

daughters born from it. Nahum Cohen, 'A Notice of Birth of a Girl' is a competent edition by a new member of the small group of papyrologists active in this country.

Other contributions in the volume include Ruth Neuberger-Donath, 'Τέρειν δάκρυον: θαλερόν δάκρυον: Über den Unterschied der Charakterisierung von Mann und Frau bei Homer', Evelyn Meron, 'Raison littéraire, et imagination philosophique: Naissance du dialogue', David M. Schaps, 'Builders, Contractors, and Power: Financing and Administering Building Projects in Ancient Greece', A.I. Baumgarten, 'Euhemerus' Eternal Gods: or, How Not to Be Embarrassed by Greek Mythology', John Glucker, '*Consuetudo Oculorum*', Arie Kindler, 'Coins of the Achaean League in the Collection of the Kadman Numismatic Museum', Naomi G. Cohen, 'The Elucidation of Philo's *Spec. Leg.* 4.137-8: "Stamped Too with Genuine Seals"' and Gerda Elata-Alster, 'Listening with the Third Ear: Freud and Lacan's "Testimonial Allegories"'. He (she) must be a singularly narrow and single-minded classicist who will not find something stimulating and instructive in this *Festschrift*.

Joseph Geiger

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, third edition, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, lv + 1640 pp., ISBN 0-19-866172-X, £70.00.

Actually, the dust-jacket (unlike the title-page) calls it 'The Oxford Classical Dictionary, the ultimate reference work on the classical world'. It may well be that, at least in one sense. It seems fairly unlikely that we shall get a fourth edition on paper. By the time a new edition becomes necessary, we shall all be electronic and be using CD-ROMs or on-line reference works, with all the advantages and the disadvantages that those will entail. For the moment, therefore, this really is the ultimate (English-language) reference book on the classical world. It comes a generation after the second edition, published in 1970, and two generations after the first, which appeared, its preparation delayed by the Second World War, in 1949.

Is it different from earlier editions? It weighs more: *OCD*³ weighs 2.675 kilos; *OCD*² weighed in at 4 lbs 7 and a half ozs (or just a tad short of 2 kilos in today's terminology). So it weighs about one third more. It is also longer: the original *OCD* contained xix + 971 pages. *OCD*² grew a little, to (xxii + 1176 =) 1198 pages; the new edition contains (lv + 1640 =) 1695 pages, similarly a growth of some one third and more between these two editions. And *OCD*² cost 6 guineas (against 50 shillings for the first edition), while the new edition costs more than eleven times as much. Money of course is worth much less now, and it may be argued that, even leaving aside questions about the contents, the new edition represents better value for money just in terms of paper.

The volume has the same shape as other current editions of Oxford reference books. This is in fact the same as that of the *OCD*², but the greater thickness of current editions seems to make these more unwieldy and less solid than the old ones. These newer editions also look slightly squatter and broader than their predecessors, but this is doubtless a product of the larger number of pages, and the resulting thickness of the volumes. Despite this, the paper is thinner and less likely to survive the rough handling to which such a work is inevitably subject. The columns, two to a page, are slightly wider (seven and

one third cm, as against just on seven cm in the previous edition), which makes rapid consultation a little more difficult on the eyes. But comparison with the paperback edition of the *Kleine Pauly*, perhaps the most obvious rival, shows in this area at least a victory for the *OCD*: the British book lies open on the desk more easily and its spine does not seem to be in such danger of collapse as that of the other. And the book is typeset by Selwood Systems and printed in the USA, and published, as noted above, by Oxford University Press. The previous editions were printed at the University Press by Vivian Ridler, 'printer to the University', and published at the Clarendon Press. Slight differences, but illustrative of some of the changes which have come over the face of publishing, and of scholarly publishing in particular, in the last generation.

