

served the needs of the Syrian market — are of great significance to Palmyrene studies. Collectively, these five papers re-evaluate a number of assumptions regarding Palmyra's role in facilitating trade networks across the region and thus make a valuable contribution to Palmyrene studies.

The second group of papers investigate the city of Palmyra itself and its regional context (49–114). In contrast to the previous group, the majority of these contributions are archaeological case-studies or methodological papers, although two papers deviate from this. Firstly, Paola Mior's contribution combines archaeological, geographical and epigraphical data to identify the road from Palmyra to Damascus mentioned in the *Tabula Peutingeriana*, a medieval copy of a possible Roman original map of the region (49–57). This paper will undoubtedly be a useful resource for future work on this topic. Secondly, Pavel Alipov's paper follows the historiographical legacy of Michael Rostovtzeff, particularly focusing on the study of Palmyrene religious cults (87–91). Alipov's contribution is interesting and readable, but it does not sufficiently clarify the impact of this research on Palmyrene studies more broadly. Also of particular note from this second group is the excellent contribution from Christiane Römer-Strehl, who presents an analysis of different cultural influences on Palmyrene pottery and evaluates the impact of this analysis on the question of Palmyrene identity (107–14). She notes that the lack of a 'distinct general Palmyrene style in the ceramics' evidences the flexibility with which the Palmyrenes adopted different styles and thus emphasises the importance of their role as traders to the construction of Palmyrene identity (112). The paper provides another useful viewpoint on Palmyrene trade, and thus complements the first five papers discussed above.

The volume closes with four papers from Japanese scholars, who present archaeological case-studies on tombs and skeletal remains (115–70), and one paper from Knut and Jonatan Krzywinski on the potential for crop production in Palmyra's hinterland in the Byzantine period (171–83). These papers will clearly make an important contribution to Palmyrene studies within their specialist fields.

Palmyrena presents a diverse group of noteworthy papers that are testament to the interdisciplinary research community working at the site before the outbreak of the civil war. Whilst the volume does not have the elegiac quality of Paul Veyne's *Palmyre: l'irremplaçable trésor* (2015) or Annie Sartre-Fauriat and Maurice Sartre's *Palmyre: vérités et légendes* (2016), the many votes of thanks and sympathy throughout the work are nonetheless touching. *Palmyrena* gives a clear sense of the diversity of Palmyrene studies and will continue to be a useful resource for the field moving forward.

Durham University
d.a.maclennan@dur.ac.uk
 doi:10.1017/S0075435818000734

DONALD MACLENNAN

II. LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

- S. HUNT, *STARTING TO TEACH LATIN*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. Pp. x + 193, illus. ISBN 9781472537911 (paper); 9781472537904 (e-book). £24.99.
- H. CULLEN and J. TAYLOR, *LATIN TO GCSE*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016. 2 vols: pp. xviii + 250 (vol. 1); xv + 304 (vol. 2), illus. ISBN 9781780934402 (vol. 1); 9781780934419 (vol. 2). £14.99 (vol. 1); £14.99 (vol. 2).
- E. DICKEY, *LEARNING LATIN THE ANCIENT WAY: LATIN TEXTBOOKS FROM THE ANCIENT WORLD*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Pp. xii + 187. ISBN 9781107093607 (bound); 9781107474574 (paper). £49.99/US\$79.99 (bound); £17.99/US\$29.99 (paper).
- E. P. ARCHIBALD, W. BROCKLISS and J. GNOZA (EDS), *LEARNING LATIN AND GREEK FROM ANTIQUITY TO THE PRESENT* (Yale Classical Studies 37). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. Pp. xii + 234, illus. ISBN 9781107051645 (bound); 9781139990639 (e-book). £60.00/US\$95.00.

Steve Hunt's guide to teaching Latin in (mainly) UK schools falls into three sections. 'Starting to Teach Latin' is an account of where teaching Latin at GCSE stands today, the General Certificate Secondary Education exam being the culmination of at least two years of school study taken at the end of UK school 'Year 11' (= US 'tenth grade'), i.e. when most learners are sixteen. In 'Teaching Language, Civilization and Literature' H. takes us through several case studies of the varied challenges of teaching Latin in schools; 'Resources' offers a critical survey of many (but not all) course books that are available to teachers.

