

BOOK REVIEWS

Herodotus, *The Histories*, translated by Aubrey de Sélincourt, revised with an introduction and notes by John M. Marincola (Penguin Classics.) Pp. liv + 622. Harmondsworth, 1996. Paper. £7.99/\$10.95. ISBN 0 14 044638 9

‘An old, blind, possibly senile man, several centuries out of place.’ So wrote A. R. Burn in a letter to Penguin Books, commenting on the choice of cover illustration for the then new edition of Herodotus’ *Histories*, and adding the suggestion that Snark International, who provided the photograph, must be a Boojum. Now, twenty-four years later, the ‘Greek sculpture of a seated philosopher in the Louvre’ has suddenly and silently vanished away, to be replaced on the current new edition by ‘an oinochoe depicting a Greek fighting a Persian, c. 500 BC, in the Louvre, Paris’. Gone too is Burn’s introduction to the volume, which was serviceable, and in its place there is a more extensive collection of material by J. M. Marincola. Two other features of the new edition deserve immediate comment, since they, probably more than anything else, turn this into a valuable edition for teaching. Chapter numbers have been added to the outside margins of the text (this was done in the Penguin Thucydides in 1972, the year that Burn’s edition of Herodotus appeared), and the translation has been revised (by an act of ‘de-translation’) so that the following words are now to be found in the text, and explained in a glossary at the beginning: archon, barbarian, colony, deme, ephor, guest-friend(ship), helot, hero, hoplite, mother-city, ostracism, penteconter, perioeci, trireme and tyrant. Is there any significance in the fact that the vast majority of these terms relate to politics and war?

Marincola claims not to have made many significant changes to de Sélincourt’s translation, but the opening paragraph has been completely rewritten. Here is de Sélincourt: ‘Herodotus of Halicarnassus, his *Researches* are here set down to preserve the memory of the past by putting on record the astonishing achievements both of our own and of other peoples; and more particularly, to show how they came into conflict.’ And here is Marincola: ‘Herodotus of Halicarnassus here displays his inquiry, so that human achievements may not become forgotten in time, and great and marvellous deeds - some displayed by Greeks, some by barbarians - may not be without their glory; and especially to show why the two peoples fought each other.’ The new version is much closer to the Greek, and it further benefits from a long note explaining the significance of the words.

Marincola’s main contribution is his introduction and notes. Herodotean scholarship has been very active in the last quarter of a century, and

the introduction shows familiarity with recent work. He discusses the structure of the work, its 'conceptual mapping' and 'thematic patterning' lucidly and concisely; the stress on the literary subtlety of the text is an important development since Burn's time. On Herodotus' sources and methods Marincola rightly dismisses Detlev Fehling and the 'liar school', and emphasises the role of the oral tradition. On at least one historical issue however he is wrong: the Delphic oracle was not 'pro-Persian' (p. 550 n. 39). This is a modern myth which depends on a fundamental misapprehension of how the oracle worked, and there is not a single scrap of evidence from the ancient world to show that anyone ever believed that the oracle supported Persia. Delphi was the main recipient of dedications after Salamis and Plataea (Hdt. 8.121, 9.81), which hardly suggests suspicion of the oracle. The 'structural outline' of the work (pp. xxxi-xxxviii) is considerably more detailed than in the earlier edition, although its major divisions, especially the grouping together of everything from 3.89 to 7.3 as 'reign and campaigns of Darius' obscure some structuring elements that were spotted by those who divided the work into its nine books in antiquity; nonetheless for those who are using Herodotus primarily as a source for historical investigation it is very useful. Useful too are the chronological tables, which tabulate the reigns of the kings of Lydia, Media, Persia, Egypt and Sparta, and also give a run-down of events mentioned in Herodotus from 650-479/8 BC. The four maps are very clear and helpful. As well as this introductory material there is a bibliography and fifty pages of notes.

The only other paperback edition of Herodotus available in Britain is Rawlinson's translation in the Everyman series, for which this reviewer wrote the (short) introduction. Rawlinson's prose is elegant and pretty accurate, but in keeping with Victorian sensibilities it is occasionally somewhat reticent. In the course of his account of Indian customs Herodotus mentions the camel, and reveals that in its hind legs it 'has four thighs and four knees, and its genitals point backwards towards its tail' (3.103). Rawlinson's translation passes over the genitalia in silence; Marincola adds a note vouchsafing the truth of Herodotus' observation.

King's College London

HUGH BOWDEN

Appian, *The Civil Wars*. Translated with an introduction and notes by John Carter (Penguin Classics.) Pp. xliii + 436. Harmondsworth, 1996. Paper. £8.99, \$13.95. ISBN 0-14-044509-9

John Carter's splendid new translation of Appian's *Civil Wars* has the potential to transform the reputation of this relatively underappreciated historian. The only extant continuous historical narrative of the years 133 - 35 BC, the *Civil Wars* is indisputably one of the most valuable sources for the history of the late Republic and thus well-known to all who work on that period. Cited more often than read, however, Appian has suffered from the fact that Horace White's 1913 Loeb has long been the only available English translation. This, coupled with the general feeling that he was a second-rate historian, has caused him to be little read outside of scholarly circles. While Herodotus, Thucydides, Livy and Tacitus have been translated into English many times over, Appian has simply not been deemed worthy of such attention.

But times have of course changed, and with them our appreciation of the fact that the value of an ancient historical text need not lie solely in the author's supposed trustworthiness or in the sources he used. In recent years Appian has experienced a significant rehabilitation, the effects of which are readily apparent in Carter's extensive, useful discussion of the historian and his work in the Introduction. In addition to assessing Appian's merits as a writer and historian, Carter fully explains the organization of the *Roman History* as a whole, the place of the *Civil Wars* in its scheme, and the structure and content of the *Civil Wars* itself. Particularly valuable is the treatment of Appian's place in the ancient historiographical tradition, the distinctive features of the narrative, and the source question. Nearly fifty pages of notes accompany the translation which concentrate primarily on historical and prosopographical matters. Also included is an Appendix containing informative surveys of several topics crucial to an understanding of the late Republic, such as the nature of the Roman assemblies and the army. In all of this Carter demonstrates a solid command of his subject. For those who want more, a Bibliographical Note provides ample guidance. In short, this book could well serve as not only an excellent introduction to Appian but a superb primer on the last century of the Roman Republic as well.

