

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').

Gellius, an event that would have given surprised delight to him, though I doubt Oxford seminar rooms match the comforts of Herodes Atticus' villa.

A lively Preface (I'd have added a tabular guide to Gellius and his age) infuses flesh and blood into our man, a process modernly begun by my *Studies in Aulus Gellius* (1975), magnificently expanded by Holford-Strevens' *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and His Achievement* (1988; 2nd rev. ed. 2003), along with his many cognate papers, all remarkable in their scholarly breadth and depth.

The volume divides like Plato's soul and Caesar's Gaul into three parts: Contexts/Achievements, Ideologies, Reception (I rather weary of this current 'buzz-word'), comports through mathematical declension five, four, three (cue Manfred Mann) contributions. Starting from the appropriate titular plural, Simon Swain explores bilingualism-biculturalism. An old topic, treated long ago by (e.g.) Charles Knapp (1894), Walter Foster (1912), and myself (1974) — all ignored, leisurely pursued, Gellius not appearing until page 28. I could have spared the reiterated jargonic 'code-switching' (4 times on 27 alone), also the tedious *odium academicum* towards Bowersock and Syme (12 n. 26, 25 n. 66). But, Swain knows his Antonine onions, with a sharp eye for telling details (Petronius 46.5 worth adding for Greek teaching at Rome, 15).

Alessandro Garcia and Valeria Lomanto are very hard-going on Gellian loan words. Not a criticism: the subject-matter makes it so. A rich quarry for word-fanciers. If right (60 n. 59) about *camella's* derivation, Lewis and Short plus *OLD* are nullified. What they (52) dub Gellian 'strange forgetfulness' may simply be error — *non omnia possumus omnes*.

Cavazza (Englished by Holford-Strevens) on etymology is also inevitably heavy, but worth it. Apropos legal terms (69), he should remember Gellius was himself a *iudex* of sorts. Full marks (66, 101), though, for insisting on Gellian independence of thought against modern detractors, and (*habent sua fata libelli*) I must love the only member (*pace* Holford-Strevens' review, *CR* 28, 1978, 53-56) of this *Collegium Gellianum* to engage (86-87) with my own book, in amicable terms on time-honoured questions of *Africitas* and *Quellen*.

Graham Anderson on story-telling is welcome light relief, in the best sense. His is one of the few contributions I could have wished longer (unlike Samuel Johnson on *Paradise Lost*). Written with erudite verve, he persuades the case (I don't need it, others do) for Gellian narrative flair, and rightly insists (116) on the realism underlying the grammarians' conversations. Had Anderson read my Gellius and Lucian books, no doubt I would have been wrongly censured along with Christopher Jones (115 n. 23) for 'emphasising experience against literary stereotype'. Andrew Stevenson is equally eloquent on Gellius' antiquarianism, readably providing many valuable nuggets of ancient information. As Samuel Johnson remarked, 'a mere antiquarian is a rugged being'. For my taste, there is too much generic dichotomy. Antiquarianism is a legitimate branch of history, not a poor man's rival — I likewise dismiss fashionable (Fergus Millar, Ronald Syme, and company) depreciations of biography against history. Stevenson (126) brands it a spare-time amateur occupation: the same has been said (notably by Gordon Williams) of Roman poetry. He also scorns *Mirabilia* as (152) 'of no practical use'. Maybe, but they had attracted the literary talents of Mucianus and Phlegon, while Lucian's satire thereof attests to the genre's popularity. All praise to Amiel Vardi (180) for his accolade on *Noctes Atticae* as 'unique in ancient literature'. Also for his quite brilliant question (180 n. 82) 'If Gellius were known only from quotations...' Overall, for my old-fashioned English bulldog-ism, there is far too much Euro-literary theory — others, of course, will laud it for this very reason, while I savour Holford-Strevens' (181 n. 85) editorial joke on narratology. Vardi's puzzlement (163 n. 19) over singular *Commentarius* is soluble if we take it here to denote 'chapter' (as often) rather than 'book'. The claim (161 n. 8) that 'Miscellany' is not an ancient title is undermined by Tertullian's allusion (*Adv. Val.* 12) to *Miscellanea Ptolemaei*.

