beatty Panopolis papyrus might have been mentioned for evidence of preparations for an imperial journey in the 290s; discussion of white clothes [C.714] might have referred to *Historia* 37 [1987], 464–8), but overall this is an extremely useful presentation of texts which deserve to be better known among Roman military historians.

University of Warwick

MICHAEL WHITBY

© Oxford University Press, 1998

D. NEBLUNG: *Die Gestalt der Cassandra in der antiken Literatur*. (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 97.) Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1997. ISBN: 3-519-07646-2.

The extraordinary commercial success (more than 200,000 copies were sold in little over a year) of Christa Wolf's *Kassandra* (first published in the Federal Republic by Luchterhand, Darmstadt/Neuwied, in spring 1983, then in winter 1983/4 by Aufbau Verlag, Berlin/Weimar; an English translation was published by Virago Press in 1984) strikingly demonstrated Cassandra's enduring vitality, though Wolf's drastically defamiliarized heroine owed more to the idiosyncrasies of Robert Graves's *Greek Myths* than to the sober scholarship of Juliette Davreux's useful monograph, *La légende de la prophétesse Cassandre d'après les textes et les monuments* (Liege and Paris, 1942). During the last half-century papyri (above all the Cologne Alcaeus and the Oxyrhynchus fragments of Sophocles' *Locrian Ajax*) have significantly enriched our understanding of the varied literary presentation given to Cassandra's complex legend, and thus created the need for a fresh treatment.

Davieux's study is not altogether superseded by N.'s book, which, originating in a doctorate supervised by Bernd Seidensticker, marginalizes iconography and cult. (No explanation is given for the omission of the remarkable epigram from Dodona in which the Zacynthian Agathon claimed to be descended from Cassandra in the thirtieth generation, thus indicating a development of the legend unattested elsewhere in verses sufficiently unusual to attract the attention of Wilamowitz [*Griechische Verskunst* 373].) So blinkered an approach severely limits the value of this work, which ought, in any case, to have undergone more revision before publication. The reader for whose sake all Greek and Latin quotations are translated would certainly need far more help than is here given in order to set these texts in their proper context and to avoid being misled by the relentlessly chronological treatment. It may be pedantic to complain of vacillation between iota adscript and iota subscript, or of the misprint π[ε]λ[ι]δνώεσσα for π[ε]λ[ι]δνώθεισσα reproduced from Page's *SLG*. But a scholar whose attention is concentrated on Priam's fey daughter ought not to suppose (p. 38) that *Κασσάνδρα* could stand at the beginning of an iambic trimeter.

Hertford College, Oxford

STEPHANIE WEST

A. TRAINA: *Poeti latini (e neolatini). Note e saggi filologici V*. Bologna: Pàtron, 1998. Pp. 277. Paper, L. 38,000. ISBN: 88-555-2437-2.

With this, his fifth collection, T. takes leave of his students after nearly fifty years of active scholarship; here are gathered articles and introductions to books dating chiefly from 1994–7 (earlier in the case of the introductions and encyclopaedia articles) on Ennius, Catullus, Virgil, Horace, and Propertius. As in the previous collection, noticed by J. B. Hall in *CR* 47 (1997), 207–8 (which, incidentally, was mislocated in the main index as on pp. 107–8), there is here too an abiding interest shown in Pascoli; the Latin verses of the fifteenth-century Gregorio Correr are also discussed. In a note on p. 9 T. asks, somewhat imprudently, when we shall have done with the Vanity Fairs of *Festschriften*. As one of your editors I can only echo the sentiment, but vanity publishing comes in various shapes and sizes, and as my friend Barrie Hall complained in last year's number, republication of very recent and very accessible articles is not an obvious desiderandum. More justifiable, at least to non-Italian readers, will be the reprints with enhanced bibliographies of introductions to the poems of Catullus and the lyrics of Horace.

King's College London

ROLAND MAYER

J. BOOTH: *Latin Love Elegy: A Companion to the Translations of Guy Lee* (Classical Studies Series). Pp. xxxv + 139. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1995. Paper, £8.95. ISBN: 1-85399-126-0.

The book provides the Classical Studies student with a detailed running commentary on a

© Oxford University Press, 1998

selection of elegant translations from Catullus (72, 76, 85), Propertius (1.1, 1.3, 2.13, 3.3, 3.24, 4.7), Tibullus (1.1, 1.8, 2.4) and Ovid *Amores* (1.1, 1.2, 2.7, 2.8, 3.2). There is a sensible introduction tracing the development of the genre and setting it in its literary and cultural context. The poems are well selected to bring out the range and essential characteristics of each author and to invite comparisons between them.

Catullus' three intense poems on the conflict between love and hate in his relationship with Lesbia introduce the genre in embryonic form. Tibullus is represented by one poem each from the Delia, Marathus, and Nemesis cycles. There are poems from all four Propertian books, with satisfying cross-references between individual elegies: so 1.1 and 3.24: the beginning and end of the Cynthia affair; 2.13 and 4.7: the funerals of Propertius and of Cynthia; 3.3 and 4.7: dream poems. *Amores* 1.1 and 1.2 provide a good insight into Ovid's very different concept of the genre, while the dramatically juxtaposed pair 2.7 and 2.8 illustrate further his poetically unorthodox approach to the genre, which reaches its climax in 3.2.

The book works well in the classroom. The aim of the running commentary is not simply to provide a synopsis or to fill students in on background facts (although it does both admirably), but its chief purpose is to stimulate questions and comparisons, and to encourage thought and discussion. In my experience it has done just that. Not all the points in the 'unashamedly subjective' (p. vii) critical analysis will meet with universal acceptance. I am unconvinced by the arguments put forward for programmatic function of the Milanion myth in Propertius 1.1, to show how mythology will be unlike his own experience (p. 18). This may be true of Milanion, but not of the majority of later mythological exempla.

My reservations are few. First, why no Latin text? The format of the 'companion' series does not of course allow for this, but even Classical Civilization students would benefit from seeing and hearing the original Latin. Many such students study the language at elementary level; perhaps many more would do so given this added source of stimulation. Second, Guy Lee's versions of Ovid (originally done for John Murray, 1968) are much freer and, on the translator's own admission (p. viii), conceived on different principles from his more faithful versions of Catullus and Propertius (produced for OUP in 1990 and 1994 respectively). B.'s translations of Tibullus lie somewhere between the two. Such differences of approach on the part of the translators cloud stylistic distinctions between the authors themselves. Ideally the same translator should have produced all the versions for the collection on the same principles. In Latin the stylistic differences between Ovid and Tibullus are far less striking than their respective English versions in this collection would lead one to believe.

All in all this is a valuable addition to the now thankfully increasing armoury of the teacher of classics in translation.

*University of Leeds*

ROBERT MALTBY

C. RAMBAUX: *Tibulle ou la répétition*. (Collection Latomus, 234.) Pp. 115. Brussels: Latomus Revue d'Études latines, 1997. ISBN: 2-87031-174-5.

R. examines Tibullus' elegies in their published order as a gradually unfolding drama, discussing in particular the poet's behaviour, motivation, and psychology as adumbrated in each. R. sees there a lover filled with illusions and contradictions, misguided in his attempts to deal with each beloved (whose wishes he ignores) and deep down wanting to be dominated and maltreated. R. claims that as we read on we come to realize that the repetition (of unreal aspirations, blinkered vision, blindness as to the true nature of the beloved, etc.) shows that subconsciously Tibullus is a helpless masochist looking for trouble and pain by choosing the same kind of unsuitable partner three times. R. concludes that Tibullus may have taken a morose pleasure in the presentation of his sufferings, setting poetic success against amatory failure, occasionally mocking himself, and giving a warning to those who risk making a similar mistake.

Some of this is obvious, some of it has already been said by critics like Mutschler and Neumeister, and some of it is purely speculative. Can one really deduce from three mistakes a helpless masochist (rather than just a 'pauper amator' with an unfortunate weakness for beautiful but mercenary types)? If so, what is to be made of Greek epigrammatists who have even more numerous problematical partners? In any case R. dismisses almost entirely the literary side of the elegiac love affair. Not much love poetry was written on successful amatory relations; and

© Oxford University Press, 1998

Tibullus was a literary artist working in a distinct tradition, according to which the beloved was venal and cruel, the lover was not rich, suffered setbacks, etc. Within these conventions there is naturally repetition; but there is in fact also much variation. There is not as strong a sense of sameness in Tibullus as R. would have us believe: for example, when Tibullus' (male) beloved is unfaithful in 1.8 he actually helps and takes an amused view; in 2.3 Nemesis (unlike Delia) is actually in the countryside; and Nemesis is presented as a harsher and more dispiriting mistress than her. R also tends to be too serious in his interpretations, not making due allowance for wit and humour (e.g. in 1.8 and 2.3). In addition he simply assumes that the published order of the poems represents their actual order of composition and that they should be read in that sequence as an increasingly revealing amatory drama (without even considering whether book 2 is complete or was put together by Tibullus himself). He does not argue for the superiority of this approach over the view that the elegies were composed at indeterminate times and subsequently grouped for artistic effects such as contrast and correspondence, and his findings do not convince me of its superiority.

There are weaknesses with regard to specific points too. Important problems of text and interpretation are glossed over or totally ignored ('o' or 'ne' at 1.4.9, the identity of the boy in 1.8, etc.). At times there are fanciful explanations (most notably in connection with 1.7). The discussion of overall structure posits an improbably kaleidoscopic set of combinations and lacks rigour (for instance, R. claims that 1.4 is among four poems 'consacrées à un personnage historique' [Titius] and accepts complex numerical schemes which cannot stand up in view of the indeterminate length of 2.3 and the probable lacuna after 1.10.25).

However, in R.'s favour, his style is clear and flowing, he has read widely in the secondary literature, and he does make some perceptive points (e.g. on p. 16 the suggestion that 1.2.59f. hints that Tibullus might use the witch to escape his love, on p. 71 the contradictions between the Tibulluses of 2.3 and book 1, and on p. 86 the reversals when the liaison with Nemesis is compared with the affair with Delia).