As for the translation, Carter has produced a version that is both eminently readable and faithful to Appian's Greek. Writing in the second century AD at the height of the atticizing movement, though hardly seduced by it, Appian employs a comparatively straightforward and unadorned style. But it does not on that account lack power, and there are occasions when he is capable of conveying unusual insight in compelling prose. White's transla-

tion does not necessarily obscure this, but first published in 1889, it now shows its age. Carter's rendition, moreover, apart from making Appian more accessible and palatable to the English reader, is based on a fresh evaluation of Viereck's 1905 Teubner and therefore corrects some of White's occasional inaccuracies. One example, drawn from Appian's narrative of the initial implementation of the proscription in December of 43 (*Civ.* 4.13), will suffice to indicate how Carter improves on his predecessor:

Straightway, throughout city and country, wherever each one happened to be found, there were sudden arrests and murder in various forms, decapitations for the sake of rewards when the head should be shown, and undignified flights in disguises which strangely contrasted with former splendour. Some descended into wells, others into filthy sewers. Some took refuge in chimneys. Others crouched in the deepest silence under the thickly-packed tiles of the roofs. For some were not less fearful of their wives and ill-disposed children than of the murderers, while others feared their freedmen and their slaves; creditors feared their debtors and neighbours feared neighbours who coveted lands. There was a sudden outburst of previously smouldering hates and a shocking change in the condition of senators, consulars, praetors tribunes...who threw themselves with lamentations at the feet of their own slaves, giving to the servant the character of saviour and master. (trans. White)

Many sudden arrests immediately ensued, both in the countryside and in Rome, wherever anyone happened to be caught; people were also murdered in all kinds of ways, and decapitated to furnish evidence for the reward. They fled in undignified fashion, and abandoned their former conspicuous dress for strange disguises. Some went down wells, some descended into the filth of the sewers, and others climbed up into the smoky rafters or sat in total silence under close-packed roof tiles. To some, just as terrifying as the executioners were wives or children with whom they were not on good terms, or ex-slaves and slaves, or creditors, or neighbouring landowners who coveted their estates. All at once there broke out all the resentment which had long been festering in secret. A shocking change occurred in the behaviour of senators, whether consuls, praetors or tribunes...who threw themselves moaning at the feet of their own slaves and called their domestics 'lord' and 'saviour'. (trans. Carter)

Quite apart from the fact that it reads better, Carter's translation really is more accurate (cf., e.g., Carter's 'smoky rafters' vs. White's 'chimneys'). It further captures one of Appian's strengths, his ability to evoke a sense of pathos in narrating details of the late Republican conflicts. He makes mistakes, to be sure, but he can seldom be accused of either disinterest in his subject or excessively rhetorical treatment.

In sum, this is a most welcome addition to a series that has given us (among many others) fine translations of Cassius Dio's Augustan books (by Ian Scott-Kilvert in collaboration with Carter) and Polybius (albeit abridged, and also by Scott-Kilvert). Among the advantages of these translations, of course, is that they make available to those who teach Roman history fundamental, primary texts in an affordable fashion. In the case of Carter's Appian, however, students and scholars will have much more than simply a serviceable translation.

But the *Civil Wars* is only one component of a much broader project, a history of the events and processes that gave rise to the Roman Empire. Thus the first half of Appian's *Roman History*, an account of Rome's foreign conquests organized ethnographically, is meant to complement the second half, the *Civil Wars*, in order to complete the picture. Written from the vantage point of an Alexandrian Greek who spent much of his career at Rome, this history provides an interesting and often unique perspective on Roman history from its beginnings down to the onset of the Augustan principate. As with the *Civil Wars*, there is much here that is invaluable and unparalleled (e.g., the *Mithridatica*). While perhaps not much is lost by reading the *Civil Wars* in isolation from the rest of the *Roman History*, one does forfeit an appreciation for the scope and ambition of the work as a whole. For that reason one can only hope that the editors at Penguin will see fit to commission a translation of Appian's *Foreign Wars* by a scholar of the same caliber as Carter.

University of Washington

ALAIN M. GOWING

(Note: John Carter died under particularly tragic circumstances in February of 1997.)

Tacitus: *The Histories*, translated W.H. Fyfe, revised and edited D.S. Levene (World's Classics). Pp. xlix + 310. Oxford University Press, 1997. £8.99.

In the dedication to his translation of Tacitus' *Histories* (Oxford 1912), W.H. Fyfe quotes Sir Henry Savile (1591): 'If thy stomacke be so tender as thou canst not digest Tacitus in his owne stile, thou art beholding to one who gives thee the same food, but with a pleasant and easie taste'. This might imply that F.'s translation is bland, which it is not. F.'s English is pithy, but clear. D.S. Levene has done a great service in making this translation accessible to a contemporary audience and more accurate too (e.g. 'tres et viginti' (1.27.2): (F.) 'thirty-three', (L.) 'twenty-three'). L. notes wryly that an English

edition which sought to capture every nuance of Tacitus' idiosyncratic style would be virtually unreadable (xxiii). Yet F. does much to mirror Tacitus' style and to avoid creating sentences which collapse under their own weight: simplicity and brevity are the chief criteria. Comparison with K. Wellesley's translation (Penguin 1993) is illuminating.

'ceteri crura brachiaque (nam pectus tegebatur) foede laniavere; pleraque vulnera feritate et saevitia trunco iam corpori adiecta' (1.41.3):

(W.) 'The rest of them, with revolting butchery, hacked at his legs and arms, as these (unlike his body) were not protected by armour. These sadistic monsters even inflicted a number of wounds on the already truncated corpse'

(F.) 'The others foully mangled his arms and legs (his breast was protected) and with bestial savagery continued to stab the headless corpse',

(L.) 'The others foully mutilated his arms and legs (his breast was protected) and with bestial savagery continued to stab the headless corpse'.

'in multa conluvione rerum maioribus flagitiis permixtos' (2.16.3):

(W.) 'In the world-wide upheaval of the time they were inextricably lost amid greater enormities',

(F.) 'In the general confusion their deed was overshadowed by more heinous crimes',

(L.) 'In the vast cesspool of the age their deed was overshadowed by more heinous crimes'.

'multos in moenia egressos pugionibus fodere' (4.29.3):

(W.) 'Many attackers surmounted the wall, but were stabbed by the Roman dirks',

(F. and L.) 'Many appeared on top of the walls, and these they stabbed with their short swords'.

Tacitus famously refused to call a spade a spade, but this should never force translators to bury meaning in verbosity. Since the publication of P. Plass, *Wit and the Writing of History* (Wisconsin 1988), scholars have become more sensitive about how Tacitus' language exposes the moral and political absurdity of the principate. L.'s clear translation (particularly of Tacitus' epigrams) reflects this heightened awareness, but sometimes he could go further. So at *Histories* 1.1.2-4, L. replaces the second-person singular verbs ('averseris', 'velis', 'sentias') with third-person generalisations, which homogenises Tacitus' narrative voice. Perhaps this does not matter, but Tacitus is in the process of establishing a rapport with his ideal reader: the third-

person verbs make him seem aloof (cf. P. Sinclair, *Tacitus the Sententious Historian* (University Park Pa. 1995) 50-6).