What of the *Dictionary* itself? How does it square up to the challenges of a generation of highly productive scholarship, reacting with great skill and agility to the decline in the popularity of the classical languages as a university subject? And how far can it be said to offer, if not, one hopes, the ultimate, then at least the most reliable, picture of the subject and of the state of scholarship in it, at century's end? On these questions, it must be said, despite some reservations, the new *OCD* is very good. Naturally, everyone will have quibbles, and most people will find mistakes, misprints, judgements with which to disagree (for example, the entry on Aramaic refers to Greek-Aramaic bilingual inscriptions, mentions a Aramaic dialect called Syriac which 'became the main language of the Christian Church of the middle east', and the Mandaic dialect, but somehow fails to notice the existence of the Talmuds, written mainly in Aramaic, two of the most substantial texts in any language to survive from the period before the rise of Islam, and texts which, moreover, are given an entry in this work), articles which are not there and others which should not be there, subjects which if treated at all have not been treated in the right place, and so on. This is the nature of any reference work. But overall, and with the experience of about a year's constant use, one can say that the *OCD*³ conforms to the standards and the norms to which previous editions accustomed users of this fundamental work.

The changes from previous editions are many. Not only are there many more, and many new, contributors. Many articles have been revised (though not all to the same degree. Two of many examples: first, that on Pseudepigraphic Literature, where the revisions are essentially minor and editorial, with the exception of the replacement of the one work listed in the bibliography by one other. It seems a little mean, especially given recent growth in interest in this area. And the relationship of this article to, for example, that on Forgeries, this one completely re-written for the new edition — though in essentials not very different from what it replaces — might have been given more thought. Secondly, Xenocrates, where the original article, by G.C. Field, has been revised by Hornblower, one of the editors: the revision seems to consist in the addition of one reference to the bibliography, and in the change of the word 'fantasies', with reference to later Neoplatonism, to 'constructs'. May we not be nasty even about the later Neoplatonists nowadays? This tendency to blandness is not unique; see below); many others have been re-written entirely, and many new ones have been added. The approaches of the writers of the articles, and those of their editors, have made this a work which will be useful not only to those directly concerned with the ancient world, but also to those in many adjacent fields. Such was not, or not so much, the case with previous editions. The inclusion of numerous articles dealing with the Jews in antiquity, and of references to them in many other articles, reflects not only the great increase in scholarly interest in Jewish

history in the last generation, and its entry into the broader mainstream of historical scholarship, but also the greatly increased awareness in classical studies that not all is Latin or Greek, pagan or, just, Christian, in this area. Similarly, the presence of articles dealing with women and with such topics as sex, in all its forms (Prostitution, secular, now joins Prostitution, sacred, which is the only sort that the second edition could afford to offer us in 1970, at the end of the '60s; and we now have Chastity too), reflects current intellectual and other interests and concerns, as well as the fact that classical scholarship, after a relatively slow beginning, has taken up the study of many areas which until this generation were relegated to the sidelines.

Many new articles, short as well as long, add to the usefulness of the new edition. The list of these itself fills three and a half pages, and includes topics ranging from Abortion through Ashoka, Cannibalism, Literacy and Oplontis to Sanitation, Spices, Vivisection and Xuthus. These include much that is important and useful, in particular in the longer entries. But there are some missed opportunities, or worse. One of the new entries is a welcome article on Egypt, Pre-Ptolemaic. Here we have a cursory account (half a column) of the 29 centuries between the First Dynasty and the Alexandrian conquest in 332; we are told that the division into 31 dynasties derives from Manetho, who wrote, it is true, in Greek (though he was, of course, an Egyptian); and we also have a shortish bibliography on the subject. But the whole piece is completely internal, looked at from the point of view of Egypt itself. We have nothing here at all on Greek views of Egypt before Alexander, on Greek knowledge of Egypt, or on the lively debate (regardless of the view one takes of it) aroused by the writings of Martin Bernal. We are told (in the article on him) that Pythagoras is said to have visited Egypt, but nowhere, so far as I could see, that Plato is too, and Herodotus is not mentioned here at all (though he is referred to as a source of information in the separate article on Egyptian deities). The whole issue of Egyptian-Greek contacts before Alexander seems to have been ignored here. Indeed, it is worth adding that in the article on the city of Naucratis, a revised and expanded version of what appears in the previous edition, the remark that under Saite Pharaohs that city 'became the chief centre of cultural relations between Greece and Egypt' disappears from the overall judgement.

