

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. Albinì makes the point that the *Lives* lay greater stress on upbringing than has heretofore been recognized. Building on an article by L. Salvioni, Albinì 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 Albinì), the sisters grew into women of less than perfect virtue, while Cato remained 'incapable of developing a healthy married life' (p. 66). Albinì 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