

die von griechischen ethnographischen Überlieferungen beeinflusst sein sollen. Auch die Position des Josephus in Hinsicht auf die jüdisch-arabischen Genealogien wird untersucht, wobei man nicht sagen kann, ob die Abstammung der Araber von Hagar und Ishmael tatsächlich auf Josephus oder auf seine Quellen zurückgeht. Josephus aber beeinflusste beträchtlich die christlichen Autoren und wie M. zu recht bemerkt: 'he had an important posthumous role in the formation of Islam' (377).

Ethnic Identity in the Roman Near East, A.D. 325-450: Language, Religion, and Culture (378-405). Ziel des Beitrags ist es, 'a preliminary exploration of some aspects of ethnicity and communal identity' (379) in den orientalischen Provinzen zwischen dem I. Konzil von Nicäa (325) und dem von Chalcedon (450) zu erörtern. Die griechische Kultur spielte eine bedeutende Rolle. Neben dieser überlebten verschiedene semitische Zivilisationen (u.a. Juden, Samariter, 'Syrer') und die jeweiligen Sprachen. Es war aber das Griechentum, nicht nur unter Christen, sondern möglicherweise auch unter Juden und Heiden die dominierende Kultur.

Hier seien noch folgende Beiträge erwähnt: *Dura-Europos under Parthian Rule* (406-431); *The Jews of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora between Paganism and Christianity, A.D. 312-438* (432-456); *Christian Emperors, Christian Church, and the Jews of the Diaspora in the Greek East* (457-486): Hier handelt es sich um eine raffinierte Analyse der Beziehungen zwischen Juden und Christen im Licht der christlichen Quellen.

Author's Epilogue: Re-drawing the Map? (487-509). Es wäre viel zu reduktiv, den letzten Abschnitt als gewöhnliche Schlußfolgerungen zu betrachten. M. macht sich Gedanken darüber, auf welche Methode das Studium der Antike basiert, wobei die griechische und römische Kultur die wichtigste Rolle spielen. Die Folge ist eine 'westliche' Perspektive, die u.a. die ägyptische, und die jüdische Kultur ausschließt. Diese 'klassische' auf Rom und Athen basierende Weltanschauung zu überwinden, um aufmerksam den Nahen Osten zu untersuchen, sollte nicht die alte Herangehensweise ersetzen, sondern ergänzen.

Res novissima ex argumento vestustissimo: Fergus Millar bietet hier eine Sammlung von schon erschienenen Beiträgen. Das beeinträchtigt aber weder die Originalität noch die 'Frische' mehrerer seiner Ideen. Über die spezifischen Theorien hinaus dürfen wir den Mut bewundern, die typische Methode in Frage zu stellen. Das Buch ist ein sehr gut geschriebenes Instrument, auf das alle diejenigen nicht verzichten sollen, die etwas mehr über die nahöstliche Region und ihre Geschichte in Erfahrung bringen möchten.

Luca Guido

University of Düsseldorf

Marianne Pade, *The Reception of Plutarch's Lives in Fifteenth-Century Italy* (2 vols., *Renæssancestudier* 14), Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2007. 391 pp., 18 ill. ISBN-13: 978-8-763-50532-1.

Greek studies in Italy started in earnest towards the end of the fourteenth century, and received an impetus with the arrival of scholars from the remnants of the already doomed Byzantine Empire as well as from other last-minute efforts to strengthen the ties with Constantinople and the Eastern Church. The first students of the language discovered untold treasures of the ancient world, and from early on made it their concern to impart their discoveries to friends, patrons, and also the wider educated public, by means of Latin translations. Not surprisingly Plutarch's *Lives*, which contain precious insights imbued with the right moral tone and attitude, were among the early favourites. Marianne Pade (= P.) who has devoted a long series of studies to these and related matters now presents us with a definitive survey and evaluation.¹

¹ For a resumé of an earlier brief statement of her main thesis see *SCI* 21 (2002), 269.

