

forget the *DRN*'s beginning (1.41–3) when the poet admits that his friend, the noble Memmius, ought to be active on the political stage because times are hard for Rome.

Philodemus is better treated: we do not have a new edition of the *De rhetorica* which might allow us to say something new. It is certainly a good idea not to start as usual with the *De bono rege*. The mention of the *De oeconomia* is more surprising and would have deserved a fuller discussion. What about Xenophon's ideal? On economics in Roman society of the Late Republic see I. Shatzmann, *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics* (Brussels, 1975). With Diogenes of Oenoanda, since R. quite reasonably adopts Ferguson Smith's chronology, he is obviously on ground he knows well (his Ph.D. was on Plutarch).

After the Conclusion R. looks at Epicurean touches in Virgil, Horace and Ovid. It is good to ask Siron's point of view, but the whole might seem deceptive because of its superficiality.

All in all, this is a pleasant book to read, with a positive view of Epicureanism, even if some interpretations suggest the reader should use it carefully.

Université de Nancy 2

YASMINA BENFERHAT
ybenferhat@yahoo.fr

JACOBY ONLINE

WORTHINGTON (I.) (ed.) *Brill's New Jacoby: On-line*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007. Unlimited site licence €730, US\$1080. E-ISSN: 1873-5363.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X09000341

Felix Jacoby published the first three parts of *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (*FGrHist*) between 1923 and 1958. They included the fragments of 856 Greek historians, and a commentary on the first 607 of them. In 1999, Pierre Bonnechere published indexes to these three parts. At the same time, the projected continuation of Jacoby's work (*FGrHist Continued*) produced its first fruits, namely the first fascicles of Part IV (Biography and Antiquarian Literature), published from 1998 onwards under the direction of Guido Schepens.

All the above was published originally only in print form. More recently, however, the three first parts (but not the continuation) have appeared in electronic form. First, in 2005 Brill produced a CD-ROM edition of Jacoby's volumes and Bonnechere's indexes, then, even more recently, promoted *Jacoby Online*, an online edition of the same three parts. The latter also includes a biography of Jacoby and an overview of his work on historical fragments, with some remarks on his editorial practices by Mortimer Chambers. However, unlike the CD-ROM edition, the online version does not include Bonnechere's indexes. Both electronic editions nevertheless have some obvious advantages compared with the print form, since they allow searchable access to the equivalent of some fifteen printed volumes.

In addition to these innovations with the 'old' Jacoby (*FGrHist*), Brill have another project under way with a 'new' Jacoby (*BNJ*). Under the chief-editorship of I. Worthington, it involves only those fragments which have already been edited by Jacoby, that is parts I–III. Not involved in this electronic edition are the volumes being produced as part of the continuation of Jacoby (IV–V). As such, *BNJ* claims to be a new edition of *FGrHist*, with a revised text, an up-to-date commentary, and the

innovation of a facing English translation (as also in *FGrHist Continued*). Since Jacoby did not have time to comment on numerous historians before his death (nos 608–856), the commentary is in fact a first in many instances. In addition, *BNJ* provides for each author an encyclopaedia-style biography and an updated bibliography.

The final product will cover Jacoby's 856 entries, plus new authors advertised by W. It is also planned that *BNJ* should exist in three forms: online, in hard copy and on CD-ROM. What is currently available is the online version, which is itself still not complete: in November 2008, only around 260 names of historians were displayed. The present review is therefore of that partial version.