R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958) 348, says of the *Annals*: 'The style abounds in violent metaphors, drawing imagery from light and dark, rapid movement, growth and decay, destruction and conflagration'. Such language also characterises the *Histories*, albeit less pervasively. Yet if a translator strips Tacitean Latin of its metaphorical qualities, the language is disarmed and weakened. Generally, L. preserves metaphorical language where W. is more cautious. 'veritas ...infracta' (1.1.1): (W. and F.) 'Truth suffered', (L.) 'Truth was shattered', and 'ardentibus patrum animis' (4.43.1): (W.) 'amid the eager approbation of the senators' and (F. and L.) '...the House was warming to this rhetoric'. Occasionally, L. overplays the metaphorical quality of the Latin. 'scelus exprobrans' (1.43.1): (W.) 'denounced their mutiny', (F. and L.) 'flinging their treason in their teeth' (cf. 1.37.5 and 4.85.1). Certainly, Lewis and Short offer 'to cast in the teeth' as a translation of *exprobro*, but the *OLD* restricts itself to 'I bring up as a reproach' (cf. *TLL* 5.2, 1802). L.'s version sounds archaic. Another example is 'custodire sermones' (2.52.1): (W.) 'they spied on their conversation', (F. and L.) 'they treasured up their conversation'. Momentarily, clarity is lost. L. pledges to modernise F.'s English (xxiii), which he often does (e.g. 'vernacula urbanitas' (2.88.2): (F.) 'a cockney joke', (L.) 'a cheap practical joke'). Yet some oddities remain.

What greatly enhances L.'s edition are the new introduction and end-notes, which should prove invaluable to a first-time reader of Tacitus. The introduction contains five useful sections (Tacitus the Historian, The Background, Sources and Methods, Understanding Tacitus, Germans and Jews) followed by three explanatory notes (The Imperial Roman State, Roman Names, The Text). There is also a select bibliography, a chronological table (AD54-117) and four maps, accompanied by a glossary of place-names (293). The text itself is clearly laid out. Each chapter-number is conveniently indented and end-notes are marked by an asterisk. Where the manuscript breaks off at *Histories* 5.26, L. has supplied a satisfying synopsis of what happens to the main protagonists (cf. F.: 'The rest is lost!'). Finally, the book's cover is illustrated with a lavish detail from *The Capture of Jerusalem by Titus* (1638/9) by Nicolas Poussin.

In the introduction, L. carefully explains points which the non-classicist might find puzzling, such as the convention that speeches in a historical work often diverge from what was really said (x). Helpfully, L. puts this feature into context by citing well-chosen examples from the *Histories*. L. is inevitably selective about what to include in the introduction. Discussion of the parallel accounts (Dio, Plutarch, Suetonius, Josephus) is reserved for the end-notes, which is sensible. Likewise, L. elaborates the historiographical background largely in the end-notes, which is less satisfactory. L. does refer

to Sallust and Livy in the introduction (xi), in order to explain that Tacitus models entire episodes upon his predecessors. Yet although L. cites as an example *Histories* 4.68ff (4.58, 4.62 and 4.72 would be more helpful), he does not elucidate which Livian scene is evoked and why (cf. E. Keitel, 'The Function of the Livian Reminiscences at Tacitus *Histories* 4.58.6 and 62', *CJ* 87 (1992) 327-37). Although the end-notes rectify this up to a point, this unelaborated reference in the introduction is tantalising.

Generally, more attention to rhetoric and historical topoi would be welcome. Several comments could be expanded along these lines. Firstly, L. refers to Vinius (xiii-xiv), cast by Tacitus as a likely conspirator (1.42), who paradoxically offers Galba potentially life-saving advice (1.32-4). L. highlights the difficulty of reconciling these two conflicting impressions of Vinius. Yet the flawed character who unexpectedly says the right thing recurs in ancient historiography (cf. Antonius Primus at *Histories* 3.2, Eprius Marcellus at *Histories* 4.8) and Vinius, 'deterrimus mortalium' (1.6.1), fits this type. Secondly, L. notes that Tacitean battle-scenes 'usually fit the known features of the landscape closely' (xi). Sometimes this is true (as at *Histories* 4.71), but the first battle of Bedriacum is particularly problematic (see L.'s note on 263). On Map 3 (xlvi-xlvii), Bedriacum, the site of two battles in the *Histories*, is indicated with a question-mark, which conflicts with L.'s generalisation about topography. Perhaps the more pertinent issue for a new reader is why these ancient historians could modify their battle-descriptions with inaccurate details and get away with it. L.'s perceptive analysis of Germans and Jews (xvii-xxii) is illuminating precisely because it sets both portraits in a wider rhetorical and historiographical context. L. argues that Tacitus interlocks the portraits of the Jews, Germans and Romans so as to present a series of questions about the categories of foreigner and Roman. This synthesised overview is particularly helpful with the Jewish 'digression' in *Histories* 5, which is often examined in isolation and provokes sharp criticism of Tacitus' calibre as a writer.

To conclude, L.'s edition should be welcomed both by those with and (increasingly) without Latin. His introduction and end-notes combine powerfully to enhance a reader's enjoyment and understanding of the *Histories*. L. notes that 'the best a translator can do in practice is to give some sense of the biting and lapidary quality of the original, without sacrificing intelligibility' (xxiii). Translation is a balancing-act at the best of times, but L., building on F.'s groundwork, negotiates his task adeptly.

Beda Venerabilis: Historian, Monk and Northumbrian. Edited by L. A. J. R. Houwen and A. A. MacDonald. Pp. ix + 179. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1996. ISBN 906 980 0926

This book contains eight papers, five of which were given to a conference at the University of Groningen in 1990, the remainder being new essays. On the one hand a collection of papers on Bede emanating from a university in the Netherlands is warmly to be welcomed, on the other, there has in recent years been a mass of scholarship published on this writer, so that the appearance of yet more requires justification.

In the case of this book, the papers are not an especially distinguished collection, and nor do they show any real coherence between each other. Three papers concern Bede as historian. Jan Davidse opens the volume with an attempt to apply the concepts of modern historiographical study to Bede, but the attempt is not a productive one, and Davidse does not deal with the most important recent commentaries on Bede's writings and purposes. A.T. Thacker gives a characteristically lucid and learned account of Bede's treatment of the Irish, but really adds little that is new to previous perceptions. Michael Allen is perhaps the most interesting of the three with his treatment of Bede and Frechulf at St Gallen, a treatment which, whereas it would clearly merit further development, is rather disappointing in the conclusions it actually reaches. Only one paper, that of Karl Lutterkort on Bede's miracle stories, considers Bede as hagiographer, and the exposition, although clear, makes little real progress. Two further papers, respectively by B.A. Blokhuis and A.M. Jansen, concern later treatment of Bede's work on Cuthbert (by Aelfric) and the development of the Oswald legends on the continent. Dan O'Donnell offers a very technical paper on a Northumbrian version of Caedmon's Hymn in a Brussels manuscript, which is a valuable contribution but sits uneasily with the more discursive papers, resembling only Blokhuis's in tone. The best paper in the volume is in this reviewer's opinion J.E. Cross's study of Bede's influence, where the author deals with the impact of Bede's writings on homilies and martyrologies. The paper goes best with Allen's on St Gallen, and points the way to a rich field of study of Bede's work which is peculiarly suited to be conducted in a continental context.

University of Durham

DAVID ROLLASON

Caesar *The Gallic Wars*. Translated with an introduction and notes by Carolyn Hammond (Oxford World's Classics.) Oxford, 1996. Paper. £6.50. ISBN 0 19 283120-8

It is pleasing to see a new English translation of Caesar's *Commentarii* of the Gallic Wars available at an affordable price. Those who wish to teach or read Caesar's work in translation will find Hammond's translation very useful. The introduction and the notes which accompany this translation are not quite of the same quality but, taken as a whole, the clarity and accessibility of the production more than justifies its existence.