To snaffle another Johnsonianism, Teresa Morgan is 'a bottom of good sense' on Gellius' ethics. Her argument (189) on his concern for advising young people could have been endorsed by

reference to the likes of Plutarch and Saint Basil. The lament (199) over women being restricted to 'occasional appearances' is a trifle gloomy: the feminist website 'Diotima' furnishes an uberous list. Stephen Beall on Gellian humanism pays a sometimes prolix homage to René Marache, the term's coiner. My book anticipated his riposte against Nettleship's too-long influential scorn. I applaud his concluding 'Aulus Gellius is delightful company', though regret his parroting of that old windbag Isaiah Berlin's endlessly quoted quotation of Archilochus' 'The fox knows many things, the hedgehog knows one big thing' — it means no more now than it did then. Holford-Strevens editorially intervenes (209 n. 21), claiming Beall's 'pot-luck' is an Americanism without British equivalent, oddly since the expression is first attested from Thomas Nashe (1592) — *interdum dormitat Homerus*.

Wytse Keulen has an engaging topic in satire. Unaware, though, that his Apuleius-Gellius speculations were long ago aired by F.G. Allinson (*Lucian: Satirist and Artist*, 1927, 18-20), echoed in my *Studies* (46). His overall argument of satire in banquet narratives could have adduced Athenaeus, shown by myself (*Acta Classica* 19, 1976, 21-42) to have been sharp on his deipnosophists.

It is impossible not to be impressed, indeed overwhelmed, by the suave erudition of Holford-Strevens' conspectus of humanist editions and manuscripts ('einen umfassenden Überblick', pronounced reviewer Michael Hesse, *BMCR* 2006. 07. 39-41). Impossible also to do it justice here, having no access to his materials — Internet sites furnish occasional items, e.g. Gordan MS 107 (Italy, 15th-century) held at Bryn Mawr. Still, Holford-Strevens' track record inspires full confidence in his accuracy and judgement. Since his own Gellius was pronounced stiff (James O'Donnell, *BMCR* 02. 01. 9-11) and headmasterly (Jane Lightfoot [*TLS* April 16, 2004, 7]), I here emphasise my contrary admiration for his crisp, jargon-free expositions of such recalcitrant subject-matter. This man (witness his present 'Palm Wood' title) could make the telephone directory readable.

Michael Heath glides through the French Renaissance, a sunny guide with an enviable gift of synthesis. Rabelais emerges as a special, perhaps surprising, exhibit — Gargantua Meets Gellius. Of course, such *Nachleben* sagas have no end. Witness (e.g.) in cognate fields R.J. Schoeck (*Renaissance News* 13, 1960, 127-129) or Karl Young (*Modern Language Notes* 62, 1937, 347-351) respectively for Thomas More and Chaucer.

Anthony Grafton on Gellius as the originator of notebook scholarship and father of academic *Schadenfreude* is vintage Grafton — no higher praise possible. His essay combines polymathy and wit in both its focal fifteenth-century Ferrara and *Collegium Gellianum* and multitudinous related personalities and topics. I chortled over his (320) Augustine seeing the *NA* 'as some modern undergraduates see the World Wide Web', albeit Isidore of Seville has pre-emption courtesy of the Vatican's proposing him as patron saint of electronic information.

Churlish to complain of a thirty-page Bibliography, yet much earlier work is missing, recoverable via J.C. Rolfe's Loeb and Marache's oddly omitted repertoire in *Lustrum* 10 (1965), 213-245. These days, Internet sites should be included — 'Googling' Gellius yielded 109,000. Some stipulated editions of classical authors (e.g. Aristophanes, Cicero, Lucilius, Martianus Capella) are quite outdated. Indexes of Gellian passages, other classical ones, and names-places are respectively curiously selective, sparse, and patchy (e.g. no sign of Trajan, despite his eminence on pages 9-10). An Index of words discussed by Gellius betrays some limitations, e.g. *dicibile*, frequently explored by Augustine via *NA* 11.12.1, on which see (eds.) Steven K. Strange and Jack Zupko, *Stoicism: Traditions and Transformations* (2004).

