

adolescent discovery of sex in *Daphnis and Chloe* might be an example. Anderson writes, rather, of Longus that "we now know that he closely follows authentic oriental versions of the Dumuzi-Tammuz story" (p. 27). Only the barest nod is given to the issue of transmission: we cannot now know in what forms or over how long a period of time this occurred. Anderson is unconcerned with any questions of particular literary form, language, or cultural context.

This book is written with the excitement of discovery, conditioned, on recurrent occasions, by acknowledgement of the complexity of the subject and presentation of these as probes in a new field of inquiry. It does not, however, address, much less settle, the questions raised by Rohde, or that of the three versions of the Ass story. Haag's *The Novel in Antiquity* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1983, rev. by G. Sandy in *CO*, 61 [1984], 136) remains unrivaled as the standard secondary source on Graeco-Roman fiction.

CARL C. SCHLAM
Ohio State University

Aristotle's Theory of Moral Insight. By T. ENGBERG-PEDERSEN. New York: Clarendon Press, Oxford Univ. Press, 1983. Pp. x and 291. Cloth. \$42.00.

There is an especially pressing teaching need for a good philosophical commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics*. This book does not produce such a commentary, though it is nonetheless the right kind of book. It takes as its starting point much of the work done in the last forty years by chiefly Anglo-American scholars. Certainly the time is ripe for such synthetic studies. Unfortunately, the book is seriously flawed and cannot be recommended to readers. They would do better to spend their energy (and money) on Cooper's *Reason and the Human Good* or Rorty's collection *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics* (the closest we have yet to the commentary we need).

E.-P.'s book is full of stylistic solecisms not unexpected in a writer for whom English is not a first language, but shocking to find Oxonian sub-editors passing. The book aims "to determine what, in Aristotle's ethical theory, moral goodness consists in." We are told this will be done by examining the concepts of *phronesis* and *praxis*. In fact, the concept of *eudaimonia* turns out to be foundational for both of these other concepts; moreover, *phronesis* is only one (not the most basic) element in moral virtue. *Phronesis* provides "a conceptualisation of the element of desire that is provided by virtue of character" (127) and it is the desiderative element which supplies the motive force for action and also provides detailed knowledge of what to do in particular circumstances. Accordingly, the real foci of this book are the concepts of *eudaimonia* and of desire. It thus remains unclear that E.-P. has clearly grasped the logical structure of his own investigation. Worse still, the treatment of *eudaimonia* makes no substantive advance on those of Ackrill, Cooper, or Irwin, and is considerably less convincing.

The quality of the argumentation and the philosophical analysis is generally poor. Moreover, one is left with the impression that the author is more concerned to make clear to us what are his views, rather than what are Aristotle's views. Important sections of Aristotle's own arguments and conceptual analyses are left without comment (especially in the pivotal arguments of EN I.7), and detailed treatments of minor points are substituted. Issues about the validity of Aristotle's own arguments seldom arise where they ought to, and thus their philosophical purposes remain obscured. All in all, a disappointing offering.

RICHARD T. McCLELLAND
Seattle Pacific University

Sources for Ancient History. By MICHAEL CRAWFORD, ed. *The Sources of History: Studies in the Uses of Historical Evidence*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983. Pp. xii and 238. Cloth. \$13.95.

This volume is part of a series, edited by G.R. Elton, aiming "to present to students and readers of history some understanding of the materials from which history must be written and of the problems which they raise" (dustjacket). There are four chapters: Literature, by Emilio Gabba; Epigraphy, by Fergus Millar; Archaeology, by Anthony Snodgrass; and Numismatics, by Michael Crawford. All of these end with brief bibliographies except for Millar's (no reason for this omission is given). At the end of the book is an index of names (all ancient except for those of Jeanne Robert and the late Louis Robert) and an index of subjects, each a page and a half long.

The chapters are of diverse structure. Gabba takes the reader through literature by genres and authors, not only historians but all sorts of other authors, though coverage of some is of necessity sketchy. Christian literature gets three pages, legal sources a wholly inadequate one and a half. Gabba's exposition is always lucid and balanced, uniting imagination about the possibilities with caution in the face of the limitations. Millar spends a bit more than half of his chapter on illustrating, mostly by noteworthy examples, the range of inscriptions: language, place, date, types, information. The reader gets a good notion of what a scholar with some imagination can do with remarkable texts. Then comes a section on "inscriptions in bulk" about categories and their contributions. Millar writes very much as an historian, and epigraphical technique is given little space. Overall, the anecdotal tack seems to me successful in conveying at least why one reads inscriptions.

Snodgrass could not offer a greater contrast to what precedes, especially to Gabba. Instead of an object-oriented survey, he proceeds (after an excellent introduction to archaeology, setting out where it touches history and where it is different from it) by types of historical study affected by archaeology; chronology, political and institutional history, military history, economic and social history, and cultural history. This chapter strikes me as throughout not only sensible but often brilliant, as well as a pleasure to read. Crawford's concluding essay had in some ways the hardest task, and his reaction to it has been to write an essay on numismatic technique. And so we hear about coin finds (especially hoards), die links, overstrikes and countermarks, production techniques, weight standards, style and chronology, types and legends. What we don't learn is why anyone would bother with all this work. The same L. Robert cited approvingly by Crawford (p. 228) would have been aghast at the short shrift (two pages) given to types and legends, from which we learn so much.