McMaster University

P. MURGATROYD

G. LEE (trans.): *Propertius: The Poems*. With an introduction by R. O. A. M. Lyne (The World's Classics). Pp. xxv + 205. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. Paper, £6.99/\$8.95. ISBN: 0-19-283198-4.

Lyne's very valuable introduction not only sets Propertius' poetry within its political and cultural context but also shows how the reader may usefully read the poems. His touch is subtle: there is no attempt to coerce the reader; the effect is rather one of an invitation to read the poems for oneself.

The translator's note at the outset of the volume explains that 'As regards the translation, though in verse, it is meant to be faithful and unadorned'. This ambition is both worthy and difficult, but it is one that is achieved with great success. Lee's versification is unobtrusive, yet serves the valuable purpose of conveying a sense of the elegiac couplet as a typical unit of thought.

The translation for the most part succeeds in providing a very clear and direct version, yet one which has enough of a sense of poetry in it for it to be interesting as well, as in this version of 2.1.1-4:

You ask me how it is I write so often of love  
And how my verses come soft on the tongue.  
These no Apollo, no Calliope sings to me;  
My only inspiration is a girl.

At 4.10.45-8 L. offers an impressive attempt at a pair of etymological puns in a passage explaining the cult title Fereetrius, where *ferit* and *ferabant* are translated as 'felled' and 'ferried'. Even minor infelicities of idiom are happily very rare, as at 2.1.11 'Or if she closes eyelids exigent for sleep' or 1.1.4 'with feet imposed Love pressed my head'; at 4.1.73 'cantillations' is too elaborate and loaded a rendering of 'cantans'. At 2.34.3 'expertus dico, nemo est in amore fidelis', L.'s translation unnecessarily loses the order of the Latin and breaks up the flow: 'In love—I speak from knowledge—no one can be trusted'. At 2.13.17 the translation of 'ocellos' as 'eyelids' gives an odd ring to the phrase 'Whenever therefore death shall close my eyelids';

© Oxford University Press, 1998



'eyes', used by L. to translate 'ocellis' in the collection's celebrated opening line, would sound far more natural in English here as well (cf. 2.1.11, cited above).

The accuracy of the translation is admirable, as at 3.8.23–4:

aut in amore dolere uolo aut audire dolentem,  
sive meas lacrimas sive uidere tuas.

In love I want to suffer or to hear suffering,  
To see my own tears or else yours.

There are a few occasions where the precise sense slips away, but not even the harshest reviewer could demand perfection of a translation: at 4.4.65 'experiar somnum, de te mihi somnia quaeram', rendering the second clause as 'and hope to see you in my dreams' misses the deliberate quality of 'quaeram'—the sense is more akin to 'and I shall look for dreams about you'. On other occasions subtleties of the Latin text are lost, such as the apostrophes of Perillus (2.25.12) and Jugurtha (3.5.16), or Propertius' use of the negative, as at 4.2.23 'fiam non dura puella', rendered as 'I'll make a grateful girl', or 4.10.12 'ipse dedit, sed non sanguine sicca suo', 'He yielded it himself, and bloodstained too'; at 1.5.22 'Or wonder why I'm a mere skeleton' loses the paradoxical note of 'aut cur sim toto corpore nullus ego'. At 1.6.36 'uiuere me duro sidere certus eris', the translation offered is 'Know that I owe my life to a cruel star', but the explanatory note suggests the much better alternative 'Know that I live under a cruel star'. The translation of 4.3.12, 'When I deferred, naively, to your insistence', loses the physical note of 'cum rudis urgenti brachia uicta dedi'; conversely, at 3.10.6 the abstract quality of 'ponat et in sicco molliter unda minas' is missed in the rendering 'And threatening wave sink softly on dry land'.

L.'s translation of Propertius is very welcome. This volume offers a splendid verse translation that is very readable and yet very faithful to the poet's by no means simple Latin.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

B. J. GIBSON

M. LOLLI: *D. M. Ausonius Parentalia. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento.* (Collection Latomus, 232.) Pp. 281. Brussels: Latomus Revue d'Études latines, 1997. ISBN: 2-87031-172-9.

Ausonius' *Parentalia* can be classified as part of his 'personal' output of poetry. The work consists of two prefaces, the first in prose, the second in verse, followed by thirty short poems of commemoration of deceased relatives. These relatives range in closeness from spouse (IX) and son (X), to nephew's wife (XVI) or son-in-law's parents (XXII, XXX); strangely, of A.'s paternal grandparents we hear nothing. The biographical details within the poems offer valuable information about Gallic society in the late third and especially the fourth centuries; yet the *P.* is also a work of great tenderness and melancholy. L.'s commentary embraces an ambitious range of approaches—literary, stylistic, historical, and prosopographical—and has an interesting introduction. There is also a useful family tree (p. 44). The text has apparatus, facing translation, and well-presented, concise comments. Each commentary is prefaced with prosopographical material and analysis of the poem's structure.

The commentaries themselves have rich supplies of essentially literary and stylistic observations. The biography of A. (pp. 11–16) is an uncontroversial account. L. dates the start of the composition of the *P.* to the year 378/9 (pp. 16–17), arguing that it was the death in 378 of A.'s father which provided the inspiration for the first poem and then the collection as a whole. By 380 A. was himself in the twilight of his years (b. c. 310) and had achieved high office (he was consul in 379); in this literary enterprise, L. argues, he aimed to discharge an obligation to his deceased relatives and the well-being of his family. The result is *P.*, a work without precedent in Latin literature. This chronology, though hardly the psychology, is in broad agreement with Green's conclusions (*The Works of Ausonius* [Oxford, 1991], pp. 298–9), who suggests the dates 377/8 through to mid-380s or later for the composition; L.'s reconstruction makes excellent sense of details such as that in 9.8, addressed to A.'s wife Sabina, where we learn that she died a full 36 years earlier. L., however, does not directly address the challenge thrown down by Sivan (*Ausonius of Bordeaux* [London, 1993], pp. 160–1), who proposes the date 366/7 (when A. left Bordeaux) for the composition of the earliest of the *P.* The interrelated questions of inspiration, date, and duration of composition are intriguing as they have a

© Oxford University Press, 1998

significant bearing on the shape of the overall work. The lengthy but intermittent process suggested by Sivan could be cited to point up the apparent lack of structure in the order of some of the poems, and other compositional peculiarities such as the variety of metres employed; and although Green supposes a more concentrated period of composition, he observes that A. never applied the *summa manus*. L.'s more assertive dating and accompanying psychological reconstruction argue for a more unified and organic character for the *P.* than has been generally assumed; and from this chronological premise stems the apologetic tone which features in parts of his introduction.

Classification of the *P.* by genre is problematic. L. considers the different approaches of the poems, some of which can be traced to certain types of preceding literature; but he also highlights some novelties, such as the absence of ages (years, days, etc.) for the deceased, a fact which distinguishes them from funerary inscriptions and literary epigrams. They are clearly funerary in context, but a preceding tradition can only be identified tentatively if we are not to lose sight of A.'s originality. One of L.'s central concerns is to acknowledge A.'s pioneering achievement.

L.'s text proposes a few deviations from V (Vossianus Latinus F111), the only MS, and Green's edition (usefully tabulated on p. 41). All but *Aemilia* <v> (XXIX.1) have appeared before. Most, such as his preference for V's *satis et . . . satis et* to Green's *satis est . . . satis et* for 1.9 of the verse preface (not 1.8 as is printed on p. 41) are modest; his revival of Souchay's *dicere et rea fit* for the troubled 111.2 is unusually bold. L. is more enlightening on matters of language and style (pp. 32–8); A.'s classicism is seen to veil some unusual constructions, rare usages, neologisms, and technical terms.

Useful bibliographies and indices close this highly organized and accessible work.

*St Andrews University*

ROGER REES

**N. DELHEY: *Apollinaris Sidonius, Carm. 22: Burgus Pontii Leontii*. Pp. 225. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1993. ISBN: 3-11-013631-7.**

D's commentary on one of S.'s more bizarre works will be welcomed by Latinists. In the commentary itself and the introduction an impressive range of stylistic, literary, and historical issues are covered with elegance and learning. Two sketches are appended (p. 212), setting out the possible arrangement of the buildings described by S.

S.'s *Burgus* is fascinating. Framed with passages of prose, it takes the form of a letter to Pontius Leontius, the owner of the *burgus* (castle), thought to be at the modern town Bourg-sur-Gironde in France. The dramatic focus of the hexameter centrepiece is a meeting between Bacchus, on his way to Thebes after his conquest of the East, and Apollo; Apollo successfully enjoins Bacchus to abandon his plans and accompany him to live at the *burgus*. Apollo's speech contains many lines of description of the property and its merits. D. highlights this curious blend of 'occasional-poetry', mythology, panegyric, and ekphrasis. The book should increase the work's accessibility hugely and stimulate further work both on the *Burgus* and on other poems.

In the introduction, there is a brief biography of S., information about the Pontii and their castle, an adjustment of the conventional dating of the *Burgus* (to 461–6), and helpful discussions of the work's content, style, and prosody. It is to these more literary matters that D. devotes most of his energy. S. himself encourages comparison of his work with Statius' *Silvae* (prose-epilogue 6), a comparison which D. follows up in an attempt to make some sense of the later work. The commentary generally combines detailed linguistic and stylistic points with some more discursive sections introducing D's subdivisions.

After decades of neglect, recent years have seen the welcome publication of historical perspectives of S. In this commentary, D. reminds us that S.'s work stands up as literature too.

*St Andrews University*

ROGER REES

**L. CASTAGNA: *Studi Draconziani (1912–1996)*. Pp. 147. Naples: Loffredo, 1997. ISBN: 88-8096-506-9.**

In recent decades there has been increasing interest in the history and literature of the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., that period lying between late antiquity and the early Middle Ages which in the West saw the gradual transformation of the Roman Empire into quite a different entity. Part

© Oxford University Press, 1998

of this increasing interest has manifested itself in an expanding study of writers like Dracontius, whose life and career were clearly fashioned by the continuing momentum of an imperial past, but who, in the context of Vandalic North Africa, was obliged to recognize the changed reality that surrounded him. The work under consideration here is in essence a critical bibliography, intended initially for the pages of the *Bollettino di Studi Latini*, but whose delayed completion in order to include the final volumes of the Budé edition led to its growth into a volume in its own right.

