geography of Africa and some descriptions of the nations there *with which the people of Rome has had wars or alliance*" (trans. J.C. Rolfe, LCL). The conquests and the growth of the Roman Empire in the age of Sallust explain the growing interest in geography also to be found in the writings of Cicero, Cornelius Nepos and Varro. It was not merely by chance that Strabo chose, a few years later, to write his *Geography*, addressing both Greek tradition and Roman pragmatism.

To sum up, the first two chapters of this book form an expanded introduction to the main theme in the following chapters, which constitute an ⸱extensive and thorough discussion of the Sallustian excerpts on ethnography. Oniga's highly enjoyable survey not only illuminates the style and methods of Sallust but also enhances our understanding of ancient ethnography.

Daniela Dueck   Bar Ilan University

Valeri Maximi Facta et Dicta Memorabilia, edidit John Briscoe, 2 vols., Stuttgart and Leipzig: Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, 1998. pp. xlii + 888.

'A new text is badly needed.' So Peter Marshall on Valerius Maximus *(Texts and Transmission*, ed. L.D. Reynolds [Oxford, 1983], 428). Briscoe has now given us one, and it will at once become standard.

Marshall's quarrel with C. Kempf's edition (2 1888) was that it 'is frequently wrong in the reports of L and A, and fails to understand the importance of the third family of manuscripts'. One assumes that Briscoe has remedied the first of these faults. As to the second, he actually values G even more highly than Marshall did. Whereas Marshall saw it as descended from the archetype common to L and A (which are very close to each other), Briscoe thinks that G's parent and the common source of AL were copied from the archetype. One would like to see that case argued in greater detail. Briscoe gives us (p. viii) a list of nine places where G gives readings that are, in his view, true and probably not the result of conjecture. Briscoe explains away one of them himself (n. 8), one is trivial (7.6.5); at 1.5.6 we cannot be sure that a scribe of this period would not know Greek letters (knowing Greek is a different matter); 6.3.1a is one of the many cases where G could be drawing on A as corrected; and there is no certainty about the correctness of *ueriori* at 2.8.5 (especially just after *uerae*). As for *diutius* at 3.6.1, it seems to me clearly wrong (PHI shows 23 juxtapositions of *multum* with *diu*, seven of them in Valerius: none with *diutius*). If these are the most impressive examples Briscoe could muster, I am not very happy with them. As for his view (p. ix) that there are so many examples of G agreeing in correct readings with A corrected or L corrected (or both) that some must be transmitted from the archetype, that is just a hope. We do not need to suppose that G or G's source is (always) conjecturing what had already been conjectured by the correctors of A and/or L. There is no reason why, 150 years later, AL or descendants of AL could not have been sources of contamination for G. Examination of representative twelfth-century MSS might throw light on this possibility.

It would in fact be interesting to know if Briscoe's text would be very different if he had used G merely as a source of conjecture where A and L are wrong. I should

personally, in any case, have liked identification of at least some of the earlier 'dett.', which Briscoe lumps together under that opprobrious name even where he is looking to them for a good correction. It would then be possible to get some idea of the stages by which the text was improved (the stages by which it was corrupted could of course be suppressed) during the later Middle Ages and Renaissance. Few, in any case, will be very happy to see such a note as that on 1.6. ext.1, where no fewer than six 'dett.' readings are strung together with a series of *uels*, to be joined by six modern conjectures. Again, at 5.3.4, twelve modern conjectures are appended to one attributed to 'dett.' It is surely the duty of an editor to weigh conjectures, and to mention no more than are really convincing, or needed to illustrate different kinds of critical approach to the problem in question. Thus when a conjecture is palmary (4.4.11 'tres scripsit'; 4.7.7 'et stationem'), doubt should not be cast on it by the addition of alternatives. My examples are the work of Halm and Madvig respectively. Class will out; it is remarkable how often, amid the dross of Briscoe's apparatus, the ideas of these scholars, and those of Gertz, shine out. And conjectures, after all, can be wrong. I mention only Georges' 'tantus <testis>' at 8.5.3. Briscoe, to judge from a remark on p. 332, aims to be more or less all-inclusive. I think that is a self-defeating aim.