Except for the deficiencies of the last chapter, this book will provide students, whether undergraduate or graduate, with a good introduction to the sources I have mentioned. But—where is the rest? Crawford's introduction proclaims that "often the most important evidence is that drawn from the well-documented practice of another age or society." Then where is geography, or anthropology, or any other useful related discipline? Crawford tells us that the papyri "may . . . enormously deepen our knowledge of the ancient world." Then where are they? Dismissed (p. 82) by Millar because of the "marked geographic bias in the evidence they present" (unlike Thucydides, one supposes?). The vacuous treatment of that rich mine, the legal sources, has already been mentioned. Where are those fascinating and dramatic documents, the records of church councils? Where are the modern travellers in classical lands? These and other lacunae are

not merely the inevitable omissions of any work with limited space. They are signs of an unwillingness to take seriously the complexity of the ancient historian's task or the areas in which a large part of recent progress has been made. That Crawford's own chapter is so purely numismatic and so little historical is also symptomatic. In sum, the editor betrays a wholly inadequate idea of what an historian does. It is a pity that the value of its contents should thus be marred by a faulty conception of the book as a whole. One will want students to read these essays, but not to take this book at its self-valuation.

ROGER S. BAGNALL
Columbia University

Seneca: Apocolocyntosis. By P.T. EDEN, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1984. Pp. xii and 169. Cloth, \$34.50; paper, \$12.95.

P.T. Eden's attractive new edition of Seneca the Philosopher's most startling work, the *Apocolocyntosis*, in the "Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics" series will be welcomed by students and teachers of Silver-Age Latin and of the turbulent Claudian and Neronian eras in Roman history as well as serious Senecan scholars and *aficionados* of Roman satire. Displaying the expertly edited Latin text and a brilliant new English translation on facing pages, and also including a reasonably full *apparatus criticus* at the foot of each page of

Latin and a well-written commentary at the end of the text, this volume will lend itself to a variety of uses on different levels and in different kinds of classes.

Among the interesting topics tackled by Eden in his twenty-six-page introduction are the origin and significance of the title, which he renders as "Gourdification," the date of composition (probably in the last months of A.D. 54), the question of authorship, and the function of this unusual writing, which "has been thought by some meanly unworthy of Seneca's image as a serious philosopher." Reviewing the previous scholarship on these questions, Eden concludes that this controversial satire must have been written shortly after the death of Claudius in October, A.D. 54, by "a man of exceptional artistic virtuosity, with a detailed knowledge of the events of Claudius' reign, and a malicious animosity towards Claudius himself," a man who must have been "Seneca, and . . . nobody else." He suggests that it was written probably not for immediate publication under the author's name but for "recitation before a select audience," namely "Nero and his intimates," at the Saturnalia in mid-December in the year of Claudius' death, "to make of Claudius an example to Nero of how not to govern." Observing that the strange title, a word which is found only in a passage written by Dio Cassius (60.35.2ff.) more than a century later, appears nowhere in the satire, Eden concludes that it was coined by Seneca as a "jocular and inexplicit afterthought."

Also included in the introduction are discussions of Menippean satire and the literary background of Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, various *testimonia* and the transmission of the

A.C.L./N.J.C.L.

1987

NATIONAL LATIN EXAM

P.O. Box 95, Mt. Vernon, VA 22121

- The Tenth National Latin Exam sponsored jointly by the American Classical League and the National Junior Classical League is open to all students enrolled in Latin I, II, III, IV, and V.
- The National Association of Secondary School Principals has placed the ACL/NJCL National Latin Exam on the Advisory List of National Contests and Activities.
- Gold and silver medals and certificates are awarded to winners.
- An application for National Latin Exam Scholarships of \$1,000 each will be mailed to 1987 Gold Medal winners in Latin III, IV, or V who are high school seniors and plan to take at least one year of college Latin or Greek.
- There are forty multiple choice questions on the exam.
- Categories include grammar, mythology, derivatives, literature, Roman life and history.
- The exam is to be administered during the period March 9-13 in each school. Awards are sent to the principal the last week in April.
- Cost: \$2.00 per student to be sent with the application.
- Applications are sent to ACL members by the ACL office at Miami University in mid-October.
- Deadline for receipt of applications is January 10, 1987.
- Any requests for information should be sent to ACL/NJCL National Latin exam, P.O. Box 95, Mount Vernon, Virginia 22121, and must be accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

N.L.E. Committee: Jane Hall, Chairman, West Potomac H.S., Alexandria, VA; Sally Davis; Linda Sharrard Montross; Martha Abbott; Maureen O'Donnell; Christine Sleeper

Consultants: Glenn Knudsvig; John Latimer; James Minter; Scholarship Chairman, Bobby La Boue