Everyone, as noted earlier, will quibble about different points in this work. Awkwardnesses do occur: thus, under Libraries, a reference to Athenian exports of books to the Black Sea is assorted with a cross-reference to Euxine, but there is nothing there beyond a general reference to trade between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. Slight inconsistencies occur too: the editors devote a long paragraph to the accessibility and spelling of ancient name-forms. Under *Aristeas*, *Letter of*, we have a reference to 'Demetrius (3) of Phalerum' — but there he occurs as coming from Phaleron, and the old harbour of Athens is spelled thus also at its own entry. And R.Tho., who signs the article on Literacy, is presumably a slip for the list of contributors' R[osalind] T[homas]. Misprints there are, though mercifully few (e.g., on p. 113, Justiman, in a cross-reference; and wonderful, under Phlegon of Tralles).

Perhaps the most shaming of these slips and mistakes, however, lies not in the body of the *Dictionary* itself but in the long list of contributors. Here those who rely on this work for reliable information might with some right expect the editors of the ultimate

reference work from Oxford University Press to know that the name of the institution in Oxford, home to 'M.J.E.', on the opposite side of the road from Pembroke is not 'Christ Church College'.

David J. Wasserstein

Tel Aviv University

A Greek and Arabic Lexicon (GALex) Materials for a Dictionary of the Mediaeval Translations from Greek into Arabic. Fascicle 3. (Handbuch der Orientalistik/Handbook of Oriental Studies, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten/The Near and Middle East, XI. Band), edd. G. Endress and D. Gutas, Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill, 1995, pp. [225-320] (+ 32 pp. of insert)

A Greek and Arabic Lexicon (GALex) Materials for a Dictionary of the Mediaeval Translations from Greek into Arabic. Fascicle 4. (Handbuch der Orientalistik/Handbook of Oriental Studies, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten/The Near and Middle East, XI. Band), edd. G. Endress and D. Gutas, Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill, 1997, pp. [321-480] (+ 42 pp. of insert).

These are the third and fourth fascicles of a most important project (earlier fascicles were reviewed in these pages in *Scripta* XII, 1993, pp. 221-2 and *Scripta* XIII, 1994, pp. 207-8). The third fascicle runs from the middle of the entry for the word *aṣl* to the middle of that for *ilā*; and the fourth from *ilā* to *inna*. In addition to the bound pages containing the material arranged according to the Arabic-to-Greek format of the *Dictionary* itself, we also have, with each new fascicle, a separate pamphlet-style insert containing a developing Greek-Arabic glossary, which is up-dated with each new fascicle. This functions as a reverse index to the *Dictionary* as a whole, and can in effect be discarded with the arrival of each new fascicle accompanied by its own up-dated insert. This is a boon, as the pamphlet contains not only the 'Greek-Arabic Glossary', Part B, containing, in the case of Fascicle 3, some 25 pages, but also parts D, 'Index of Variant Greek Passages' (in fasc. 3, three pages), E, 'Index of Variant Arabic Passages' (in fasc. 3, just over two pages), an index of Middle Arabic usage in manuscript readings, and F, an 'Index of Greek Quotations' (in fasc. 3, one page). In Fascicle 4, Part B, the Greek-Arabic Glossary, contains 33 pages, Part D, three and a half pages, Part E, 3 pages, the Index of Middle Arabic usage in manuscript readings one page and Part F, one page also.

We are reminded usefully also that Part C, an 'Index of Greek Proper Names and Words in Transliteration', will appear only at the end of each Arabic letter in the main part of the *Dictionary*. In addition, it is worth reminding readers and users of this work, and in particular librarians and others who might be tempted to bind the fascicles, and in doing so to throw away their paper covers, that the backs of these two fascicles, like those of their predecessors, also contain valuable addenda and corrigenda to the List of Sources, and Additional Abbreviations. Similarly, the fronts indicate who carried out the actual work of compilation and preparation of the individual fascicles. The information carried on these covers is not to be found elsewhere in the fascicles as published, and these sections should therefore by no means be discarded.

It can easily be seen from these figures alone that the development of the *Dictionary* progresses apace, for the comparison between Fascicles 3 and 4, in the indices alone,