It should be noted that most of the available historians have a very limited corpus of fragments. Many have only one fragment (e.g. Agaklytos, Agathokles, Agesilaos, Aieluros, Alexarchos), or even one *testimonium* (e.g. Diogenes of Sikyon, Xenophanes of Kolophon, Xenophon of Ephesos, Zenobia). Some have a more substantial corpus (e.g. Antisthenes of Rhodos: 3 *testimonia* and 9 fragments; Isidoros of Charax: 3 *testimonia* and 19 fragments). Among these 'big pieces', some appear to take advantage of recently published studies: thus the *BNJ* version of the *Lindian Chronicle*, by Carolyn Higbie, looks like an abridged version of part of her book *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greeks' Creation of their Past* (Oxford, 2003), which published a text of the inscription with commentary. Another slightly different example: Krateros the Macedonian (21 fragments), by Edwin Carawan, appears to make use of Donatella Erdas' *Cratero il Macedone* (2002), an edition with translation and detailed commentary on each fragment (plus a general introduction on Krateros). More original, it seems, are the *BNJ* studies of Strabo's *Historical Commentaries* (19 fragments, by Duane W. Roller), Megasthenes (8 *testimonia*, 34 fragments, also by Roller), and Kritias of Athens' *Politeiai* (16 *testimonia*, 42 fragments, by William S. Morison). Note that the latter work was not included in *FGrHist* I–III; Morison suggests that 'the reason is unknown', although in fact Jacoby planned to include Kritias' *Politeiai* in a later volume, and it will now be included in *FGrHist Continued* IV C, edited by G. Schepens (cf. G. Schepens & J. Bollansée, 'Frammenti di *politeiai*, *nomoi* e *nomima*. Prolegomeni ad una nuova edizione', in S. Cataldi [ed.], *Poleis e Politeiai*, Alessandria, 2004, pp. 259–85). Perhaps the inclusion of Kritias' fragments in *BNJ* are not fully consistent with the advertised project. It is nevertheless an interesting contribution.

So what is 'new' in these available pieces of the *Brill's New Jacoby*, when compared with the old *FGrHist*?

Worthington mentions 'new readings of many of Jacoby's Greek texts'. Perhaps I was unlucky, but I must confess that I did not observe substantial improvements in that field. Worse: the reader is not told exactly where the Greek text comes from. If we take the case of Megasthenes, it seems that – with the exception of the Armenian text of Eusebius' *Chronique* – we are offered a pure reproduction of Jacoby's text. As such we might lament that philological progress in the last half-century has not been taken into account. For example, Megasthenes' F4 (= Diodorus 2.35–42) gives Jacoby's text. This means, first, that we are given the text as produced by Vogel, with embedded editorial corrections, suppressions and choices (by Vogel and Jacoby), some of which have since been contested. What is worse, the reader will not suspect any of this without going back to Jacoby. In that case, would it not be better to read Jacoby's text itself? Secondly, *BNJ* reprints Jacoby's square brackets, which he used to indicate phrases which he thought came from Diodorus and not from Megasthenes. The recent edition of Diodorus Book 2 by Bernard Eck (CUF, 2003)

could have been helpful here. For example at 2.35.1, Eck retains the word *σχεδόν*, which is in most manuscripts, and which makes Diodorus say that the Indus is 'le plus grand, ou presque, de tous les fleuves après le Nil'. As Eck explains (n. 3 on p. 65, at p. 166), according to two other passages of Megasthenes, the Ganges is bigger than the Indus, so that all three fragments perfectly converge, and there is no reason either to think that Diodorus deviates from Megasthenes, or to use square brackets. Instead, Jacoby followed the old editors who had rejected *σχεδόν* and had supposed that this description did not go back to Megasthenes. The *BNJ* reproduces this strange decision without taking into account recent studies on Diodorus' text.

Another oddity concerns the apparatus criticus. It sometimes appears in footnotes, and is at times brought up to date (e.g. Athenaios F1), but usually there is no apparatus at all (e.g. for Megasthenes). For Krateros the Macedonian, the *BNJ* only gives two variants for four testimonia and more than 20 fragments. A comparison with the editorial practices of Erdas' edition is revealing.

Instances of advances in the editing of texts may have escaped my attention, but I must confess that I am not so far convinced that, as W. has asserted, '[these] new texts of the authors will become the standard ones' (*BMCR* 2005.09.24). Any comparison will generally be in favour either of the old Jacoby or of more recent editions.

A second feature of the *BNJ* is certainly an innovation when compared with *FGrHist*, namely the provision of facing English translations of the Greek fragments and *testimonia*. This ought to be an improvement, and not only for readers with no Greek, since translation is an important part of the interpretative process. There are however two possible reservations: first, as seen above, the translated text is not always satisfactory (cf. point 1); secondly, the accuracy of the translation is variable, and Greek words are sometimes omitted (e.g. omitted words in the translations of Strabo T2 and F6; T1 *φιλόσοφος* translated as 'scholar'; F6, where *χρήματα* is sometimes translated 'wealth', sometimes 'funds', which might be misleading for a non-Greek reader).