H.'s role here is that of mentor, but the tone is lively and informative: H.'s experience and enthusiasm for the subject are palpable. If I were starting to teach Latin in a UK school, I should like to spend some time with this book, but I feel there is some bias towards the *Cambridge Latin Course* in the second section and some omission in general. I did not get a clear sense of what grammar and vocabulary a student actually needs to acquire in order to thrive at GCSE. More importantly, I felt that half of the GCSE requirement was insufficiently addressed: the 'Literature' component. In its current configuration, half of the qualification depends on a student coming to grips with some 150 lines of original poetry, largely from *Aeneid* 9, and roughly the same quantity of prose adapted from Caesar and Pliny. The prose (produced and published by the same body that administers the exam) is adapted beyond what purists would call recognition. What about the poetry? Two things currently happen. Teachers are tempted to gloss over difficult grammar and vocabulary, and the students take recourse to what they routinely call 'the English': they simply memorise swathes of English that they 'square up with the Latin' in order to deal with it. H. cannot be blamed for not addressing the fact that these students then take this habit into the next stage of school Latin (UK 'A level'), should they continue with the subject. If they then choose to study Classics at university, they end up very ill-equipped to deal with far longer lists of the real thing, and tend to fall back on this depressing habit.

Cullen and Taylor's *Latin to GCSE* offers a very clear alternative to the *Cambridge Latin Course*. While there is no doubt as to the latter's popularity among some students and teachers, some find the 'inductive' method of acquiring grammar and vocabulary infuriating. The course has merits, but it would not be impossible to envision a textbook that fits the GCSE required grammar and vocabulary more efficiently and within a realistic timeframe for a school. This is exactly what C. and T. have done. The two volumes are designed with almost military precision to deliver exactly what the GCSE requires, and the authors should be applauded for this. The textbook is in fact endorsed by the examining body, OCR, and rightly so, especially since it addresses attaining competence in composing simple sentences from English into Latin. Despite some opposition (from Hunt, no less), from 2018 the GCSE will give students the option to answer further grammatical questions or attempt a few sentences in Latin.

My only quibbles with the textbook are: (1) Why no macra, even for the regular endings? Perhaps (in keeping with the minimalist ethos) one can argue that they are, after all, just icing on the cake, and since there is no unseen verse at GCSE a knowledge of macra cannot give anyone an advantage. But most of us will probably want to hear a distinction between *monere* and *regere* right from the beginning. (2) The textbook strikes an excellent balance of grammar, reading and exercise, but it might be nice to see a little more original Latin. Richard LaFleur's *Scribblers, Sculptors and Scribes* (2010) is a superb illustration of what can be done here, even at the simplest level.

There is similar inspiration in Dickey's *Learning Latin*, a kind of practical guide to her edition of the *Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* (2012–15) for the Cambridge 'Orange' series. There is much food for thought here (just over half of *Learning Latin* is from the *Colloquia*), but the overall result is chaotic, and I wonder if her wish that this book 'complement a textbook' (xi) is too ambitious. In many places it seems designed for those with no Latin at all, perhaps a scholar from another discipline. Much of the material here originally featured Ancient Greek and Latin versions of the same idea (e.g. 'a trip to the bank', a brief prose summary of *Iliad* 8) and in most places D. has replaced the Greek with English. I frequently felt keen to see the Greek, and though D. does finally let us see *some* of this, by re-presenting *some* earlier pieces in their original form at the end of the volume, there is no consistent plan, and it is unclear why a single passage was not presented with all three languages in the first place.

At the other end of the spectrum, D. plunges her reader into chunks of Charisius without English translation on the grounds that he 'is not difficult to read' (92); readers who depended on her English at the beginning of the book might disagree. Similarly she feels no compunction about ten full pages of 'texts without word division'; indeed all in upper caps, and Greek without diacriticals. This is all good fun, but I do not see myself using this in a language class. The book strikes me more as a companion to L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson's *Scribes and Scholars* (4th edn, 2013), H.-I.

Marrou's *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité* (1948) or P. Parsons' *City of the Sharp-Nosed Fish* (2007). Yet D. cannot help but warn readers of 'non-standard' Latin throughout the pieces; I felt unconvinced, in many cases. In what may be the book's single error we are warned of a phrase that 'Cicero would have expressed with *quae cum ita sunt*' (69), obviously a typo for *sint*, and of course not found in Cicero. (But it does appear once in Latin: Lucretius 2.859.)

One of the great strengths of the book is the light it sheds on bilingualism and literacy in antiquity: students of imperial literature must read this, or at least be aware of its contents. One highlight for me is the list of 'all ancient Latin-learning materials' (178) at the end, where we find, in a nutshell, Greeks working through Seneca, Sallust, Terence and those workhorses of the curriculum, the *Aeneid* and *In Catilinam* 1. If this was happening in villages, then what was happening in cities?