Though the main body of this exhaustive study consists of a detailed case-by-case analysis, P. has set herself three main questions to be answered by the collected evidence: '1) why Plutarch's *Lives* attracted the attention of humanist translators at such an early date; 2) why some *Lives* were translated before others, or repeatedly; and 3) what the manuscript tradition tells about the popularity of different parts of the corpus and about the way the translations were read' (i. 15). These last two questions in particular can receive a comprehensive answer only on consideration of the evidence assembled here.

After a good introductory survey, including some hitherto unnoticed details of Plutarch's fortunes from his own times down to the thirteenth century,² we arrive at the main subject of the book. Plutarch was virtually unknown in fourteenth century Italy — it was mainly through the spurious *Institutio Traiani* that he had any claim to fame.³ As is well known, it was Manuel Chrysoloras' acceptance of a chair of Greek in Florence in 1397 that marked the real beginning of Greek studies there. 'Chrysoloras' pupils, and eventually their pupils as well, were responsible for most of the translations of the *Lives*: Leonardo Bruni; Iacopo Angeli de Scarperia; Guarino Veronese, who studied with Chrysoloras in Constantinople from 1403 to 1408, and his pupils Francesco Barbaro and Leonardo Giustinian; and Francesco Filelfo, the pupil and eventually son-in-law of Manuel's nephew, Johannes Chrysoloras, with his pupil Lapo da Castoglionchio the Younger' (i. 96).

Thus we arrive at the main part of the work: what remains of vol. i is taken up by detailed case studies of the assorted translations of the *Lives* into Latin, organized by venue and with a chronological list of translations down to the *editio princeps* of the *Lives* in Latin in 1470 (for which see i. 385-8). In vol. ii we get the full text of the prefaces to the various translations, as well as a variety of useful lists, of MSS, Scribes, Owners, Dated MSS, as well as a rich bibliography and indexes.

Though the translations were a direct consequence of the new study of Greek, Latin style was of the highest importance, and accordingly translations were made *ad sententiam* rather than *ad verbum*. In some cases it can be seen that the earlier literal versions, exercises in fact, were later revised accordingly (some autographs are extant), and ideally came close to the style of classical authors. Paradoxically, the study of Greek was used to restore and renew Latin. As for the choice of *Lives*, though this depended to an extent on their availability, the main concern was to provide texts with the right political message. It was in Republican Florence that the first translations were made: Iacopo Angeli de Scarperia translated the *Brutus*, *Cicero*, *Pompeius* and *Marius* between 1400 and 1406, while the more successful translations of Leonardo Bruni comprised the *Antonius*, *Cato minor*, *Aemilius Paulus*, the *Gracchi*, *Sertorius*, *Pyrrhus* and *Demosthenes* executed between 1405 and 1412. The virtually exclusive interest in Roman history is striking: this was the reason also for the *Pyrrhus*, while the interest in Demosthenes was inevitably linked with that in Cicero. An interesting example is Bruni's preface to his translation of *Antonius* sent to Coluccio Salutati (ii. 153-5): it was the attractive narrative, not the virtues of the hero that drew him to the work (non virtute hominis invitati sumus, sed historiae amoenitate allecti), and there should be no doubt that Latin is not inferior to Greek (non video, qua in re Latinae litterae a Graecis superentur). But this is a somewhat exceptional case (as is the *Antonius* in Plutarch's *œuvre*), and mostly P. finds that the choices can be explained by Hans Baron's thesis of Florentine civic humanism, whereas humanism in Venice was 'patrician'. The relevance of the *Lives* is also reflected in the controversy surrounding Caesar, the sympathies predictably divided between Ghibellines and Guelphs.

² For the problem of replacing Hirzel's *Plutarch* (Leipzig 1912) see *ibid.* 267.

³ In an extremely rare oversight in her reading of modern scholarship P. is unaware (i. 63) of the spirited defence of the authenticity of Plutarch's introductory letter to Trajan by M. Beck, 'Plutarch to Trajan: the Dedicatory Letter and the Apophthegmata Collection', P.A. Stadter and L. Van der Stockt (eds.), *Sage and Emperor. Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan (98-117 A.D.)* (Leuven 2002), 163-73.