W. is certainly right to see in the commentaries 'the scholarly heart of *BNJ*' (*BMCR* 2005.09.24). Each testimonium and each fragment has its own commentary. In addition, for each author there is a 'biographical essay' and a bibliography. These are new and valuable contributions to the interpretation of many historians. See for example the excellent commentary on the two fragments of Alexis by Alexis D'Hautcourt – an example which proves that the *BNJ* is especially interesting for authors with a very restricted corpus of fragments. Moreover, the *BNJ* provides for the first time commentary on texts that Jacoby did not cover before his death (e.g. Megasthenes). The commentary is sometimes precise and rich, literary and historical, with references to ancient or recent discussions. However:

(a) There is no general harmony in the type and style of commentary. For example the commentary on the Archias of Antioch testimonia consists in (very useful) footnotes on various details, while other commentaries seem conversely to include unnecessary information (e.g. in the commentary on Xenophanes of Kolophon's T1, Jan Stronk tells us what happened to Elea/Velia in Roman times). Many others comment closely on the fragment in question.

(b) More disturbingly, the commentary usually neglects to take into account the nature of the commented texts. With the exception of papyrus fragments, these are usually not a product of direct tradition, but rather adaptations which sometimes include heterogeneous material. As such they pose problems with regard to the definition of a fragment's limits and so on. Despite the recent studies which have

emphasised these problems, many commentaries in the *BNJ* take into account neither the context of quotation nor the methods and intent of the transmitting author. There are exceptions, such as Paola Ceccarelli on Athenaios, or Duane W. Roller on Megasthenes. In the last case, the commentary has many valuable features: it takes into consideration the transmitting author and the context of the citation, sheds light on historical aspects, and has bibliographical references. Furthermore, although there is no separate and systematic apparatus criticus, some emendations are included in the commentary on the fragment (e.g. T2b) and even in the text of the translation (e.g. F3b).

(c) Despite disparities, one point seems to be clear in the case of every historian covered: the *BNJ* does not pretend to offer a monograph on each author. It is not a real rival of editions such as those published in the collection *I Frammenti degli storici greci* or *FGrHist Continued* (see above on Critias): these are different products and somewhat complementary projects, as will appear if one compares *il Cratere* of Donatella Erdas with *Krateros* in the *BNJ*. There will be readers who will be glad to find in the *BNJ* a rather concise version. For example, Carolyn Higbie gives in the *BNJ* a partial and abridged version of her book on the Lindian Chronicle, and it could be useful for a reader to begin with this. This should not prevent the user from reading, after that, Higbie's additional commentaries and chapters of synthesis in her book. But in other cases, will more extensive research have been undertaken beforehand?

Finally, the *BNJ* on line has, as an electronic tool, considerable practical advantages: first, it is less bulky than some fifteen volumes in print, volumes which require something like an initiation before use; secondly, one can browse and search, copy and paste, and exploit many links either internal to *BNJ* or external to *FGrHist*, or the *New Pauly* on line. It is stated that the bibliography will be regularly updated. Perhaps the electronic form could allow some other improvements. It would also be useful for the reader to know in each case the date of publication and of the last updating.

I should say that I regret the need to express some serious reservations on the outcome, because the *BNJ* is a huge project for which one ought to admire the determination of both W. and Brill. It will certainly provide a search tool for fragmentary historians. Will it become 'the new standard reference work on the Greek historical fragments', and 'completely supersede the traditional 18-volume set known to classical scholars', as proclaimed on the Brill website? I have expressed my doubts concerning the editing of the text and the methodology used in tackling the fragments. In the same way, the reference value of the translation and commentary will probably differ on a case by case basis, and will depend on the potential availability of monographs on any given historian. It should be noted that the present edition does not include important figures such as Theopompos, Ephoros, Philochoros, Posidonios, Apollodoros of Athens and many other authors, study of whom would require many years of philological and historical work. Perhaps an optimistic view would allow for the possibility of changes and improvements to the electronic form, not only because the corpus is not yet completed, but also because, technically speaking, what has already been done could in some ways be revised.

Université de Strasbourg

DOMINIQUE LENFANT
dominiquelenfant@free.fr