Archibald, Brockliss and Gnoza have assembled a promising volume, whose table of contents is worth listing:

1. Introduction: "Learning me your language": Elizabeth P. Archibald, William Brockliss, Jonathan Gnoza
2. Papyri and efforts by adults in Egyptian villages to write Greek: Ann Ellis Hanson
3. Teaching Latin to Greek speakers in antiquity: Eleanor Dickey
4. Servius' Greek lessons: Félix Racine
5. Pelagian fountains: learning Greek in the early Middle Ages: Michael W. Herren
6. Out of the mouth of babes and Englishmen: the invention of the vernacular grammar in Anglo-Saxon England: Jay Fisher
7. First steps in Latin: the teaching of reading and writing in Renaissance Italy: Robert Black
8. The teaching of Latin to the native nobility in Mexico in the mid-1500s: contexts, methods, and results: Andrew Laird
9. *Ut consecutivum* under the Czars and under the Bolsheviks: Victor Bers
10. Latin for girls: the French debate: Françoise Waquet
11. Women's education and the classics: Fiona Cox
12. "Solitary perfection?" The past, present, and future of elitism in Latin education: Kenneth J. Kitchell, Jr.
13. Exclusively for everyone – to what extent has the *Cambridge Latin Course* widened access to Latin? Bob Lister
14. Epilogue: Emily Greenwood

Promising, but flawed. While every piece here brings something to the table, I cannot recommend purchasing this book for your personal library; more worth a perusal. The typical piece will offer at least a brief survey of Classical pedagogy within a set of limits, e.g. early England, renaissance Mexico or recent France, but that may be all that will be gleaned. It is to be expected that pieces from a conference will result in an uneven book. So Dickey's chapter is an abbreviated *Learning*; it is no surprise then that neither this chapter references that book nor vice versa. But far the worst offender here is Black's chapter, beginning with an extraordinary note worth quoting in full (99):

This article reproduces pp. 37–9, 40–2, 44–5, and 57–9 of R. Black, *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century*, Cambridge University Press, 2001; pp. 36, 43–4, 54–6, and 58–60 of R. Black, *Education and Society in Florentine Tuscany: Teachers, Pupils and Schools c. 1250–1500*, Brill, 2007; and pp. 107–9 of R. Black, "Italian education: languages, syllabuses, method," in L. Nauta (ed.), *Language and Cultural Change: Aspects of the Study and Use of Language in the Later Middle Ages and Renaissance*, Peeters, 2006.

Beyond the inconsistent abandonment of author-date here (each of these three items is then repeated in the bibliography), this is a nineteen-page piece drawing on twenty-three pages from three separate publications between ten to fifteen years old. At least there is an admission of self-recycling here.

The better pieces here offer stronger voices, for example Cox's women, though I was shocked to find no mention of J. K. Rowling here, a woman who has surely contributed to the enduring popularity of Latin among a generation of children across the world. Bers' chapter oozes with charm and erudition, like everything he writes, and almost redeems the volume: I wish each chapter were like it. Kitchell and Lister both pointedly round on the vital problem of going from beginner's Latin to the real thing:

Is there no room in our world for the student of average ability who simply likes Latin and wishes to continue in it? Is advanced literature study the only goal of our language classes? (Kitchell, 181)

Reading formidably hard authors [...] may be the 'central' point of university courses (though how many undergraduates are likely to agree with that?), but within the constraints of the school curriculum, with state schools lucky to have 240 hours to take pupils from scratch to GCSE, getting the students to a point when they can reach any literature in the original is an achievement. (Lister, 195)

Is it any wonder then, that students resort to memorising 'the English'?

I regret concluding on a negative note, but I doubt I am the only reader who dislikes a footnote that is a mere reference. Such footnotes interrupt the experience of reading. It is clear from this volume that many scholars are still being trained to believe that footnotes, whether reference notes or 'content' notes, make a piece of scholarship more impressive. But a different kind of problem caught my attention with this footnote (166): 'Quotations from *The Tempest* are taken from Shakespeare 2005'. 'Shakespeare 2005' simply seems wrong, and all the style guides deprecate it. And while I appreciate the difficulty of dealing with a dozen authors employing different styles of reference, the bibliography is not pleasant reading. For example:

Butler, S. (1992) *The Way of All Flesh*. London.

Eliot, G. (1980) *The Mill on the Floss*, ed. G. S. Haight. Oxford.

Sayers, D. L. (1979) "The lost tools of learning," *National Review* January 11: 90-9. Reprint from 1947.

(2003) *Gaudy Night*. London.

Shakespeare, W. (2005) *The Tempest*, (eds.) V. Mason Vaughan and A. T. Vaughan. London.

Am I the only reader to wince at such items, not to mention the inconsistencies here?

And haven't we finally reached an age where we can omit the city of publication from a citation, if we did not actually reach that age soon after 1800? I find it extraordinary to include the *city* of publication but not the *press*, neither of which are necessary anyway. (Though I think a good case can be made for including mention of a historically significant series, such as Teubners, OCTs, Budés or Loeb.)

