

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-