The general format of this edition of Caesar is part of its strength. The text is clearly divided into the traditional books and chapters and the print is of reasonable size. Hammond omits Q. Metellus Scipio from the consular title for 52, leaving the reader to believe Pompey was sole consul for the entire year, but this is the only flaw in a series of restrained and helpful headings at the beginning of each book. In contrast with the Penguin edition's reprehensible omission of the preface of Book 8, not only its inclusion but the clear references to Hirtius as continuator here and elsewhere is a welcome change. The maps are simple and uncluttered, though one notes the use of only Latin names for rivers in the main map (fig. 1) when Hammond employs French names in the text, and some problems deciding which, if any, scale to use (miles, Roman miles and, in one case, kilometres are used in different maps). The timeline is useful but the glossary might have been more helpful had it included the terminology used for weapons and military devices as well as people. As it is, it doubles for the index.

The translation is clear, accessible, readable and as faithful to the text as one might reasonably expect. On some occasions, Hammond surpasses (in my opinion) the currently available translations, sometimes in small details (such as capturing the impudence of P. Crassus' actions at 3.21), sometimes in a broader style and understanding (for example in the drama of the contest in courage of Caesar's centurions, Pulio and Vorenus, at 5.44, or, more importantly, in preserving some of the jerky changes of subject (attempts at snowing the public???) brought about by Caesar's use of the ablative absolute, as at 5.4-5. I must object, however, to the translation of *P. Crassus adulescens* as 'a young man called Publius Crassus' at 1.52. P. Crassus was very well known in Rome, even more so if, as Hammond believes, the work was produced in 50 BC after his tragic death at Carrhae and the marriage of Pompey to his widow and not in 56 when he was Caesar's prefect. In this context, the epithet *adulescens* surely has more to do with non-senatorial rank than a need to introduce a *nobilis*, whatever its proper translation might be in other circumstances. She could perhaps have employed a more Roman-

sounding opening to the Letter to Balbus at the beginning of Book 8. 'Dear Balbus' is certainly less formal than the studied grace of Hirtius' effort. That aside, Hammond usually employs Roman terms for the various ranks in the Roman army (legate, centurion) rather than meaningless equivalents from a modern military situation, is sensitive to Caesar's use of direct speech and indirect speech and generally achieves the rapid pace which Caesar uses to catch his reader up in the excitement and pathos of war. Only occasionally does the density and craft of Caesar's Latin defeat her, such as the introduction of Vercingetorix at 7.4, but the resulting translation of this passage is still creditable, if lesser than the original.

What difficulties I have with this edition lie with the introduction, the notes and the bibliography. The introduction is divided into five sections: Caesar's career (including a potted history of late Republican Rome); Caesar's army; Caesar's targets (not his audience but his enemies); Caesar's writings and Caesar's influence (a discussion of his reputation in later ages). It is obviously difficult to cover such a variety of complex material in a few pages (under 43) and perhaps Hammond should have attempted less. It must be said that writing an introduction and notes to a work such as Caesar's and a period such as late Republican Rome is no easy task. No-one else writes the introduction one would have written oneself and no two people will approach the text in the same way. On the other hand, there are places, especially in the sections on Caesar's career and his writings, where I think Hammond might have better demonstrated to the beginner (for such I see is the purpose of such an introduction) the problems and issues of Caesar's career and the history of first century BC Rome.

Hammond's difficulties, as I see them, spring from her view that the books were produced in 50 BC and reflect Caesar's need to win favourable publicity in his approaching (and inevitable) fight with Pompey. Thus her thinking is dominated by the events of second civil war and its outbreak in 49 BC. The introduction to Caesar's career, therefore, offers a general history, mentioning the Gracchi and 'popularis' politics, the splendid career of Pompey, and some of the main events of Caesar's career. What it leaves out is any discussion of the Social War of 91-89 and the Civil War of 88-81 and subsequent political struggles in the seventies and sixties BC. In omitting any discussion of these events, though they are recorded in the timeline, the reader is left without the information that the younger life of Caesar and his contemporaries was scarred by civil strife, and that Pompey (with his 'splendid career') benefited because he was Sulla's protege and Caesar, loyal (mostly) to his Marian and Cinnan connections, did not. There is no mention of the fact that Caesar at one stage had to leave Rome in a hurry for his health, that he suffered capture by pirates, and refused to divorce his wife who was closely connected to the losing side. Neither is the reader made

aware of Caesar's allegiance to Marius, even though the ghost of Marius is an important element in the text. I suspect that the audience principally targeted by this series could have gained more from a knowledge of Caesar's immediate background than from an abbreviated history of the late Republic where too much complex material has a good chance of confusing the reader.

One gains the feeling that this section of the introduction was written many times and cut back and back to fit a format. Evidence of this appears on p. xvii where in a paragraph which could only have been produced by a word-processor jumble, Caesar is both proconsul and proprætor in Spain in 61 BC and no reader could understand what really was going on without prior knowledge. For someone who commands a graceful and clear style in the body of the actual translation, such glitches are a pity.

Hammond is firmly convinced that the work was produced in 50 and as a whole. Only in a brief reference does she allude to a scholarly debate on this topic, a debate in which, I should say, I take an entirely opposite view. It is to Hammond's credit that she does not usually let this view subvert her translation. It does, however, colour some of her notes. She suggests that the two references to Pompey (at 6.1 and 7.6) contain irony, that Caesar took the opportunity to point out how Pompey had let him down or to slight his success. In both cases, the irony is not readily evident in the Latin and must be (and is) read in by the translator. The reference to Pompey at 7.6 is the most blatant. Caesar, relieved from the need to return to Rome as the revolt of Gaul erupts, points out that this is unnecessary because the state had been brought into a tidier condition *uirtute Cn. Pompei*. Hammond's note reads (p. 237): 'a deliberate irony, with Caesar writing in late 50, maintaining the fiction of reliance on Pompey's friendship.' *Virtus* is a popular word with Caesar (70 instances of the word in the eight books of *BG* alone). In no other case does he use it ironically, whether he refers to Gauls he is just about to conquer, his soldiers or selected individuals. Hammond is certainly right to translate it differently here from the usual 'bravery' or 'courage' which she uses as interchangeable terms in nearly every other occurrence. She chooses 'thanks to the resolution of Gnaeus Pompey' to translate the phrase. Yet, the passage might be as easily read as a compliment gone overboard ('excellence', 'merit' or 'personal talents' for 'resolution?') than irony. The relationship between Caesar and Pompey was complex, involving tortuous attempts at backroom diplomacy mixed with public professions of admiration and support even after the war broke out. Hammond should have alerted her readers to some of these complexities, or, if that were too hard, leave the text to stand on its own, as she wisely does concerning many others famous passages.