Following a brief introduction setting out, among other things, the rationale of the work's chronological limits—its point of departure is Ettore Provana's substantial essay published in 1912 which dealt with earlier literature—the first chapter is devoted to the bibliography itself. This is divided thematically into sections such as the history and culture of North Africa; Dracontius and the poetry of late antiquity; each of the individual genres that Dracontius worked in: the *Orestis Tragoedia*, the *Romulea*, the short *De Mensibus* and *De Origine Rosarum*, and the Christian works: the *Satisfactio* and the *De Laudibus Dei*; and finally a listing of more general works on the period and its literary products.

What follows is a series of chapters of critical survey primarily on each area of Dracontius' works. The first, by Bianca Maria Mariano, in many ways lays the foundation, dealing (albeit selectively) with the Vandalic period in Africa: (1) the historical, social, and religious setting, including specific problems such as the interaction of Roman and Vandal; (2) North African culture in the Vandalic period; and (3) Dracontius' life and career.

Next comes C.'s survey of work on the *Orestis Tragoedia*: manuscript tradition, editions, translations and commentaries, a selection of textual cruxes and conjectures, handbooks and general studies, investigations of individual topics (such as attribution and date, title and genre, structure, style and metre, myth and religious content), Dracontius' cultural inheritance—his access to Greek literature and his Latin sources—and finally his influence on others.

This basic formulation continues in subsequent chapters: Lavinia Galli on the varied constituents of the *Romulea* (the epyllia, the rhetorical works, the epithalamia), and then the twenty-four and fourteen verses respectively of the *De Mensibus* and *De Origine Rosarum*; Bianca Maria Mariano once again, this time on the *Satisfactio*, which Dracontius composed in prison, having fallen foul of the Vandal king Gunthamund for some unspecified political offence, and in which he repents of his fault and asks forgiveness; and finally Giovanna Galimberti Biffino, who deals with Dracontius' longest work, the *De Laudibus Dei* in three books, a total of 2327 lines affirming the author's faith, describing the Creation and reflecting on the Incarnation.

Though designed specifically for students of Dracontius, who will find within the covers of the book a treasure trove of reference and critique, this is a work that extends its usefulness far beyond its stated boundaries. Its listing of more general works, in fact, includes items that no one involved in research of the period can fail to find useful. The rest of us, whose main areas of interest lie elsewhere, can only look on with envy that our own topics are not equally well served.

University of Warwick

STANLEY IRELAND

J.-P. CÈBE (ed.): *Varron, Satires Ménippées (11): Prometheus Liber, Sesqueulixes*. Édition, traduction et commentaire. (Collection de l'École Française de Rome, 9.) Pp. xxxii + 1757–1893 + A-M. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 2-7283-0367-3.

In this fascicle C. deals with frs. 423–84 Buecheler. There is just one new reading, *murinas* for the MSS *marinas* in fr. 463, which is neither impossible nor compelling. The apparatus is not always as accurate as it might be, with MSS readings sometimes wrongly reported (e.g. in fr. 436 the MSS have *obstrigilatorem*, not *obstrigilatorem*), and sometimes omitted (e.g. on fr. 447 he does not note that LB<sup>A</sup> have *i*, which is only corrected to *in* by F<sup>3</sup>), and editors' proposals imprecisely described (e.g. on fr. 459 he says that Buecheler emended *ariuo deo* to *tripodi deo*; in fact he proposed to replace *ariuo deo* by *tripodi*) or omitted where inclusion is desirable (e.g. on the same fr. if he includes Della Corte's *aris diuinis deorum* he should not omit Gothofredus' *aris deorum*, and on fr. 466 Buecheler's *dum erro* should be there alongside Bentinus' *dum oro*). I note also a couple of rather strange errors—he says that fr. 426 is omitted by C<sup>A</sup> and that fr. 449 (where the Nonius reference is p. 497, not p. 296) is omitted by BGen—both statements are true,

© Oxford University Press, 1998

but these MSS do not contain the relevant parts of Nonius and should not be reported at all in these cases.

The commentary is generous in scale, though C. does sometimes seem to me to omit relevant material. For example, in discussing the significance of the title *Pseudaeneas*, he should surely make some reference to the εἰδωλον of Aeneas in Hom. *Il.* 5.445 ff.; on fr. 471 he ought to have noted Vahlen's suggestion that Homer's λευκὴ γαλήνη (*Od.* 10.94) might lie behind Varro's use of *album*; he refers to Witke's attempt to relate Horace *carm.* 1.9 to the *Sesqueulixes*, but has no reference to Kilpatrick's similar argument about *carm.* 1.28. His interpretation of the satires is always interesting, though some of his ideas seem to me to be improbable. Fr. 440 he sees as a comic suggestion that a doctor might serve to his dinner guests the *absintium* and *castoreum* which he gives to his patients; it seems to me much easier to interpret the speaker as saying that doctors are to be avoided because they weaken their patients by giving them evil-tasting medicines. He interprets fr. 475 (*hic enim omnia erat: idem sacerdos, praetor, parocos, denique idem senatus, idem populus*) as a description of a *pater familias*; realizing that the usual sense of *parocos* (*parochus*) makes this unlikely, he appeals to Hor. *serm.* 2.8.36, where he says it means 'maitre de maison, amphitryon'; but surely it is used contemptuously there—Muecke rightly translates it 'caterer'. On fr. 459 he says that Rome did not consult oracles of foreign gods until after the Punic Wars, but Livy 5.15.3 records a consultation of Delphi in 398 B.C. In other cases his interpretations are not supported by the citation of any ancient sources; so in fr. 467 he identifies the *Pieridum comes* as Echo, but gives no evidence for any association between Echo and the Muses; similarly in the interesting discussion of fr. 463, which C. interprets as referring to an offering by a wife of items usually associated with marriage in thanks for the safe return of her husband (and as a consequence for resumption of their marriage), he offers no evidence for such offerings in either context to the Lares.

Nor is C. always very thorough in his citation of linguistic parallels. I miss, *inter alia*, references to *culcita plumea* in Cic. *Tusc.* 3.46 (fr. 448), *putri gelu* in Sil. Ital. 4.749 (fr. 467), *Orco demissum* in Hor. *carm.* 1.28.10–11 and *demittimus Orco* in Virg. *Aen.* 2.398 (fr. 423), and Suet. *Iul.* 84.1, Hor. *serm.* 2.6.103, and Pl. *Stich.* 379 could all have been cited in the note on *eburneis lectis* (fr. 434). Finally I note some incorrect references, e.g. Pl. *Merc.* 703 for *Men.* 703 (fr. 481); Cic. *Arat.* 258; 482 for 238 (482) (fr. 465); and Ath. 5.179 for 12.538d and Polyb. 31.3.10 for 30.25.10 (fr. 434).

I trust that C. will soon bring this great work to a conclusion—two more fascicles will presumably be sufficient; it will be of great assistance to those who need to use Varro's Menippeans, but it should be used with some caution.

National University of Ireland, Dublin

RAYMOND ASTBURY

E. NARDUCCI: *Cicerone e l'eloquenza romana: Retorica e progetto culturale*. (Quadrante, 86.) Pp. viii + 186. Rome and Bari: Laterza, 1997. Paper, L. 37,000. ISBN: 88-420-5124-1.

This book comprises five discrete chapters on aspects of Ciceronian eloquence: long treatments of the *de oratore* and the *Brutus* are interspersed with shorter accounts of the *pro Archia*, of Cicero's contradictory statements about the orator's need to feel the emotions he is seeking to arouse, and of the relationship between the spoken and written versions of a speech. N. explains that his book is the by-product of more general researches into the history of eloquence at Rome (p. vii), and emphasizes that part of his project is to link Cicero's thoughts on eloquence with their historical and cultural backgrounds (p. viii).

This approach is undoubtedly a fruitful one, but N. does not do it full justice. One problem is the absence of an explicit overall argument. Despite cross-referencing, it is not easy to see how the different chapters relate to one another, beyond the general point that Cicero's lack of other political capital meant that he had strong personal reasons to construct eloquence as a key aspect of statesmanship, and the reader would have been greatly helped by an introduction and a conclusion. As things are, it is not obvious that what are in effect five articles have gained anything from being presented in book form.

Lack of a clear argument is also a problem on a smaller scale. So, for example, it seemed to me that the chapter on the *Brutus* seeks to show that the dialogue is an attempt to both defend eloquence against autocracy and defend Cicero's eloquence against its detractors. It would have been easier had N. spelt this out, and this would also have enabled him to show how the

© Oxford University Press, 1998

arguments converge to allow Cicero to place himself at the centre of political life. And towards the end of the chapter on the *de oratore*, it came as a surprise to be told (p. 72) that N. had been trying to illuminate 'certain "ideological" presuppositions which control the construction of the model of the orator and of his culture'.

N. is sensitive to the literary nuances of the dialogue form and makes some good points; e.g. p. 33, the characterization of Cotta and Sulpicius in the *de oratore* foreshadows their subsequent careers; p. 106, the fact that both Brutus and Atticus were tough creditors makes Cicero's use of the language of borrowing and repayment to describe his writing of the *Brutus* as a response to Atticus' help particularly pointed. Given this, it is disconcerting to read that the *de oratore* imitates 'the progress of a real conversation' (p. 34). Some arguments cry out for further expansion: for example, N. is surely right to draw attention to Cicero's explanation of the actions of the Gracchi in terms of personal grievances (p. 142), but it would be worth considering whether this is a deliberate attempt by Cicero to deny that they were addressing serious political problems, rather than being the result of his own obtuseness about their motivation; and perhaps the lack of susceptibility of popular assemblies to rational argument (p. 58) need not be accepted at face value, but could be linked to Cicero's reasons for wishing to undervalue the Assembly's contribution to political decision-making.