Another fascinating issue is the relationship between the humanist translators, their patrons or dedicatees, and the choice of heroes. The prefaces to the various *Lives* assembled in vol. ii, though containing more often than not heaps of commonplaces, seek in many cases to establish the parallel between the hero and the dedicatee and to provide the latter with an opportunity to learn a lesson from history. The most illustrative case is that of Lapo da Castiglionchio, a man with little luck in his quest for patrons. He dedicated the *Artaxerxes*, in short intervals, to Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, and then to King Alfonso of Aragon. P. sets out in convenient table form Lapo's prefaces to the two men (i. 377-83) — only slight adjusting was required in order to show why each of them was the suitable recipient of the *Life*. Another case in point is Guarino Guarini of Verona: while Florence looked to the Roman Republic, maritime Venice turned East and to Greece. 'In Florence Guarino had translated *Lives* of Roman heroes, in Venice he was to translate a number of Plutarch's Greek *Lives*...' (i. 184) — among them the *Dion* and the *Phocion*, two disciples of Plato, who were of special interest for Venice.

The popularity of some of these translations is quite astonishing. The best-selling author was Bruni: 76 MSS are extant of his *Pyrrhus*, 78 of the *Gracchi*, 87 of the *Cato minor*, 91 of his *Sertorius*, 95 of the *Demosthenes* and 110 of his *Antonius*; this is dwarfed by the 251 extant MSS of his *Cicero novus*, a rewritten biography of the orator and statesman. Some others did not lag far behind: Guarino's *Marcellus* is represented by 42 MSS, Angeli's *Pompeius* by 51, Francesco Barbaro's *Aristides-Cato* by 60 and the *Cimon-Lucullus* translated by Giustinian is extant in 77 MSS. Significantly we know of only one translation that has not been preserved, the *Artaxerxes* by Lampugino Birago.

Though much of this material had been published before, both by P. herself and by earlier scholars, there never has been a comparable effort at a comprehensive survey, and many points of detail, especially pertaining to dates, are reassessed and corrected here. On the whole this is an impressive piece of meticulous scholarship, and vol. ii contains a great amount of raw material that can be utilized. The two volumes are beautifully produced with some eye-catching illustrations; there are but a few trivial misprints and virtually no mistakes in the text.⁴ Plutarch would have loved this book. The Quattrocento humanists read the *Lives* exactly as they were intended, as a series of character-forming (and in some cases, deterrent) examples, paradigmatic for the aspiring statesman and general, true Mirrors of Princes. Of course the detached armchair scholar cannot but smile at such an Age of Innocence — but then, is the loss of innocence such a change for the better? Moreover, the reputed claim of Harry Truman to have had Plutarch as his first source of political wisdom should rebut any concern lest high ideals and hard-as-nails *Realpolitik* cannot go hand in hand.

Joseph Geiger

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Leofranc Holford-Strevens and Amiel Vardi (eds.), *Noctes Oxonienses, The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. XVI + 392 pp. ISBN-13: 978-0-19-926482-7.

Time was when Gellius was just dipped into for grammatical minutiae, an attitude crystallised by S. Whitely's 'Fossicking through Aulus Gellius' *Attic Nights*' (*Acta Classica* 21, 1998, 99-114), unmentioned in these tarted-up *Acta* of (by editorial surmise) the first-ever conference devoted to

⁴ 'A series of lives of the Roman emperors from Augustus to Vespasian' (i. 37) is a rather strange way of saying that the *Lives* comprised Augustus to Vitellius (inclusive); 'Plutarch often quotes Latin writers' (i. 135) is, at best, an exaggeration; at i. 143 it is implied that the *Gracchi* were 'patricians'; at i. 305, referring to *Aratus* 15.2, 'On friendship between kings and tyrants' is a rather misleading translation of *De amicitia regum et tyrannorum* (the meaning of the original φιλαία βασιλέων καὶ τυράννων is 'friendship of kings and tyrants').