Some points in the text might have been elaborated at greater length in the notes. Both Caesar's reliance on Labienus and Hirtius' portrayal of him as an oathbreaker might have elicited some comment in the light of his desertion of Caesar in early 49. Little is said anywhere of Labienus beyond a note at 1.21 and a reference in the glossary (under ATIUS Labienus, which neither Pauly-Wissowa nor T.R.S. Broughton list as his nomen). A reference to the Parthian war, containing no information about Crassus or his dreadful defeat, is somewhat bare. However, it must be said of notes as of introductions that there will always be room for individual interpretation and on the whole Hammond keeps her explanatory notes to a minimum, and on the whole I agree with this policy.

My last criticism is reserved for the bibliography provided on pp. xliv-xlvi. Hammond expects a very high standard from her readers. Most of the titles are in German or French, surely inaccessible to the type of reader for whom the work is intended. Even some of the authors writing in English would have the effect of plunging the beginner or the person of general rather than academic interest into the (very) deep end. This need not have been the case. Instead of (or alongside) P.A. Brunt's detailed *Fall of the Roman Republic*, Oxford, 1988, there might have appeared his *Social Conflicts in the Roman Republic*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1971, D.C. Earl's useful, if dated, *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1967, as well as some of the many biographies of Cicero and Pompey. Some of the works by T.P. Wiseman might have been included, and among those long scholarly tomes there should have appeared E.S. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, CUP, Berkeley, 1974 and Z. Yavetz, *Julius Caesar and his Public Image*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1988, both of which, whatever difficulties they might present, are in English and are seminal works for the issues at hand. Some space might have been given to alerting the reader to the many other ancient sources in translation dealing with this period: Plutarch's and Suetonius' biographies, Cicero's correspondence, Dio and Appian's histories to name the most obvious. The bibliography as it stands does more to reveal Hammond's interests than to assist the reader to discover both the work and the period in more detail.

These criticisms ought to be set within the context of the intention and achievement of the enterprise. This is to provide an accessible, accurate translation of Caesar's most famous work. In this, Hammond has succeeded admirably. Her attention to detail and her clear and readable prose, added to World Classics' user-friendly format deserve thanks from all those with a need or desire for an English text of Caesar's (and Hirtius') account of his activities in Gaul. For the most part, the notes are simple and informative, and apart from my criticisms of some parts of the introduction, this does contain useful information on Caesar's army, the peoples he devastated and

his later reputation. Debates about the text and its purpose will go on. In the meantime, more readers will find Caesar's account of the Gallic War more easily accessible.

University of Sydney

KATHRYN E. WELCH

Plutarch and his Intellectual World. Edited by J. Mossman. Pp. xii + 249. London: Duckworth, 1997

This aptly titled volume contains thirteen essays, most of which originated at a conference of the International Plutarch Society held at Trinity College in Dublin in 1994 and all of which have a connection with one or another aspect of Plutarch's variegated writings. By now it is generally recognized that Plutarch is an author of major importance, so neither explanation nor apology need be offered for the present collection. And the papers in this volume are nearly all of them very good, even when --- in some instances, especially when --- they invite disagreement. The result is an undeniable success for the editor and her collaborators.

A better start than Ewen Bowie is difficult to imagine. His contribution poses the question: did Favorinus introduce Plutarch to Hadrian? The short answer is that, given the condition of the evidence, it remains impossible to say. But that is hardly the point of this paper, which is a learned and charming disquisition on sundry dimensions of Favorinus' career. Some of it is necessarily speculative, as when Bowie, in discussing the dedicatee of the second book of Favorinus' *On Cognitive Impression*, rejects Barigazzi's plausible emendation of the variants 'Dryson' and 'Dyson' to 'Bryson' (the name of Pyrrho's teacher) in favor of 'Rouso', that is, P. Calvisius Tullus Ruso (cos. 109), largely because Syme conjectured that this man was dead by 120, a supposition that allows Bowie to date the work more or less exactly when he wants it to be dated (just after the emperor's accession). Now of course Calvisius was eminent enough to merit a dedication from Favorinus, else Bowie would not have introduced him into the discussion, but the entire argument strikes me as at once so clever and so far-fetched that, were I an Englishman, I should have to describe it as 'ingenious'. Far more valuable is Bowie's absolutely convincing demolition of Cassius Dio's representation of Hadrian as hostile to rival intellectuals (in particular: to Favorinus, to Dionysius of Miletus, and to Apollodorus of Damascus).

Two philosophical essays follow. J. Opsomer seeks to recover the epistemology of Favorinus, largely on the basis of Galen's criticisms of it (which Opsomer, unfortunately, tends to distrust whenever they fail to conform to his general thesis); the predictable result is that Favorinus emerges as espous-

ing an Academic scepticism not unlike the position scholars have regularly discerned in Plutarch's writings. Not that there has been unrestricted agreement on the part of everyone as to Plutarch's exact philosophical stance in every particular composition, and G. Boys-Stones makes a case for softening the common representation of Plutarch's scepticism in *De Stoicorum Repugnantibus*, which scholars ordinarily characterize as being quite strictly Carneadean. In Boys-Stones' opinion, one must not overlook the positive aspect of the essay: Plutarch finds contradictions in the Stoics 'just where, and so by implication just because, they diverge from Plato' (p. 52), thus, 'in a positive, if subtle, way' (p. 54), Plutarch is promoting Platonism. His style of argumentation should not overwhelm its purpose.

From philosophy to more practical affairs. In an admittedly inchoative study of Plutarch's appreciation of the role of the family in character formation, F. Albinus makes the point that the *Lives* lay greater stress on upbringing than has heretofore been recognized. Building on an article by L. Salvioni, Albinus concentrates on the problem of fatherless heroes: they tend to turn against their fatherland (though Demosthenes violates the pattern), nor does adoption do much to improve matters, as the case of Cato Minor and his sisters is felt to show: reared by their strict uncle, Livius Drusus (not deemed a good role model by Albinus), the sisters grew into women of less than perfect virtue, while Cato remained 'incapable of developing a healthy married life' (p. 66). Albinus makes no reference to the demographic realities that made early fatherlessness a far from uncommon circumstance in Greco-Roman antiquity (cf. R. P. Saller, *Patriarchy, property and death in the Roman family* [Cambridge, 1994], 9ff.), so it must remain unclear whether she believes Plutarch considered the 'balanced atmosphere of the natural father and mother' (p. 66) to be normal as well as normative.

One of the most intriguing essays in the collection is K. Blomqvist's on women in politics in Plutarch. Space forbids an adequate appreciation or critique (her paper is too ambitious to avoid criticism: for instance, scant attention is paid to the narratological function of women in the *Lives* as foils to their masculine subjects). Blomqvist attempts to isolate the various types of political women whom Plutarch writes; the analysis is, for the most part, highly nuanced, though Blomqvist's proposal that Plotina lurks in the background of Plutarch's portrayal of repugnant women is a startling lapse from her regular sophistication. The ideal for *all* women, so Blomqvist concludes, is that of the virtuous Roman *matrona*, a claim that demands further consideration (and would benefit from some consideration of the important essay by S. Fischler, 'Social Stereotypes and Historical Analysis: The Case of Imperial Women at Rome', in L. J. Archer et al. (eds.), *Women in Ancient Societies* [New York, 1994], 115-34). Donald Russell provides a close reading of Plutarch's depiction of his younger self discoursing on love in the *Amatorius*.