One final complaint: where is the bibliography? I was much less inclined to pursue N.'s interesting-looking citations when it became a matter of hunting that shy creature *op. cit.* through a dense undergrowth of footnotes; and this lack of consideration for one's audience is particularly ironic in a book which deals with a writer who was never guilty of that fault.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

C. E. W. STEEL

R. MELLOR (ed.): *Tacitus: The Classical Heritage*. (The Classical Heritage, 6.) Pp. liv + 249. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1995. \$45. ISBN: 0-8153-0933-3.

'His service is more suited to a disturbed and sick state, as ours is at present; you would often say that it is us he is describing and decrying' (Montaigne; quoted on p. 132). 'Tacitism' presents style as transcendent truth and sometimes offers a Tacitus who sums up events beyond his own temporal understanding. At this end of the process, the reception scholar represents a succession of readers who reflected on Tacitus in the light of their own political circumstances. Dryden's 'Politick Reflections' sums up a practice of reading which is not peculiar to his age.

The *Classical Heritage* series, in which this book appears, has been designed 'to demonstrate continuity from ancient to modern culture' (Series Preface); such a design demonstrates a commitment to a particular model of history, one in which the past remains both meaningful and relevant. There is a certain irony to this, as Tacitus and the Tacitist writers frequently articulate the voices of dissidence, stressing moral/temporal rupture and discontinuity. A historian (such as M. in this volume) who glosses these dissidences as 'naturally' recurring phenomena (and thereby smoothes them over) needs to take account of his own complicity in a prevailing political narrative.

The range of this sourcebook is from the late fourteenth to the twentieth century, and comprises both well-known Tacitists and many who deserve to be better known. Reviewing a collection of this sort is never easy, since each individual reader will want more of one author and less of another. My own opinion is that too many passages seem to have been included because they were *about* Tacitus rather than *influenced by* Tacitus. To take one example, Casaubon's anecdote about King James I (p. 115) is of limited interest when set against the king's own *Basilikon Doron* (1603), only referred to in this volume, which it would be interesting to compare with other handbooks on governing and being governed, such as Gracián's *The Oracle* (1647: pp. 77–9), Amelot de la Houssaie's *The Modern Courtier* (1687; pp. 142–7), or indeed Machiavelli's *The Prince* (1513; pp. 6–8).

This selection raises the issue of what constitutes 'Tacitism' as an identifiable feature of a text, an issue which is not brought to the forefront of the discussion in this volume. Indeed the very process of selection is concealed under a representation of Tacitist writing as something which simply occurs and is therefore included. As I have remarked above, a particular sort of history is being written through this sourcebook; drawing attention to the history configured here inevitably renders the selection of texts less innocent. To take an example, Amelot de la Houssaie's translation into French of Gracián's *The Oracle* is not included, since the reader can

© Oxford University Press, 1998

turn back to an excerpt from *The Oracle* itself (pp. 77–9). But why then include Degory Wheare's work on reading histories (1623; pp. 116–18) which amounts to little more than a compilation of Lipsius (pp. 41–50) on the same subject? Wheare's inclusion makes sense within a historical plot promoting not only continuity but the endurance of classical scholarship; on two occasions we are not only informed that Wheare was the first Camden Professor of Ancient History at Oxford (pp. xxxvi, 116) but also given the name of the present incumbent. While any collection of texts is inevitably mobilized towards a particular historical view, in this collection the impression is continually given that the texts *just happened* upon the editor's notice; that the texts in themselves are political, but that their collection in this volume is not political.

Traiano Boccalini (1556–1613; pp. 55–65), according to M., was disgusted by scholars who ignored parallels from contemporary politics when reading Tacitus. Like Boccalini, I believe that the ancient historian is not to be read as a distraction from present evils but rather as a challenge to confront them. The choice of mid- to late-twentieth-century Tacitists in this volume, and M.'s reminder (p. liii) that Tacitus was banned in Eastern Europe, invites us to address the evils of totalitarianism in the present world: relevant, but also (from a *fin de siècle* British–American perspective) safe. Contemporary Tacitists in this country would do well to respond to the historian's challenge with a searching look at the newspeak of New Labour and the Blairite redefinitions under which 'change' is 'no-change'.

University of Bristol

ELLEN O'GORMAN

W. H. FYFE (trans.), D. S. LEVENE (revision and ed.): *Tacitus: The Histories* (The World's Classics). Pp. xlix + 310, 4 maps. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. Paper, £8.99/\$8.95. ISBN: 0-19-283158-5.

The introduction begins with a short description of Tacitus' career, including new evidence which suggests unusual distinction at a very early stage. After a succinct outline of the development of the Augustan principate, L. discusses the conventions of historiography that allowed Tacitus, like his predecessors, to manipulate events for artistic purposes, and to incorporate freely composed speeches which expounded what seemed rhetorically appropriate for the situation. He also refers briefly to the other histories and biographies of the period that could be used to evaluate elements of bias in Tacitus' work of contemporary history. Perhaps one may postulate a greater use of the witness of Agricola, whose adroit diplomacy at the behest of Galba is reported by Tacitus (*Agr.* 6.5).

The section 'Understanding Tacitus' begins with a discussion of Tacitus' epigrams, which suggest a distinguished mind who saw beneath the surface 'the realities of power and the moral depravity of civil war' (p. xii). The reader must be made aware that the moral dimension was fundamental to Tacitus as to all Roman historians as a source of comment and instruction on human behaviour. L. tackles the problem of constructing an overall picture of Tacitus' opinions (p. xiii), but a unified view cannot be attained. He is successful in presenting an ambiguous interpretation of Antonius Primus, seen from different angles throughout the narrative. Yet in general this part of L.'s work is disappointingly negative.

Pliny's letters to Tacitus and on contemporary historiography would be an excellent introduction to the *Histories*. The reader also needs positive guidance on the intention of Tacitus' literary artistry and the wide range of his levels of tone. The description of the sack of the Capitol (3.71) suggests the high style akin to epic. The deaths of Galba (1.40f.) and of Otho (2.48–50) include some elements of the tragic. There is harsh denunciation for the death of the loathsome Tigellinus followed by comic irony for the lucky escape of the impudent Calvia Crispinilla (1.72f.).

The main subject of Book 4 and the truncated part of Book 5 is Cerialis and the Batavian revolt, but in a piece labelled 'Germans and Jews' L. is concerned in the first place with the insert in Book 5 on the history and customs of the Jews. Tacitus' account is a deplorable display of crass ignorance and misinformation, and has been dismissed as such by Chilver–Townend in their commentary (Oxford, 1985) on 5.2. It is surprising that L. states that no part of Tacitus' work is better known than his account of Judaism, and regrettable that he should have taken it beyond the context of the Early Empire.

In a note on the Imperial Roman state L. expounds in simple terms the functions of the

magistrates and other aspects of Roman administration and society, including the army. Such information is much to be commended for the inexperienced student and the wider reading public.

In a critical note L. lists places in which he rejects the reading of Fisher's OCT or H. Heubner's Teubner text (Stuttgart, 1978). He dismisses the authority of Wellesley's Teubner text (Leipzig, 1989) but rightly accepts Wellesley's reading at three places.

The contents of the *Historiae* are listed through the medium of a chronology (pp. xxxvii–xli) that is useful to the historian, as some events from different parts of the Empire and beyond occur at about the same time, though narrated in different books.

L. has corrected misinterpretations and infelicities in Fyfe's translation of 1912, and presents a version that reads well with a dignity of expression, but avoids artificial Tacitean stylization. In the obituary of Galba *famae . . . nec uenditator* (1.49.3), 'he did not flaunt it' (L.) is more appropriate for the late twentieth century than 'he did not court it by advertisement' (F.). At 2.69.2 *uires luxu corrumpebantur* 'efficiency was demoralized' (F.) is much inferior to 'energy was corroded' (L.).

The brief explanatory notes are devoted for the most part to points of historical information and interpretation. L. refers to other writers in order to supplement or correct Tacitus' narrative. Tacitus (1.71.2) dismisses as hypocrisy an action by Otho that Plutarch (*Oth. 2*) interprets as an act of clemency. Tacitus' geographical mistakes are corrected, such as a misunderstanding of the course of the Po (2.19.1). In more frequent notes in Book 5 L. rectifies the details of Tacitus' presentation of Judaism. The work concludes with a comprehensive general index.

University College London

MICHAEL COFFEY

**B. W. JONES: *Suetonius: Domitian*. Edited with Introduction, Commentary and Bibliography. Pp. xvi + 171. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1996. Paper, £10.95. ISBN: 1-85399-454-5.**

Until comparatively recently Suetonius had not received the serious critical attention his biographies deserve, and J.'s study of the *Domitian* is a welcome addition to the increasing bibliography on Suetonius. This edition provides a text (pp. 1–10) and commentary (pp. 11–157). J. makes a few textual emendations of the Teubner edition and comments on both issues of linguistic obscurity and the organization of the *Life*, but this is essentially a historical commentary. J.'s approach to the period is broadly prosopographic and one of the strengths of the commentary is the identification of the various characters. The commentary carefully brings out points of historical obscurity and explains areas of scholarly dissent. In some cases J. seems reluctant to give his opinion, being content to present lucidly and with occasional flashes of humour the opinions of others. One might have wished for more on literary aspects of the *Life*. J., for instance, sees the placing of the discourteous treatment of Caenis in the 'bad emperor' section as exemplifying the rather hurried composition of the work, but in several chapters, such as that dealing with Domitian's memorable sayings, J. discovers Suetonius escaping from a rigid division of good and bad qualities to the extent that one wonders whether Suetonius is deliberately eroding his own conventions. J. seems uninterested in the broader literary questions concerning Suetonius' treatment of the genre though these must obviously influence our understanding of the work. Nevertheless, the commentary will be of great benefit to those studying Domitian.