That is not to say that it is easy to emend Valerius, or to know when he is being emended rightly. He writes so flatly that it is easier to tell when his text is wrong than when it is right. Briscoe suggests (or prints) emendations of his own well over fifty times, not counting many adjustments to proper names (where he often admits that Valerius may be erring). But he rarely takes the text by the scruff of the neck, contenting himself with building (often convincingly) on old foundations. I comment on a few passages (Briscoe's suggestions in each case forming the lemma): 1.1.1 ciuitatis accepisset <iura>, nomine] Briscoe (p. x n. 12) regards L's 'ciuitatem accepisset nomine' as conjecture (perhaps because he over-estimates the importance of G); I suspect it is both right and transmitted (cf. [Valerius's source] Cicero, Balb. 55 'ante ciuitatem Veliensibus datam'). 2.7.8 [et] Rullianus et magister equitum et uictor ...] Cf. however 2.10.2 'et rex et lacessitus' (s.v.l.). 2.8.4 pro aucto imperio, non ob reciperata quae] One might think of 'pro reciperato', deleting 'quae ... fuissent'. 2.10.2 tum cum maxime] So too at 3.1.2. In both cases read 'cum maxime' (see *OLD* s.v. maxime 6b and 6d). 3.4.ext.1 -- sic uirtus per se ipsa aestimatur --] I think Halm was right to keep 'si', with a comma preceding it (for this sort of collocation see my n. on [Quint.] decl. min. 259.2). For the subjunctive cf. 4.8.1 'si ad calculos reuocetur'. 7.3.4 quod sequitur improbandum est] I should prefer a fuller phrase, like '<improbandum potius quam> narrandum est'. 9.11.ext.4 manantes furias] Hardly when 'furoris' follows within three words. Conjecture is free here; 'furoris' came into the archetype from below, and G (characteristically) adjusted to the plural. I add two more general points. First, Briscoe convincingly diagnoses a gloss at 4.3.3. The text of Valerius is indeed subject to such (sometimes learned) additions. Note e.g. 1.1.1 (discussed in part above), where one might think of deleting 'nomine Calliphanam' as well as 'uel ut alii dicunt Cal(l)iphoenam'; 2.1.3 ('in publicum'); 2.7.9 ('fugitiuorum'); 3.2.9 ('Rulliani': notice how AL here get right the proper name corrupted, even in the excerpts, earlier in the section); and esp. 2.10.8 (lines of Martial, a little tidied up in G). I suggest two further cases below. Second, it is

strange practice to place obeli against a manuscript reading cited in the apparatus (so e.g. at 8.2.2).

I add with no great confidence some suggestions of my own. 1.4.5 uixque] sicque. 1.8.6 delete 'ubi conferti dubio certamine terebantur [? tenebantur]': 'illuc' means 'to the camp', and this misguided addition is confected from 'resque ancipiti euentu conlatis unum in locum utriusque partis copiis gereretur' above. 2.4.2 nota esset] non deesset'. 3.7.9 contra M. Antonius ille disertus non [enim] respuendo ... quam innocens esset testatus est: quaestor <enim> ...'. Halm's repunctuation, accepted by Briscoe, is awkward; Valerius normally summarises or comments, then adds the example (so 4.1.ext.2, with nam). 8.2.2 quod si eadem formula Varro et sibi damnari et aduersariae absolui potuisset (for the datives cf. 8.2.1 'illum Calpurnio damnauit'). 8.2.3 caenoque paludis ... oblitum, et [iam] in domum suam ....deductum. 8.7.ext. 1 Briscoe's text can hardly stand unless 'equidem' is resolved into 'et quidem'. Better, perhaps, read 'proeliatus enim cum rerum natura equidem ...' 8.15.9 si quidem [magnum] Pompeium ... I think that the two syllables referred to are not 'in te' (as Constant's translation implies) but 'Magnum'. Valerius (as at 8.7.ext.1 'artis quam adfectabat primam litteram') sets his readers a little puzzle: not a difficult one, considering that Pompey's cognomen has been mentioned just above.