And love --- heterosexual love --- is likewise the theme of J. Mossman's examination of the *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men*, a superb account of the delicacies of wit and structure that garnish that dialogue. It will be a matter of taste whether she has completely salvaged the *Dinner* from Wilamowitz's searing criticisms, but her reading of the piece must now be regarded as the fundamental analysis.

The stuff of the *Lives* comes under scrutiny in four essays. J. Moles reviews the status of Brutus' Greek and Latin letters and their value as sources for the *Lives*. Plutarch explicitly questions the authenticity of *some* of the Greek letters (*Brut.* 53. 5-7); by resorting to a complicated and subtle (perhaps overly-subtle) reading of the *Brutus* (esp. 2. 5-8), Moles rejects the authenticity of *all* the Greek letters. He may well be right to do so, but the *Brutus* cannot really be considered incontestable evidence on this point. Moles is absolutely correct, however, to argue for the authenticity of the Latin letters: he demolishes the case against them and demonstrates how unsatisfactory it is to rely on connoisseurship and *ex cathedra* pronouncements in adjudicating such issues. Indeed, Moles' whole treatment of the Latin letters is nothing short of magisterial, and it really ought to become required reading for students who will have to cope with documents the authenticity of which has been impeached. T. Duff, elaborating an earlier study by P. Stadter on ambiguity in the *Lysander-Sulla*, argues for more powerful contrarities in their ethical delineation: on Duff's reading of the Life, Plutarch endeavors to problematize the moral status of his heroes. As Duff makes clear, the *Lysander-Sulla* yields no simple or unambiguous moral judgments. What to make of Plutarch's complexity here, however, remains puzzling. R. Ash maintains that Plutarch's *Galba* and *Otho* are unconventional biographies, structurally acephalous, in order to reflect the 'headlessness' of civil war. I must say that I find it difficult to say anything very definite about the typical shape of Plutarch's *Lives of the Caesars* for the obvious reason that all save two of them are lost, nor am I so impressed as is Ash by the symbolism of decapitation in these texts. Nevertheless, good observations on Plutarch's deployment of Bacchic imagery to depict collective passion distinguish this contribution. And, finally, C. Pelling demonstrates how Plutarch, by introducing a supernatural level to his narrative, is able to import suspense --- as well as a thought-provoking element --- to his account of Caesar's (all too well-known) assassination.

Two short essays remain for comment. In four pages, L. Senzasono says nothing very helpful about *De Tuenda Sanitate Praecepta*. And J. Dillon makes the assertion that Plutarch, like F. Fukuyama, possesses a notion of 'the end of History'. For Fukuyama, the end came with the inexorable triumph of liberal democracy; for Plutarch, with the empire, which was for him the ultimately rational form of government. This is a fascinating start, though Dil-

lon's essay is as concise as it is suggestive. Were he to give the thesis more consideration, others might as well.

In sum, then, a worthy collection of essays. I spotted few misprints, though Maud Gleason's name is twice misspelt on p. 12. There is an index of passages and a general index. There is no general bibliography, however. Let me close with a plea concerning methodology. Plutarch, owing to the enormity and range of his writing, is more susceptible than most to an exegesis that involves assembling numerous snippets from various compositions. Under such circumstances, it becomes all too easy to overlook the whole of the original context when these snippets are deployed. For instance, *Dem.* 3. 2 is no proof that 'originality of the individual is likely to have a divine provenance', as p. 61 claims by removing Plutarch's image from its rhetorical setting; *Amat.* 756E-F is misappropriated on p. 76 (see Russell on p. 101 for its full and fair context); nor does *Ad Princ. Inerud.* 780E indicate that Plutarch 'certainly .. held that the monarch is the image (*eikon*) of God on earth' (p. 234), since the full passage in Plutarch's essay describes an ideal and is admonitory.

Florida State University

W. JEFFREY TATUM

David Braund: *Ruling Roman Britain: kings, queens, governors and emperors from Julius Caesar to Agricola*. Pp. 217, Illus. 34. Routledge, London and New York, 1996. £40.00.

There are many books available which discuss Roman Britain but few which have very much that is new to say. This book is one of the few and provides a variety of interesting new insights into the history of the province.

To understand the historiography of Roman Britain it is important to appreciate that it has several strands, two of which are currently dominant. Traditional histories (best exemplified by Frere's *Britannia*) have been based on attempts to write narrative history from the textual sources, supplementing these with information from archaeological sources. Such attempts draw principally upon the excavation of military and urban sites where the evidence has most relevance to the history of events. They tend to provide a straightforwardly Romano-centric view with an emphasis on military history and short term events and are primarily the product of authors educated in the Classics. In the last couple of decades those (like this reviewer) who have come to the subject through the archaeology of the 1960s and 70s have tried to write different types of history based primarily upon an analysis of excavated evidence from a variety of sites but with a principal emphasis on those

away from the frontiers. They place less reliance on literary sources, instead preferring to draw on interpretative models drawn from the social sciences to examine broader long-term social and economic trends.

In recent years these two strands have tended to diverge and much debate amongst the current generation of research students has concerned problems like the character of Roman imperialism and issues of ethnicity and gender. However, there has been little evidence that those specializing in the study of archaeological material from Roman Britain have been fully aware of the exciting and relevant new work on the contextual study of Classical texts. As a result, traditional scholars have continued to read the sources as the unproblematic raw materials of history, while many working on archaeological material have remained largely uninterested in the texts.

David Braund's new book provides an important and complementary new perspective, bringing to bear contemporary approaches from the mainstream of Classical research, looking at the literary sources within their appropriate historical and cultural context and attempting to understand them on their own terms. In doing this he draws on a wide range of information from across the Graeco-Roman world. His approach thus attempts to explain not only how and why Rome became involved in Britain, but how the changing character of Rome's interests determined the nature of the sources with which we are left. Such studies have become common in other branches of Classical research and Braund has done a fine job in presenting his ideas in an accessible way and in a new context.

His overall approach is extremely successful and produces a book which should be read by all with a serious interest in the study of Roman Britain. It complements the current archaeological accounts and provides an important corrective both to those who have ignored the texts and those who have used them without any thought of the people and processes which produced them.

Braund's text is concerned only with the period down to Trajan and explores three principal themes: imperialism, geography and monarchy. I found all three fascinating and generally finely interwoven. There is some unevenness; the discussion of monarchy in the second chapter might have been better integrated elsewhere as it tends to break the flow of the text. Equally, the useful and sober comments on coins and dynasts (chapter 5) seemed a little out of place on their own in a separate chapter. There are also one or two points of detail which perhaps deserve reconsideration. For instance the archaeological dating evidence for the quadrifrons arch at Richborough is not sufficiently precise to allow it to be dated to AD 87-88 (p. 173), whilst its height was probably not as much as 100 ft/30m (cf. D. E. Strong in *Richborough V* [1968] 47, where it is given a broad date range of AD 80-90 and a reconstructed height of 86 ft/26m). Equally, in a few places

points are presented too briefly to allow full assessment. Thus, the discussion of Cogidubnus' citizenship (p. 110) suggests that he was probably a Roman placeman under Claudius rather than a son or grandson of Tincommius or Verica, because both 'should have been Julii'. This is certainly a sustainable position but hardly one which is unproblematic. Did they necessarily obtain citizenship from Augustus? If they did, were they sufficiently Romanized to have known to pass it on to their heirs? What assumptions would have been made in their society about the status of those who claimed filial descent from a 'king' or who obtained power through acclamation? We surely know too little about the character of Iron Age society to make assumptions on the basis of analogy alone, especially as our information points towards social organization being highly variable. Here and elsewhere a little more debate of such issues would have been valuable and would have lessened the danger of implicit assumptions developing into new 'factoids'.