J.'s treatment of the politics of the period is familiar from his other works. Hence, for example, Domitia Longina's influence is explained by the connections between Corbulo and a swathe of the Roman aristocracy. Yet one wonders whether this is even half the picture. Her apparent popularity with the urban plebs, her association with the theatre, and her survival and prominence long after the deaths of the sons of Vespasian suggest a formidable personality capable of reshaping ancestral alliances. Such problems are fundamental, of course, to the prosopographic method, cruder applications of which have been much criticized, but here the approach relates to a wider historiographical issue than the promotion of a particular methodology, since J. is also a revisionist: Domitian, in his view, got a bad press and was unfairly treated by the political faction that dominates our literary tradition. J. systematically deconstructs the anti-Domitianic bias of Suetonius and others. This usefully counterbalances our ancient sources, but I doubt whether we can be so cavalier with the dominant hostile tradition. For instance, J. brings out psychological aspects of Domitian's alleged habit of locking himself away

© Oxford University Press, 1998

with only flies for entertainment, but emperors were supposed to live in the public eye and keep open house. Domitian's love of solitude was odd and the breach of convention menacing for those dependent on the 'friendship' of the *princeps*. Domitian's treatment of the consulship and the emperor's supposed use of '*dominus et deus*' are also dismissed as black propaganda, but surely the deaths of so many senators in the latter years of the reign mean that we need to take the explicit emphasis on senatorial hostility to this type of activity seriously. Similarly, Domitian's refusal to acknowledge his father's long-term mistress Caenis is presented by J. as being perfectly respectable, but can Suetonius' portrayal of this as overly stuffy really be dismissed (Suetonius does not come over as a social or moral radical)? Also, although we cannot be sure of the nature of Domitian's relationship with Julia, can J. be right in dismissing this as evidence only of Domitian's finer feelings for his family? Julia's prominence was part of the political presentation of the regime, and sex and politics had been inextricable since the foundation of the Principate.

J. follows the traditional historian's line in being more interested in facts than presentation and he is deeply suspicious of our sources. Yet most of what we have seems to result from contrasting 'spins' on the career of the emperor and trying to put a 'Domitianic spin' on the material merely emphasizes the fact that the realities of imperial power will be forever closed to us.

Royal Holloway, London

RICHARD ALSTON

S. MATTIACCI (ed.): *Apuleio: Le novelle dell' adulterio (Metamorfosi IX)*. Con testo a fronte. (Il Nuovo Melograno, 28.) Pp. 186. Florence: Casa Editrice le Lettere, 1996. Paper, L. 30,000. ISBN: 88-7166-279-2.

Present day readers of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* are well equipped with modern editions and studies, such as the recent translation by P. G. Walsh (Oxford, 1994) and the monograph of Nancy Shumate (reviewed in *CR* 47 [1997], 316–7). For book 9, the book of the famous 'adultery tales', there is the recent volume of the *Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius* (Groningen, 1995). Now M., who is known for several important articles on Apuleius (e.g. on his reception of archaic poetry), has published another edition of book 9 with a commentary in Italian. It is a convenient, moderately priced pocket book, characteristics which clearly distinguish it from the *GCA* volume. It contains the Latin text with face-to-face Italian translation, preceded by forty-five pages of introduction and followed by sixty-eight pages of (small printed) commentary.

In her introduction M. gives a brief survey of the different scholarly approaches to the novel and takes a moderate view herself: she opts for the 'Winklerian' position that the novel offers various levels of meaning, which leaves it to the reader to choose and to join in the *gioco ermeneutico*. Thus the tales of book 9 may be read as amusing stories about sex and cunning tricks, but also seem to form a coherent cycle, preparing for the mystico-religious finale of the 'Isis book'. In the introduction, M. also devotes some attention to the influence of Apuleius on later novelistic authors, such as Boccaccio and Morlini. The actual commentary remains closer to the Latin text. It includes many notes on the constitution of the text and Apuleius' often peculiar vocabulary, and provides ample literary parallels for many relevant matters of subject and style.

Most of this is useful and thorough, but one cannot help wondering which readers M. had in mind when writing this book. Given its format and the existence of the *GCA* volume (which M. has used), one would expect it above all to offer help to an inexperienced reader, or, alternatively, to focus on intertextual relations between Apuleius and the Italian Renaissance novelists. Neither of these two goals seems to have been aimed at. Instead, the range of matter covered largely corresponds to that of *GCA*, with which M. agrees in many, although not all, details. M.'s remarks are usually shorter than *GCA*, but not always clearer. This is mostly due to a tendency to cluster a number of different observations in larger, and so less well-ordered, notes.

The smaller number of pages available to M. (with *GCA* measuring well over 300 pages) inevitably imposed severe restrictions on the number of topics to be dealt with. But regrettably, it is not quite clear what principle of selection has been adopted. For example, the commentary on 9.3 contains some modest notes on textual and linguistic points (e.g. *cubilis*; the nexus *excubias agere*; the rare form *uirus*; and a parallel for *sanum . . . sobrium*), but also not less than a whole page on the theme of hydrophobia in asses and animals afflicted with rabies. Finally, literary models are sometimes overestimated at the expense of other explanations. This may be seen, for instance, in the famous picture of the evil miller's wife who worships only one God (9.14). This passage is now explained by many scholars as a parody or a veiled attack on Jewish or Christian

© Oxford University Press, 1998



religion (see recently V. Schmidt in *VChr.* [1997], 51–71). However, after briefly discussing the issue, M. considers the passage to be chiefly dependent on the general, negative picture of women in Sall. *Cat.* 24.3—a rather meagre conclusion.

Apart from these shortcomings, M.'s book is a welcome contribution to Apuleian studies. Given its format and scope, it will benefit above all readers who have no access to *GCA* or who prefer a study in Italian. For a general readership, however, it seems less suitable.

University of Leiden

VINCENT HUNINK

J. C. YARDLEY, W. HECKEL: *Justin: Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus: Books 11–12: Alexander the Great* (Clarendon Ancient History). Pp. vii + 360, 3 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 0-19-814908-5.

This volume, the first of two, contains the history of Alexander the Great as epitomized by Justin from the *Historiae Philippicae* of Pompeius Trogus, who devoted Books 11 and 12 of his work to the narrative of the deeds of the Macedonian conqueror. It will be followed by a second volume, containing Books 13–15, which in the original of Trogus covered the events after the death of Alexander until the death of King Cassander from what we read in the *Prologoi*. The original *Historiae Philippicae* by the universal historian of the Augustan age Pompeius Trogus, born in Vasio (today Vaison la Romaine) in Gaul, has been lost, probably in the Dark Ages, though curiously Chaucer reflects in his writings some knowledge of the original work.

The English translation, based on Otto Seel's Teubner edition (Stuttgart, 1972), has been very successfully done by Y., who, like Trogus with *Herculeae audacia* (Justin, *Praefatio*, 2), has rendered both the *Epitome* of Justin and the original prologues of Trogus (reviewed in *CR* 46 [1996], 163–4). The translation of the prologues and Books 11 and 12 has been provided by Y. and the commentary by H., who with great expertise has also produced the other sources for the events and gone through the corresponding bibliography. Y. has also added five appendices (pp. 302–43): I. Fragments of Trogus, which are translations of passages identified by O. Seel in his *Pompeii Trogi Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1956) as coming from *Philippic History* 11–12; they are *Fragmenta* 84–125 in Seel's collection. II. The death of Philip II according to Justin, *Epit.* 9.5.8–7.14 in English translation. III. The comparison of Philip and Alexander according to Justin, *Epit.* 9.8.1–21 in English translation. IV. A digression on Persian history based on Justin, *Epit.* 10.3. V. The language of Justin and Trogus, in which attention is mainly focused on the influence in Books 11 and 12 of Livian expressions, poetic usage, and so on. The book finishes with an index (pp. 344–60). Three maps (Alexander's Empire, Southern Italy, and Central Asia) have also been included.

As the authors point out in the preface (pp. V–VII), the commentary endeavours 'to distinguish between Trogus' original contribution and Justin's reworking of the *Philippic History*' (p. V); this has been done extremely carefully.

The introduction is divided into two parts: I. Justin and Trogus (pp. 1–19) by Y., and II. History and Historiography (pp. 19–41) by H. Y. defends the theory that Justin lived c. A.D. 200 (p. 1). This seems to me the most reasonable since Justin's attraction to the *Philippic Histories*, the product of a time when the world was unified by Augustus, corresponds to the new organization of the Roman Empire by the African Emperor Septimius Severus. For Justin he was doubtless a new Augustus, even though it cannot be proved that Justin came from Africa himself, which would add to his respect for Severus. Trogus' interest in Universal History finds parallels in authors of the same epoch: Strabo and Nicolaus of Damascus. Y. offers intelligent remarks such as 'Trogus did not include a history of Gaul as a whole in his work' (p. 2). Y.'s observations of the relations between Livy and Trogus (pp. 6–8) are very fine. He suggests 'a date towards the latter part of the second century (or, possibly, the early part of the third)' (p. 13) for the *Epitome*, a matter which has always been a point of controversy. H. has clearly shown (p. 19) the limits for knowing the *Historiae Philippicae*, whose structure must be built up from the prologues, the *Epitome* of Justin, and the fragments collected by Seel. H. has traced very well the influence of Trogus–Justin in later authors (pp. 19–20). His remarks about the development of Universal History are very good (pp. 21–2), but perhaps he should have referred to the theory of world empires, which is the nucleus of Trogus' interpretation of historical evolution. H.'s remarks about the way the work is set out are very good (pp. 22–4). He has clearly noticed that Trogus 'did not

© Oxford University Press, 1998

have a chronological system' (p. 25); what H. means by this is that he lacked a consistent one. H. has also provided a systematic survey of Trogus' sources (pp. 30–4). The last section of the introduction (pp. 34–41) is devoted to the history of Alexander the Great.