The volume's production is up to Oxford's traditional high standards (not something you can take for granted nowadays), doubtless thanks to this being Holford-Strevens' stamping-ground. Rare venial misprints include 'GADX' (210) and 'excepts' (249). Easy-on-the-eye printing and attractive cover complete the aesthetic pleasures.

This miscellanist's miscellany deserves a far more detailed analysis than space permits — to its credit I ended up with twenty pages of notes and queries. Apart from my books on Gellius and Lucian (1973), these Baldwiniana, reprinted in *Studies on Greek and Roman History and Literature* (1985) and *Roman and Byzantine Papers* (1989), ignored by the Oxonian *Collegium Gellianum*, plug some gaps: 'Aulus Gellius and his Circle', *Acta Classica* 16 (1973), 103-107; 'Aulus Gellius on Vergil', *Vergilius* 19 (1973), 22-27 — this includes a complete conspectus of references; 'An Anonymous Latin Poem in Gellius', *Arctos* 13 (1979), 5-13; 'Biculturalism and Bilingualism in the Roman Empire', *Pacific Northwest Conference on Foreign Languages* 25 (1974), 65-68; 'A Bibliographical Survey: The Second Century from Secular Sources', *The Second Century* 1 (1981), 173-189.

Apropos Gellian *Nachleben*, there's one more thing I have always wanted to know, and am sure that Holford-Strevens is the man to ask. Namely, the import of seventeenth-century antiquarian-biographer John Aubrey's description of Ben Jonson's 'studyeing chaire, which was of strawe, such as old woemen used, and as Aulus Gellius is drawne in'.

Barry Baldwin

University of Calgary

Michael B. Charles, *Vegetius in Context: Establishing the Date of the Epitoma Rei Militaris* (Historia Einzelschriften 194), Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2007. 205 pp. ISBN-13: 978-3-515-08989-0.

This monograph is a condensed version of a doctoral dissertation completed in 2003 and submitted to the University of Queensland at Brisbane in Australia. The title *Vegetius in Context* signifies the intention of Charles (henceforth: Ch.) to investigate 'Vegetius and his world' (15) and to study 'the epitomator and his milieu' (155). In Ch.'s opinion both the military perspective and the political and cultural aspects of the *Epitoma Rei Militaris* should be examined in comparison with other literary sources, in the hope that the cumulative evidence will be persuasive. The subtitle, *Establishing the Date of the Epitoma Rei Militaris*, points to a controversial issue in modern scholarship: the identity of the unnamed emperor to whom Vegetius dedicated his work. According to modern scholars, this must be one of the emperors who ruled between the death of Gratian in CE 383 (Veg. 1.20.3) and the date of the *scriptio* at the end of the treatise, CE 450.

The book opens with an introduction (13-21) in which Ch. states his aim to evaluate the contribution of Vegetius to the history of the Late Empire. He provides a conspectus of modern research on the date of Vegetius' work focusing especially on the reigns of Theodosius I (CE 379-395) and Valentinian III (CE 425-455). This is followed by three main parts, containing a total of five chapters. Part One contains only one chapter ('Identity and Provenance', 23-50). Part Two consists of chapters 2 and 3 ('In Theodosium I — Miscellaneous References', 51-85, and 'Titulature and Praise — the Augustus in the Late Empire', 87-123). Part Three has two chapters ('Military I — Vegetius and "Barbarization"', 125-154, and 'Military II — Other Military Considerations', 155-180). The book ends with a 'Conclusion — Navigating Between the *Termini*' (181-184), a 'Bibliography' (185-198), and an 'Index nominum et rerum' (199-205).

In chapter 1.1 (23-26), Ch. tries to clarify the meager evidence for the personality of Vegetius. Accepting the scholarly view that both the *Epitoma Rei Militaris* and the *Digesta Artis Mulomedicinae* (a veterinary compendium) were written by the same author, and bearing in mind the normal use of nomenclature, Ch. concludes that his full name was Fl. Publius Vegetius Renatus.¹ After a survey of the evidence on the Christianity of Vegetius (chapter 1.2) and a discussion of the value of the manuscripts and their dedications, Ch. provides an interesting note

¹ Cf. the title of the edition of A. Önnersfors, *P. Flavii Vegeti Renati Epitoma rei militaris* (Stuttgart and Leipzig 1995), whose entry in the bibliography (193) should be corrected.