Despite these points the text works well and draws attention to Braund's important ideas about the place of Britain within the Empire. In particular, his emphasis on the relationship of the texts to the changing priorities and perspectives of the Imperial House sheds valuable new light on the development of Rome's involvement in Britain. His valuable discussions of Strabo and Cassius Dio demonstrate how they have been misunderstood in the past whilst his comparison of the different accounts of the Boudiccan revolt casts new light on the character of that event. In this sense Braund may be seen to have given new life to the subject. My only real objection is that, like the course of lectures on Roman Britain I attended as an undergraduate, it stops too early! Could we not have these ideas developed on the second, third, fourth and fifth centuries?

University of Durham

MARTIN MILLETT

Norma Thompson, *Herodotus and the origins of the political community: Arion's Leap*. Pp. xiv + 193. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996). ISBN 0300 06260 5

In Michael Ondaatje's *The English Patient*, the central character, the Englishman, has a copy of G. C. MacCauley's 1890 translation of Herodotus' *History* which serves a number of purposes. It is a valuable source of information for him in his exploration of the Egyptian desert in search of the lost Oasis of Zerezura in the 1930s; it acts as a commonplace book, as the Englishman pastes in pages cut from other books and adds his own observations; and when Katharine Clinton reads from it the story of Gyges and Candau-

les' wife (1.8-12), it sets in motion the chain of events which drives the whole novel. For the English patient, Herodotus' *History* belongs to the present: it describes the world in which he is living, not the ancient past.

Herodotus has a similar importance for Norma Thompson, but for her the key story is not that of Gyges and Candaules' wife, but of Arion and the dolphin (1.23-24). The last paragraph of her 'Afterword' reads: 'The task then is to fulfil the human vocation, to create history through art and to form community by means of that perception. To be human is to engage history, for history is all we have. What we make of it will shape a common destiny. If shaped well, the community may thrive; if not, it may crumble when out of its element, or confronted with crisis. Arion's story stirs us towards courage, creativity, and a readiness to leap into an unknown future' (p. 167). The story of Arion is only introduced at the very end of the book, but it can be argued that Thompson sees it as an allegory of the role of Herodotus' *History* operating at many levels. In the story, Arion is sailing in a Corinthian vessel to Tarentum, when he is set upon by the sailors. Faced with the choice of being thrown overboard or committing suicide, Arion agrees to kill himself after he has sung his last song, dressed in his bardic robes. Having sung his song, Arion leaps into the sea, in full costume, but is rescued by a dolphin, who brings him ashore at Taenarum, whence he makes his way back to Corinth, and denounces his attackers to the tyrant Periander, who summons the sailors, and establishes their guilt. For Thompson perhaps, Arion stands for Herodotus, who offers us his art in all its poetic splendour, but is set upon by critics, ancient and modern: his leap is through time, to a late twentieth-century world which can appreciate his presentation of society for what it is.

Herodotus' ancient critics are Aristotle and Thucydides. In the first chapter, 'The decline and repudiation of the whole: notes on Aristotle's enclosure of the pre-Socratic world', we are presented with a different metaphor. The subject matter of the pre-Socratic writers, including Herodotus, is a vast expanse of unenclosed common land, over which anyone can let their ideas wander freely: Aristotle introduces notions of theory and specialisation to divide this land into narrow plots that must be ploughed by single-minded individuals. Thucydides is discussed in the last chapter, 'Before objectivity, and after', where he is seen as the initiator of the tradition that historians should aim to be objective - a tradition now in inevitable decline (p. 149). Herodotus wrote before, and therefore outside, this tradition: he can therefore speak to us now, and offer a different vision of the historian's role, one which puts stories, not events, at its centre. The fifth chapter, 'The use of Herodotus in contemporary political and cultural criticism', is where Herodotus' modern critics are investigated. Thompson focuses on three writers,

Martin Bernal, Francois Hartog and Edward Said. The critique of each is valuable.

The heart of the book lies in the three central chapters, 'The development of social memory', 'The formation of Persian political identity', which focuses on the Persian constitutional debate (3.80-83), and 'Political identities in conflict: Herodotus in contention with his characters'. She explores various episodes in the *History*, in order to demonstrate what Herodotus has to say. And it is important at this point to emphasise what Thompson is looking for: as the final paragraph, quoted above, makes clear, this is a book about what Herodotus can mean for us now. This is a contribution to modern political debate, rather than to the historical study of Herodotus. That does not mean that the work is of no interest to Classical scholars - only that they may not find what they expect.

Having, I hope, given an impression of how the book works, I must say something about how it doesn't. It is a short work, but it is not easy to read: the brief introduction does not really prepare the reader for what is to follow, and there is no clear thread of argument running through the book as a whole; instead, stories are discussed, often with interesting digressions (for example on the critical fate of Melville's *Moby Dick* [pp. 155-161]), and then the author passes on; there is no conclusion, but only the discussion of a story to act as a message for the work as a whole. Some might point out that precisely the same criticisms could be made of Herodotus by an unsympathetic reader, but Thompson is handicapped by her prose style. Arion was borne ashore on the back of a dolphin; if Thompson in this book is doing the same for Herodotus, she has found a much less graceful means of conveyance. Some of the chapter headings quoted above give an indication of her way with words. Thompson discusses Aristotle's criticism of Herodotus' 'free-running' prose style (pp. 11-17), but a sentence like: 'At the heart of Herodotean historiography is attentiveness to these diverse amplifications that occur in the discourse about events' (p. 147) is anything but free-running. This is a pity, because an attempt like this to reclaim Herodotus for the present age, and one carried out with an evident love and respect for the *History*, deserves the attention of any Herodotean.

King's College London

HUGH BOWDEN

Herodotus, *Histories*: Translated with Notes by George Rawlinson; With an Introduction by Tom Griffith. Ware: Wordsworth Classics of World Literature, 1996. ISBN 1 25326 466 0. £2.50.

Wordsworth have now added Herodotus to the authors of whom they provide the cheapest version. Rawlinson's translation (hereafter R) has also been reissued, with an Introduction by H. Bowden, in the relaunched Everyman's Library (1992: £7.99); the Penguin translation of A. de Sélin-court (hereafter S) has been revised with a new Introduction and Notes by J. Marincola (1996: £7.99: hereafter M); and there is another recent translation, with a smiliar quantity of short notes, by D. Grene (University of Chicago Press, 1987: paperback edition £11.25; hereafter G).¹

Both Wordsworth and Everyman reproduce Rawlinson's 1858 translation, with little change apart from the restoration of the Greek names of gods and goddesses where R had given the Roman equivalents. Both follow the original Everyman edition of 1910 in giving E. H. Blakeney's selection from R's extensive notes, but Wordsworth includes in brackets the notes added by Blakeney while the new Everyman does not. The new Everyman has a slightly longer and a more learned Introduction than Wordsworth, but otherwise if one wants R's translation the only consideration that might make one pay Everyman's higher price is that the Everyman version has an index (as do the other translations discussed here) but the Wordsworth does not. Should one, however, want R at all, or is it better to pay more for S as revised by M or for G?