It would have been worthwhile mentioning something about the reasons for Justin's omissions from the original of Trogus' Books 11 and 12: prologue to Book 11: . . . *dictaeque in excessu origines et reges Cariae*; prologue to Book 12: . . . *et ab Archidamo, rege Lacedaemoniorum . . . Additae his origines Italicae . . . Lucanorum, Samnitum, Sabinorum . . .*

Y. and H. have produced an extremely useful work and we look forward to seeing the second volume. On the other hand, a commentary of Justin's entire *Epitome* of the *Philippic History* of Pompeius Trogus is needed and would be of great utility, since in this author there is historical information which is not to be found in other sources for the period.

Madrid

J. M. ALONSO-NÚÑEZ

B. ZIMMERMAN (ed.): *Griechisch-römische Komödie und Tragödie II. (Drama: Beiträge zum antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption, 5.)* Pp. 231. Stuttgart: M&P, 1997. Paper, DM 45. ISBN: 3-476-45176-3.

Unlike the vast majority of classical periodicals, *Drama* is not only dedicated to a specific aspect of antiquity, i.e. the ancient theatre and its reception, but has also tended to produce volumes which concentrate on an individual theme within theatre, most recently *Sophocles' Electra in Performance*. The present volume, however, casts its net more widely, with thirteen papers ranging in time from Aeschylus to Terence. It opens with four papers on Aristophanes: one on *Frogs* 165f., followed by three on *Wasps*, which range from a discussion on Philocleon as actor and spectator to the affinities between Philocleon's storytelling and its equivalent in present-day North Carolina, in many ways an intriguing extension of oral composition. From this we pass on to Gregory Dobrov's close examination of Pherecrates' *Chiron* and its relationship to contemporary developments in the dithyramb, followed by studies on Aristotle *Poetics* 17, the *scholia* to Euripides' *Alceste*, Aeschylus' *Septem* and Sophocles' *OT*, Terence's *Andria*, and Seneca's *Thyestes* and *Agamemnon*. Finally come two papers on recent performances of *Thesmophoriazusa* and Menander's *Samia*, one in the high-tech theatre of the University of Western Australia, the other on an *ad hoc* stage and before an audience that had to be squeezed in where there was room, in the 'Herculanean' garden of the Getty Museum at Malibu. Interestingly the authors of these two papers themselves play a dual rôle, as both apologists and critics, providing an insight into the at times self-indulgent thought processes (and the tribulations) of those who seek to transfer ancient drama to the present day. Rounding off the volume are five reviews and a list of ancient plays produced in Britain (1993–6) and the Netherlands (1991–4). It is an inevitable characteristic of periodical/series volumes that they contain material differing widely in both approach and quality, and the present volume is no exception. What is perhaps less acceptable is to find that a number of the papers included have already appeared elsewhere (in one case in a variety of versions), or have been abstracted from material already published.

University of Warwick

STANLEY IRELAND

E. STÄRK: *Kampanien als geistige Landschaft. Interpretationen zum antiken Bild des Golfs von Neapel. (Zetemata, 93.)* Pp. 257, 2 pls. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995. Paper, DM 88. ISBN: 3-406-38351-3.

This book is not a history of Campania, but an exploration of the notion of Campania as an ideal in both ancient and modern literature. Its starting point is the 'Grand Tour' literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, which produced contrasting approaches—an idealized view of the beauties of the region and an increasing engagement with the historical and literary topography of the Bay of Naples. Much of this second aspect, however, was concerned less with the surviving monuments themselves than with an attempt to correlate these with references in ancient literature. The long second chapter attempts to unravel the implications of the tendency to approach the topography of Campania via the *Aeneid*, which has left a lasting legacy of

© Oxford University Press, 1998

misidentified monuments. The main theme is the poetic geography of the Bay of Naples, demonstrating how this acquires a life of its own, entirely independent of the actual topography of the region. The starting point is Virgil, but S. traces the roots of the Virgilian tradition on the Phlegraean Fields in Homer rather than in the geography of the area. Following the same methodology, he examines the same theme in later poetic sources such as Ovid, Silius Italicus, and Statius, indicating how Virgil's Homer-derived geography was the basis of these. It is particularly valuable for its demonstration that poetry must be treated with extreme caution as a source for both history and geography. Catalogues of cities, peoples, and troops by poets such as Silius Italicus are particularly tempting, and S.'s demonstration that these are frequently derived from earlier poets rather than writers of history or knowledge of the region is salutary.

The third chapter is perhaps the most problematic in that it is extremely long and attempts to deal with a vast and diverse amount of material, covering everything from a wide-ranging analysis of descriptions of the Bay of Naples in ancient literature to the more specific problems of the region in Late Antiquity and the emphasis on the coastal resorts and spa culture. The methodology of the earlier chapters is applied to geographical writers and a broader spectrum of literary forms. The aspects of Campanian identity highlighted contain few surprises; *topoi* associated with the region include the *otium* and *amoenitas* associated with villa culture, the abundance and fertility of the region and consequent associations of pastoral idyll, and the more negative connotations of *luxuria* and self-indulgence. Despite this, S. does address one or two of the more persistent myths about the region. In particular, he tests out the idea, commonplace in the identity of the Flavian regime, that Vespasian and Titus had a less luxurious lifestyle and eschewed the *luxuria* and *otium* typified by the Hellenized Campanian villa culture of the Neronian era, and finds no significant evidence of change. More intriguing in terms of the study of regional identities and how they are formed is the central section, which demonstrates how Campania became transmuted in the authors of late Antiquity into an ideal rather than a place. The term was used almost as an adjective rather than a proper noun, a shorthand to indicate precisely such areas of agricultural richness, villa culture, and elite aspirations as those embodied by the Bay of Naples. S. points out that references to Campania are used to convey the flavour of villa life in Istria, and that 'Baiae' becomes a euphemism for a spa, replacing the more usual 'Aquae'. Finally, the book closes with a briefer discussion of the more doom-laden associations of Campania as a place of danger, courtesy of the seismic and volcanic nature of the region and the underworld associations of the Phlegraean Fields and Lake Avernus.

Many of the specific points raised by this book are highly intriguing and illuminate both the specific identity of Campania and the uses to which different types of source and different approaches to the topical question of identity can be put. However, as a study of Campanian identity, or even that of the Bay of Naples, it still leaves many questions unanswered. Many of the *topoi* identified are well-documented and uncontroversial, although indications as to their implications are valuable and interesting. In particular, the emphasis on Augustan and post-Augustan sources means that, with the exception of the discussion of Virgil's use of Homer, there is little sense of how the identity of this area might have developed. The use of Grand Tour literature and the identity of Campania in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is also of intrinsic interest, but the attempt to mesh the ancient identity and its afterlife together ultimately has the effect of short-changing both of these important topics. Nevertheless, this book provides a thought-provoking and unusual angle on the identity of ancient Campania.

*University of Newcastle upon Tyne*

KATHRYN LOMAS

G. WHITAKER: *A Bibliographical Guide to Classical Studies: Vol. 1. General History of Literature. Literature: Accius—Aristophanes (Entries 1–3073); Vol. 2. Literature: Aristotle—Fulgentius (Entries 3074–6532)*. Pp. xxiv + 372 (Vol. 1); viii + 355 (Vol. 2). Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Olms-Weidmann, 1997. Cased, DM 228 per volume. ISBN: 3-487-10465-2 (Vol. 1); 3-487-10466-0 (Vol. 2).

These are the first two in what will ultimately be a nine-volume set detailing monographs produced between 1873 and 1980 on virtually every aspect of the ancient classical world down to A.D. 600: literature (which will account for the first four volumes), language, history,

© Oxford University Press, 1998

archaeology, and science. Not included are Biblical and Christian literature, Bronze Age archaeology, unpublished dissertations, inaugural lectures, school editions, and works in languages such as Hebrew, Japanese, and Russian, to which access is limited. Such an undertaking would be a mammoth task even for a whole group of scholars; for a single individual it represents an enormous investment of time, energy, and sheer determination. As W. explains in his preface, the work is the product ultimately of a thesis submitted for the Fellowship of the Library Association in 1984, and its bibliographic exactitude is evident on every page since the descriptions accompanying individual entries are the result of the author's own examination of the works listed.

W.'s aim throughout is to supplement established works of reference (Engelmann 1700–1878, Klussmann 1878–96, Lambriano 1896–1914, *Dix Années* 1914–24, and *L'Année Philologique*) with a listing that allows developments within individual areas to be followed chronologically. This demands, of course, considerable rigour in terms of organization, and to this end W. has introduced a scheme that users should find readily accessible. Each major area is divided initially into three main sequences: General, Greek, and Roman. Secondary arrangement is by type of publication: (1) encyclopaedias and alphabetical reference works; (2) handbooks; (3) critical and annotated surveys; (4) descriptive bibliographies; (5) editions of authors' works or collections of such items as inscriptions; (6) scholia and concordances; and (7) studies. Needless to say, those sections devoted to individual authors are clustered around elements 5–7. Where a work covers a diverse range of topics the reader is directed to the index, which will appear in Vol. 9.

Since in part the work is designed to allow readers to trace developments within areas of scholarship, there is little doubt that it will prove an invaluable tool for anyone faced with the otherwise daunting task of wading through the more conventional reference collections. In this respect W. will have created a useful tool for every student of antiquity, from the undergraduate seeking easy access to the available literature on a topic, to the postgraduate embarking on a higher degree and needing to become quickly acquainted with the literature, or the established scholar who wants a labour-saving guide to areas not previously studied in any depth. As W. admits, though, such a work contains the seeds of its own obsolescence in that it ends with 1980, except in the case of series completed after that date or later editions and reprints. This must be regarded as the major weakness of the whole project. In so many areas recent years have produced significant advances either in absolute knowledge (new texts of Menander, for instance) or interpretation. To have sacrificed the opportunity to include even partial reference to such material upon the altar of his quest for bibliographical precision (doubtless a feature of his library training) W. has condemned some sections, excellent though they are in other respects, to being of only historical interest even before their publication. One wonders indeed why such a work has been produced at all in hard copy when a CD ROM database instead would not only allow a more speedy and wide-ranging means of access for the reader but also offer the possibility of regular updating.