Valerius Maximus is blessed, or cursed, with two epitomes, which Briscoe prints after the main text. One problem they raise is how far they should be used to correct the full version. Briscoe is rightly cautious (though he might have been less patchy in citing the evidence of P in his apparatus). But this is nothing compared with the caution with which he approaches a second problem, how the epitomes themselves should be presented. 'Ego tamen haudquaquam confido textum me auctorum huius aetatis constituere posse. Rationem igitur secutus sum quam aliqui lectores sine dubio mirabilem, ne dicam ridiculam, iudicabunt: nisi emendatio mihi certa uidetur, lectionem codicum dedi, nec obelis usus sum' (p. xxv). The result of this criterion, which Briscoe has applied very rigorously, is that the epitomes, and particularly that of Nepotianus, are often left to the nonsense supplied by their manuscripts. This seems hard on epitomators whose prefaces show they could write elegantly and intelligibly enough. But emending them on the basis of the complete text is a treacherous business (that, surely, is the problem, not the late date of the writers), and one can see why Briscoe was unwilling to undertake it. Perhaps we do not want to read the epitomes through at all. If we do, we shall have to construct our own text: Briscoe has not done it for us.

Briscoe, a historian as well as an editor, has taken a lot of trouble with the list of Fontes printed above the textual apparatus. I think it would have helped if he had, where appropriate, indicated the particular passage on which Valerius was in all probability drawing (thus Cicero, orator 74 at 8.11.ext.6). And it is irritating sometimes to be referred for details to another, not always very accessible, book (thus 'J.-M. David, *Demokratia et Aristokratia*' at 8.10.1).

A few notes on orthography: 1.8.2 I am unhappy with plural 'Epidauri' (is it in the MSS?). 2.4.5 AG preserve the old(?) 'luntre', and AL at 3.7.8 the old 'inicum'; P at 1.1.21 preserves (before correction) the choice 'thensaurum'. More important than all this: at p. xxx Briscoe discusses a series of occurrences of petit, redit, repetit, which he regards as historic presents or errors by haplography. They are all perfects, (correctly) spelt as they so often are (see Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre* iii. 447-8):

that G gives them all in the longer form is a sign of lack of sincerity. Editors sometimes employ a circumflex to show the tense they intend. Briscoe himself allows us petisset at 8.10.ext.1.

I have noticed perhaps twenty misprints (all trivial, and mostly in the apparatus): a tiny haul in this very long text. That, like everything else, shows what careful labours have gone into this fine edition.

Michael Winterbottom   Corpus Christi College, Oxford

Nikos Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty. Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998. 518 pp.

This book consists of ten chapters of text and ten appendices. Also included are fourteen figures of family trees, three chronological charts and three maps. In the first three chapters the author deals with the history of Idumaea and Herod's ancestry; in the remaining seven, he follows the history of the family from the generation of Herod's father, Antipater, to the last known Herodians of the second century AD. The majority of the appendices are devoted to chronological points, ranging in time from Herod's appointment as king to the date of Agrippa II's death. However, appendices are not the sole repositories of discussions on chronology; a large proportion of the main text is devoted to this subject too, either directly or by implication. Although omitted from the title, chronology is in effect one of the major topics of the book, if not the main one.

In spite of the fact that so much has already been written on the Herodian dynasty, there is certainly room for a book of the scope envisaged by Kokkinos. Many problems touching upon the genealogy and chronology of the dynasty are interconnected, so that it makes excellent sense to discuss them under the same roof. Given the great volume of evidence to be examined and of modern literature to be consulted, the author's readiness to meet this challenge deserves appreciation. The painstaking reconstruction of the history of the family down to its most obscure members must have been a formidable task.

Kokkinos does not confine himself merely to putting together the conclusions and suggestions made by his predecessors. On the contrary, more often than not he disagrees with their opinions. The book contains many unconventional views, on matters both historical and chronological. Thus the author suggests that the Herodian family was descended from Hellenised Phoenicians rather than ethnic Idumaeans; he is also of the opinion that the role of the Herodians in Judaean affairs in the first century AD was much greater than commonly believed. The accepted chronologies of the last years of Herod, of Agrippa I and of the period leading to the First Jewish Revolt are revised as well. However, if the book is problematic, which it is, the author's polemic spirit is not the reason. His way of arguing things is. Since my own fields of interest happen to be numismatics and chronology, I shall expand primarily on these issues.

Throughout the book, there is no dividing line between what can be said for certain and what is a mere possibility; assumptions or conclusions based on them are often treated as if they were facts. A few examples later in this review will illustrate