Rawlinson's English is sometimes a little old-fashioned, but (to this reader in his upper fifties) not so seriously or so often as to be a serious impediment. S (as was expected of early Penguin translators) produced fluent narrative English designed not to puzzle non-specialist readers, while M in revising him has not been drastic, but has used such words as 'barbarian' and 'tyrant' which S avoided (on 'tyrant' see below) and has tried to change the tone where he thought S did not do enough to 'underline the seriousness of Herodotus' purpose'. G found R 'dull and prolix' and S like 'a twentieth-century journalist', and set as his own aim a style which was 'direct, powerful and clear but also ... a little odd': when reviewing his translation I thought that the oddity was only slight but he seemed 'to waver a little uneasily between informality and an old-fashioned formality'.²

¹ I note in passing that Crawley's Thucydides is likewise available both in the new Everyman and in Wordsworth; there is of course a Penguin Thucydides; Grene has not translated Thucydides himself but has edited Hobbes's translation; and Jowett's translation is to be revised by S. Hornblower.

² G&R xxxv 1988, 96.

Literary scholars will want a translation which keeps as closely to the Greek as is compatible with readability; historians will want one which is consistent and reliable in its treatment of technical terms. For a general check I have compared the different translators' versions of the Corinthians' warning to Sparta against tyrants and account of their own tyranny in V. 92. M changed only the occasional word in S's version, and almost all the time R is much closer to the Greek (but R places after the Delphic oracle to Cypselus part of the material which in the Greek and in the other translations precedes the oracle). G is about level with R in his closeness to the Greek, but a good deal more awkward in his English. R is the only translator who tries to include in his translation an explanation of the pun on the name Cypselus, offering 'a 'cypsel' or corn-bin'. The beginning of the chapter provides a fair sample of how the different translators render Herodotus.

(R) Such was the address of the Spartans. The greater number of the allies listened without being persuaded. None however broke silence, but Sosicles the Corinthian, who exclaimed -- 'Surely the heaven will soon be below, and the earth above, and men will henceforth live in the sea, and fish take their place upon the dry land, since you, Lacedaemonians, propose to put down free governments in the cities of Greece, and to set up tyrannies in their room.'

(M) Most of the allied representatives disapproved of the substance of this speech, but the only one to raise his voice in protest was Sosicles of Corinth. 'Upon my word, gentlemen,' he exclaimed, 'this is like turning the universe upside-down. Earth and sky will soon be changing places -- men will be living in the sea and fish on land, now that you Spartans are proposing to abolish popular [changed by M from S's 'democratic': the Greek is *isokratiai*] government and restore despotism in the cities.'

(G) That was what they said. But the majority of the allies did not accept their proposals. Though the rest of them kept silent, the Corinthian, Sosicles, spoke up: 'Truly shall the heaven be beneath the earth, truly, earth above the sky! Truly shall men have their living in the sea, and fish have what men had formerly, when you, the Lacedaemonians, abolishing the rule of equality in the cities, make ready to return to them their absolute princes!'

R was often (as in that passage) willing to write of a 'tyrant' and of 'tyranny', but he did not always use these words to render *tyrannos* and *tyrannis*. S regularly avoided the technical words, and M sometimes but not always (and not in that passage) reinstates them; G again regularly avoids them. I give a few

other examples. In I. 6. i Croesus (who is called *tyrannos* by Herodotus, and technically is a *tyrannos* as a descendant of Gyges, who overthrew the previous dynasty) is lord of the peoples west of the Halys (R), king (S, M), ruler (G). In I. 59. i Pisistratus is tyrant of Athens (R); dictator (S), changed to tyrant (M); sovereign lord (G). In a cluster of passages in book VI R has tyranny in Athens (123), but calls Cleisthenes king of Sicyon (126. i) and Pheidon king of Argos (127. iii). M retains S's absolute government for Athens in 123, but changes master to tyrant for Cleisthenes and ruler to tyrant for Pheidon; G writes of a despot in Athens, and makes Cleisthenes and Pheidon princes.

The *prytanies* of the *naukraroi* in Athens in V. 71. ii are a notorious problem, and not only for the translator. R avoids interpreting, and gives us the straightforward 'Heads of the Naucraries'. S paraphrased as 'the officers in charge of the administrative districts', and M leaves that unchanged; G has 'the presiding committee of the naval boards'. I do still prefer the derivation of *naukraros* from *naus* = ship, but in view of the alternative derivations which have been canvassed recently R's is undoubtedly the best version to set in front of students.

S had originally presented some of Herodotus' material in footnotes, to improve the flow of the narrative; A. R. Burn in the 1972 revision restored this material to the text and produced a book with a very small number of explanatory footnotes; M in the latest revision of the Penguin has supplied new notes, more often historical but sometimes literary, some giving basic explanatory material but many drawing on and giving references to a variety of recent discussions. G's notes are disappointing: those which are not simply explanatory are based on the commentary of How and Wells, and they are often out of date and sometimes actually wrong. R's notes, with those added by Blakeney for the 1910 Everyman edition, do not of course pretend to be up to date, but they are sensible and often still useful, and were well informed at the time of writing. We might profitably have been given a discreet modernisation of such terms as 'the Gulf of Dantzic' (spelled *sic*), which survives unaltered in both versions of R (book III n. 123 in the Wordsworth edition). In book VII I notice that n. 19 refers to Darius' Behistun Inscription (as does M's n. 9); n. 29 refers to the surviving traces of Xerxes' Athos canal (as does M's n. 13); n. 111 invokes the fact that Artemisia was from Herodotus' home town of Halicarnassus to explain her prominence in the narrative (as does M's n. 28); n. 231 remarks that Amphictyon is likely to have been invented as an eponym to provide the origin of the term amphictyony (a point which M does not make). None of those four points is covered in G's notes.

To accompany the best notes, M's revision of the Penguin has the best bibliography. S's Penguin had maps and M has provided new maps; G has

elderly maps reproduced from the Loeb Herodotus; neither version of R is supplied with maps.

How will one's money best be spent? For readers who are not looking simply for 'a good read' but who want to study Herodotus, particularly for the increasing number of readers who are wholly dependent on a translation and are not using the translation to help them with the Greek text, R's seems to me to offer the best combination of readability and close reflection of the Greek original; but M's new Penguin has by far the best explanatory material. Wordsworth Classics are so cheap that an enthusiastic student may feel able to buy both; in any case the extension of Wordsworth's interest into the Greek and Latin classics, with the reissue of good out-of-copyright translations, is very much to be welcomed.

University of Durham

P. J. RHODES