University of Warwick

STANLEY IRELAND

J. WILKINS (ed.): *Food in European Literature*. (Europa, 2.4.) Pp. 64. Exeter: Intellect Books, 1996. Paper, £9.95. ISBN: 1-871516-88-9.

A book of this nature will inevitably frustrate some: too brief and too disparate perhaps to fulfil the promise of its title, the five essays and introduction range from Homeric roasts via medieval Portugal to musings on Italo Calvino's fridge, the product presumably of an academic symposium, although this is nowhere stated. However, the enthusiasm of the writers is clearly evident, whilst the helpful marginal references point to further literature should the appetite be whetted, but M. Montanari's *The Culture of Food* (Oxford, 1994) is passed over, despite its trenchant bearing on the topic.

W. introduces the book from a Scottish angle to highlight the frugal versus the luxurious, a theme frequently tackled in literature as allowing for discursions on national character and human foibles. The element of satirical comedy in the latter might, perhaps, have lent greater cohesion to the book if it had been developed further.

S. Mennel examines the cultural differences identified in foods. Traditionally France and England are divided by their respective preference for roast beef and sauce, a symbol of plain Protestantism and complicated Catholicism; but perhaps there could be added the contrast between the Celtic and the Roman. Chicken breast with brie in The Netherlands must surely be

© Oxford University Press, 1998

no more than a modern manifestation of what has been dubbed Roman cultural imperialism, that is, availability ensuring an application, as with Trimalchio.

C. Nocentini suggests that the comic is linked to a sense of disproportion, hence the black humour in Marcovaldo's poor lunch and a rich child's lunch, respectively solid salami and bread as opposed to fluffy fried brains. Similarly Gesubambino squashes cakes in a shop window by crawling over them with slapstick bravado.

E. Phillips writes from the heart with genuine *saudade* for Portuguese food, which makes for an attractive essay. Scholarly diversions are somewhat hesitant and, as with the spices in this national cuisine, the footnotes are few.

A. Elliott's vigorous translations of extracts of Roman poetry with a nutritional theme are introduced by W. Here more is needed to link and explain the pieces, particularly Ovid's didactic parody of Pythagoreanism and Seneca's Stoic views on the dangers of a rich table that appear almost verbatim elsewhere, e.g. in his *Phaedra*.

W. looks at the topsy-turvy world of Athenian comedy where dung is food, beetles are heroic steeds, the countryside smells sweet, and women have sexual power equal to men. War purées peasants into the ancient version of pesto, with the generals and politicians as the pestles.

Finally J. Davidson deftly plays on the old conundrum of why Homeric heroes do not relish fish. That ichthyological nomenclature could be comic shows how fish were an everyday feature of the classical diet, which draws attention to their absence in Homer. If they were common and amusing, then they were hardly the stuff for heroes or sacrifice. Yet perhaps too they were shunned in offerings to the gods because they were from an alien realm.

Haileybury College, Hertford

MARK GRANT

**R. B. PARKINSON: *The Tale of Sinuhe and other Egyptian Poems 1940–1640 BC*. Pp. ix + 317. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. ISBN: 0-19-814963-8.**

Classicists interested in the development of ancient lyric and epic will find plenty to enjoy in P.'s elegant and subtle collection of translations of the principal Egyptian literary texts dating to the period known as the Middle Kingdom. Literature in the Egyptian language has tended to play a peripheral rôle in these debates, especially at the teaching level: I know that I have seen many bibliographies for undergraduate comparative literature courses (usually called something like 'the epic tradition'), which include the Mesopotamian texts, such as the story of Gilgamesh, but leave out the equally interesting and relevant Egyptian writings. This marginalization is not wholly the fault of classicists, as Egyptologists are quite resistant to the literary qualities of their texts, often thinking of them as factual information for writing history rather than as creative productions in their own right (particularly true for P.'s eponymous text, *The Tale of Sinuhe*). Fortunately, P. has gone a long way to remedy this. His beautiful translations and thorough, informative yet unobtrusive commentaries work together to convey strongly the poetic qualities of the Egyptian originals. His concise but sophisticated introduction (pp. 1–18), tantalizingly larded with references to Sappho, Virgil, Eliot, Coleridge, and Yeats, not only places the Egyptian poems in their historical context but also within the wider trajectory of world literature. Here P. addresses many questions of interpretation that will interest classicists: how the speaker–hearer relationship is dramatized with framing devices; the rôle of the author in primarily oral contexts; and the relationship of the poems to prevailing cultural values, for instance. The translations which follow are divided into three sections. The first consists of tales (pp. 21–127), of which the centrepiece is the story of Sinuhe, a courtier who flees Egypt but cannot bear to live abroad, and his efforts to return to his homeland (pp. 21–53). The other two categories are discourses, usually pessimistic and concerned with a perceived decline in moral and social standards (pp. 131–99), and didactic literature (pp. 203–84), in which classicists will find much to remind them of Hesiod. A glossary, chronology, and useful bibliography follow (pp. 298–317).

P. has produced a book of lasting value here, whose high quality and easy yet authoritative presentation will make these too-long-obscure poems accessible to a wider audience in comparative literary studies, and (I hope) beyond.

University of Warwick

DOMINIC MONTSERRAT

© Oxford University Press, 1998

M. LA MATINA: *Il testo antico. Per una semiotica come filologia integrata.* (Circolo semiologico siciliano, Working Papers 1.) Pp. 186. Palermo: L'epos, 1994. Paper, L. 24,000.

La M.'s book is concerned with some methodological problems connected with the interpretation of a text. His aim is to begin the elaboration of a common theoretical ground for the various disciplines concerned with the text, giving ample space to the discussion of existing theories. To this purpose he uses the results achieved by two disciplines, textual philology and semiotics, that approach the text, respectively, from a historical point of view and from the perspective of structural analysis. In La M.'s opinion, in fact, the tension between philology and structuralism cannot be harmonized to the advantage of only one side.

The book consists of six chapters, with the addition of some concluding remarks ('Approdi'), a bibliography, and an index of the names cited. The introductory chapter defines the aims and central ideas of the book and gives definitions for the basic technical terms the author will use. The three following chapters deal with existing theories. The second and the third focus mainly on the developments of textual criticism and structuralism in Italy in the last thirty years. The fourth presents the model of rational reconstruction of the interpretative process proposed by Janos S. Petöfi, from which La M. in part derives his own theory. Petöfi's model, presented in the form of a diagram, is then applied to the analysis of a specific text, a sixth-century A.D. epigram from the *Greek Anthology* (16.388) and its translation into Italian verse by Giacomo Leopardi, made early in the last century.

In the two remaining chapters (5 and 6), La M. respectively introduces his own 'theory of the Editor' and then applies some aspects of it to the problems related to the passage from orality to writing in archaic and classical Greece. The aim of the 'theory of the Editor', as the author defines it, is to study the relationships between expressions belonging to different languages or to different levels of the same language. In the last chapter La M. re-examines his theory in the light of the book by Eric A. Havelock, *The Muse Learns to Write. Reflections on Orality and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present* (New Haven and London, 1986). Can Havelock's well-known views about the rôle of orality in archaic and classical Greece lead to a new theoretical model of interpretation of archaic and classical texts? La M.'s thesis is that if we assume a conceptual difference between an oral and a written expression we should as a consequence elaborate a specific interpretative method for this type of texts.

The interdisciplinary approach is the principal interest of the book; at the same time it can also be considered its weakness, since, as the author himself is well aware (p. 14), the danger is that its contents will appear to be excessively commonplace and trivial to a specialist in semiotics, and too difficult or theoretical in the eyes of a philologist. I can speak for the latter, and even if the lengthy treatment of theoretical topics in some chapters is not easy reading, the book is not beyond the reach of a reader who is not a specialist in both fields. Much of the terminology is either explained or paraphrased; the theories La M. refers to are applied to the interpretation of actual texts. The examples provided span a wide chronological range, from sixth-century A.D. Greek epigrams to Italian Medieval and contemporary poetry (Ungaretti and Montale). Even so, it makes considerable demands of a reader without a semiological background.

As the author states very clearly in the last pages (pp. 155 ff.), the book is mainly conceived to encourage the reader to ask a series of questions about the methodological basis of specific types of interpretation, rather than to supply ready-made conclusions. In this sense it is certainly stimulating and well worth the effort.

University College London

MARIA BROGGIATO

W. BURKERT: *Homo Necans. Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen* (2., um eine Nachwort erweiterte Auflage). Pp. xii + 378. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1997. ISBN: 3-11-015098-0.

The first edition of this work received no review in *CR*, *JHS*, or *Gnomon*, as Jan Bremmer pointed out in a notice of the English translation (*CR* 35 [1985], 312–13). Simple inability to cope on the part of reviewers seemed the obvious explanation, but in respect of *Gnomon*, at

© Oxford University Press, 1998

least, a further possibility is opened by B.'s recent revelation that 'certain colleagues decided that the author of such a book was unfit to become editor of a philological journal' (*Pegasus* 41 [1998], 10). The suspect book has made its way in the world nonetheless, and now appears in what professes to be a German 'second edition', though the text is in fact a photographic reproduction of the first (the admittedly trivial alterations to the notes of the English translation have therefore been lost).

What is new is a twenty-page *Nachwort*, which Burkert-watchers and admirers will read with the greatest interest. It reveals what is in many ways an astonishing open-mindedness, a willingness not to dig in in defence of views merely because they happen to have been those of the author's past self. While B. does not quite invite the reader to ignore his theories and attend only to specific analyses (as J. G. Frazer was to do in respect of *The Golden Bough*), he retracts all pretension to have been describing a necessary or universal phase in human evolution. In other traditions it may have been otherwise: what the book describes is merely how it was in the tradition to which the Greeks belonged (and us in a sense with them). Concessions are made on the central rôle of aggression in constituting human society, and on the supposed universality of guilt over killing. Even for the sacralization of killing, explanations unrelated to the hypothetical anxieties of the hunter are canvassed.

Yet in crucial respects the B. of 1996 remains the B. of 1972. His fundamental concern is still, heroically, with colossal questions about the emergence of human culture over huge expanses of time. He discusses the implications for the book of recent developments in genetics, and in the study of animal behaviour and of Neanderthal man. Two deep thinkers about Greek religion have gently questioned the relevance of such concerns to the study of sacrificial practices (J. P. Vernant, in *Entretiens Hardt* 27 [1981]; J. Z. Smith, in R. G. Hamerton-Kelly [ed.], *Violent Origins* [1987]). Particularly challenging in my view is Smith's suggestion that no line of development can possibly lead from hunter to sacrificer, since 'sacrifice is an elaboration of the selective kill, in contradistinction to the fortuitous kill . . . the artificial (i.e. ritualized) killing of an artificial (i.e. domesticated) animal'. The *Nachwort* represents a dialogue with B.'s own past position, not with theirs.

*New College, Oxford*

R. C. T. PARKER

R. MERKELBACH: *Isis Regina–Zeus Sarapis: Die griechisch-ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen dargestellt*. Pp. xxvii + 722, 35 line drawings, 261 pls. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1995. DM 245. ISBN: 3-519-07427-3.

M.'s aim is no less than to marshal all the available evidence about the cult of Isis and closely related cults to show the ritual basis for several classical novels. The view that the 'Isis-novels' of Achilles Tatius, Apuleius, Xenophon of Ephesus, and the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* were ritual texts, written in a code that could only be understood by the initiated, is dealt with in the second of M.'s three sections and is a development of M.'s controversial arguments, first expounded in *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike* (Munich and Berlin, 1962). M. provides a brief résumé of his approach (Chapters 27–28) and then tackles the novels, with particular attention to the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, in a mini-commentary format which should be useful to anyone reading these texts (Chapters 29–37).

The real significance of this new study, however, lies in the vast compendium of evidence, literary, documentary, and iconographic, discussed in the twenty-six chapters of Part I and illustrated with line drawings and also with 252 photographs of statuettes, wall-paintings, coins, etc. which make up Part III. Evidence from the Macedonian conquest of Egypt (with some reference to Pharaonic material) until the destruction of the Alexandrian Serapeum in A.D. 391, and from across the Mediterranean world, is discussed with impressive clarity. For M. this bewildering array of material comes together to give the following picture of a Graeco-Egyptian religion. As the myths of Isis and Osiris developed from their inconsistent Pharaonic forms, they incorporated both near-Eastern parallels and the Ptolemaic cult of Sarapis, originally the cult of the deified Apis-bull, Osiris-Apis. The Isis and Sarapis myth was systematized through a process of 'Interpretatio Aegyptiaca' and philosophical interpretation and the many instances of Isis-cult which were found across the Roman Empire shared hymns or aretologies and aspects of ceremonial with the Egyptian original. This shared ritual was then encoded in the novels.

© Oxford University Press, 1998

In many respects M.'s work is a *tour de force*. It not only draws on a vast range of learning but also makes this learning very accessible to the reader, both in the lucid writing-style and also in the generous provision of source material, often given in the original as well as in translation. Whatever one might think of M.'s thesis, no historian of religion should ignore the challenge that this material presents. The hymns, myths, rituals, syncretisms, and so on, which M. analyses, were an integral part of the world of ancient paganism and understanding their place in that world is a critical part of understanding paganism itself. There is a fundamental problem, however, with the way M. does, or more often does not, deal with the context of the evidence. The premises are often antiquarian rather than historical, it being assumed rather than argued that this disparate material can simply be combined to form a unified whole.

M.'s treatment of Egyptian religion is a key example. The usefulness of the term 'Graeco-Roman' which he employs to describe Egypt under Ptolemaic and Roman rule is dubious. In the religious as in most other spheres there were significant changes. One relevant development here is that whilst the cult of Sarapis only really took off in the Roman period, the mummified animal cults, so importantly connected with the worship of Osiris and very popular in the Ptolemaic period, declined drastically in popularity in the Roman period. M. mostly ignores such changes. Another point is that M. is too cavalier about the provenance of documents. So, for example, in using the Greek magical Papyri (Chapter 16), M. tackles the question of whether magical texts can shed light on religion, but ignores the fact that the hymns and 'spells' preserved in the Magical Papyri are not drawn from documents found across Egypt but from one collection from the Roman period, discovered probably in the area of modern Luxor. We need to be much surer about the reasons behind this collection and how representative it is before feeding it into a picture of religion in Egypt, let alone the Roman Empire. Finally details of how Egyptian cults were organized are thin on the ground and sometimes inaccurate. *Pastophoroi* in Egypt were not 'shrine-bearers' as he claims (p. 123), nor a minor rank of 'clergy' under the authority of the priests. Their name refers simply to their insignia of office and they were most probably primarily temple-guards, who functioned as a semi-autonomous group within the temple, submitting their own accounts to the authorities.

The challenge of pulling the Egyptian and other material into its proper context remains. Scholars, however, should be grateful to M. for making this fascinating material and his insights into it so provocatively accessible.

*University of Keele*

P. M. GLARE

P. PAKKANEN: *Interpreting Early Hellenistic Religion: a Study Based on the Mystery Cult of Demeter and the Cult of Isis*. (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens, 3.) Pp. 180. Helsinki: Finnish Institute at Athens, 1996. Paper, 180 FIM. ISBN: 951-95295-4-3.

In this Helsinki dissertation, P. makes the attempt, in principle very laudable, to escape loose generalization about Hellenistic religion by investigating particular cults of a particular period and place. She contrasts the Eleusinian Mysteries with the cult of Isis as it emerged in Athens and on Delos (here seen as an extension of Athens, which before 166 it was not) in the Hellenistic period. This is a neat juxtaposition in a way, given the common assimilation of Demeter to Isis (a subject treated in the book's best pages). P. is interested in methodology in the study of religion, and makes sound individual observations. But both conception and execution left me finally unsatisfied. About the latter it would be tedious to elaborate. But as to the former, one cannot exploit the potential of a focused, localized study if a large proportion of the religious activities of that locality are excluded. There is far more evidence in Hellenistic Athens for, say, the (obligatory) devotion of ephebes to traditional cults than for the worship of Isis, which simply cannot bear the necessary weight of comparison. And, in treating what she sees as the growth of *thiasos* religiosity, P. distinguishes too little between the behaviour of citizens, for whom the turn to *thiasoi* was an option (but one perhaps additional to participation in city, deme, and phratry cult, not a substitute), and of non-citizens, for whom it

© Oxford University Press, 1998



was a necessity. In consequence, P. puts less distance between herself and the old clichés about Hellenistic religion than she had set out to do.

*New College, Oxford*

R. C. T. PARKER

G. BOSIO, E. DAL COVOLO, M. MARITANO (edd.): *Introduzione ai Padri della Chiesa; Secoli III e IV*. Pp. xxiv + 528. Turin: Società editrice internazionale, 1993. ISBN: 88-05-05301-5.

This book, with a publication date of 1993 and a bibliography closing in 1991, reached me late in 1997. It is a new edition of the useful two-volume patristic anthology, *Iniziazione ai padri*, published by Bosio in 1963-4 and now revised by two Salesian University colleagues with a team of contributors. It is also the third volume of *Strumenti della corona Patrum*. This volume, taken in isolation, does not explain its specific purpose or its expected audience: but what it does is to select the major Latin, Greek, and Syriac Fathers of the third and fourth centuries and to provide for each a brief account of historical context and range of writing; an anthology of passages in translation, with some annotation; and a scholarly bibliography of texts, translations, and important secondary work in European languages, on the same lines as the bibliographies in the classic *Patrology* of Quasten (revised by di Berardino). Heretics and those on the fringes of orthodoxy come in the prelims, in small print, with bibliography only.

Eleven contributors cover twenty-one Fathers: the Latins Arnobius, Lactantius, Hilary, Optatus, Ambrose, Chromatius, Rufinus, Jerome; the Greeks Eusebius, Alexander (of Alexandria), Methodius, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, the Cappadocians, Epiphanius, Diodore of Tarsus, John Chrysostom; and two Syriac fathers, Aphrahat and Ephraem. With such a range, detailed theological exposition is not to be expected. The *corona Patrum* is a long way from the traditional *catena Patrum*, which was a careful listing of passages designed to show the securely linked development of orthodox doctrine. The common purpose of these contributors is evidently to persuade a present-day Christian readership that the Fathers are not insulated by time and authority from the twentieth-century Church, that they led interesting and varied lives, and that their preaching, hymn-writing, and theological exposition continues to be helpful. It is frankly acknowledged that Arnobius is distinctly pre-Nicene in his understanding of the Trinity, that the Latin Fathers are not outstanding independent theologians, and that John Chrysostom's forte was rhetoric not systematics. The Arian controversy makes two brief appearances, in relation to Alexander and to Athanasius, but the *Life of Antony* gets much more coverage.

Contributors vary in their acceptance of their subjects' perspective. A certain North Italian patriotism (the Salesian University began in Turin) may explain why Chromatius is firmly restored to the high status conferred by his fourth-century admirers (p. 95), though not why Ambrose gets only faint praise (p. 55) for his skilled presentation of Greek theology. Jerome's personal relationships, especially the admiration of Damasus (p. 129), are presented very much as Jerome would wish. Rufinus (p. 116) counters the perverse dialectic of the heretics with the simplicity of Christian faith: there is no comment on this favourite tactic for refusing to argue. But the sympathy of contributors for their subjects has its own value in introducing a new generation of readers to the splendours of patristics.

*University of Liverpool*

GILLIAN CLARK

C. GILL: *Greek Thought*. (Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics, 25.) Pp. 103. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 0-19-922074-3.

'This book,' G. states in his preface, 'explores four themes in the area of Greek thought, relating to psychology, ethics, politics, and the idea of nature as an ethical norm.' 'I have chosen these topics,' he explains in his introduction, 'because they are ones on which I feel reasonably competent to outline recent developments, and on which I have some points of my own to make. Also, these topics are some . . . of those that may be of particular interest to readers who are not specialists in ancient philosophy.' As G. points out, this book draws heavily on material in his much larger work, *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue*

© Oxford University Press, 1998