For example:

Le Guin, U. (2008) *Lavinia*. Orlando.

Really?

What then to make of items such as these?

Erasmus, D. (1975) *La Lengua de Erasmo Nuevamente Romançada por Muy Elegante Estilo*, trans. B. Pérez de Chinchon, ed. D. S. Severin. Madrid.

Valadés, D. (1579) *Rhetorica Christiana*. Perugia.

Or to reach back further:

Priscian. (1855-9) *Institutionum Grammaticarum Libri XVIII*, 2 vols., (ed.) H. Keil. *Grammatici Latini* vols. ii, iii. Leipzig.

Scot Eriugena, J. (1993) *Iohannis Scotti Eriugena Carmina*, (ed.) M. W. Herren. *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* 12. Dublin.

Servius Honoratus, M. (1864) *Commentarius in Artem Donati*, (ed.) H. Keil. *Grammatici Latini* 4: 403-48. Leipzig.

And yet further:

Seneca. (1965) *Epistulae Morales Ad Lucilium*, (ed.) L. D. Reynolds, 2 vols. Oxford.

Vergil. (2008) *The Aeneid*, trans. S. Ruden. New Haven and London.

Should the former have been:

Annaeus Seneca, L. etc.?

And while this seems just understandable:

Keil, H. (ed.) (1855–80) *Grammatici Latini*. 8 vols. Leipzig.

this seems wrong:

Migne, J. P. (ed.) (1844–55) *Patrologia Latina*, 217 vols. Paris.

Perhaps the worst offender(s):

Rutilius Namatianus. (2007) *Sur Son Retour*, (ed.) E. Wolff. Paris.

Wolf [sic], E. (ed.) (2007) Rutilius Namatianus. *Sur Son Retour*. Paris.

(It's a Budé, by the way.)

This is not pedantry: this is about understanding — and communicating — Classics. I should have preferred more typos.

Clare College, Cambridge
cw322@cam.ac.uk

CHARLES WEISS

doi:10.1017/S0075435818000230

K. DE TEMMERMAN and K. DEMOEN (EDS), *WRITING BIOGRAPHY IN GREECE AND ROME: NARRATIVE TECHNIQUE AND FICTIONALIZATION*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Pp. xiii + 354. ISBN 9781107129122. £74.99/US\$120.00.

This volume aims to illuminate two broad but related areas: the genre of ancient biography and the issue of 'fictionalization' in narrative literature (xi). It is divided into four parts. The first part (Ancient Biography Revisited) introduces the theoretical basis of the volume. Parts II (Individual Biographies), III (Collective Biographies) and IV (Biographical Modes of Discourse) include papers on a range of authors and texts, including the *Life of Aesop*, Plutarch, Lucian, Philostratus, the Greek translation of Jerome's *Vita Malchi*, Sulpicius Severus, Diogenes Laertius, Suetonius, the *Historia Augusta*, Chion of Heraclea, the Ps.-Hippocratic letters and Heliodorus.

In Part I, the key theoretical point of Koen De Temmerman's ch. 1 is to nuance the distinction between truth and fiction by distinguishing 'fiction' and 'fictiveness'. The former he defines as being untruth which relies upon a contract between writer and reader to establish that the work is not intended to be taken as truth. In contrast, 'fictiveness', he argues, need not operate at the level of the entire text; rather, 'techniques of fictionalization' may exert a transient or localised fictionalising impact (7). These 'fictionalizing techniques' and their functioning in biographical texts are the key focus of the volume, which considers 'how ancient biographical narratives articulate contracts with readers about (non-)fictionality and believability' (13).

This chapter could usefully have made more of an attempt to investigate whether ancient and modern ideas about 'fiction' and 'fictiveness' are entirely the same. In addition, not all of the claims are entirely convincing. De T., for instance, argues that 'metaphorical characterization' (giving the example of likening the biographical subject of the *Life of Aesop* to Thersites) is an index of fictionality on the grounds that it creates a parallel which does not exist outside of the text, but is *constructed* by the narrator and thus confronts the reader with the 'artificiality' of what they read (21). Such a technique may confront the reader with the 'artificiality' of the discourse, but all discourse — fiction and non-fiction — is 'artificial' (in the sense of 'constructed'), so I do not see that this specifically suggests 'fictionalization'.

De T. also claims that 'associations of characters with paradigms almost by definition deviates from factual truth representation and can therefore be labelled instances of fictionalization' (21). It is not clear to me that this is true. Most frequently 'metaphorical characterization' in ancient biography functions to reveal features of the biographical subject. When Plutarch, for instance, likens Pelopidas to Euripides' Kapanews (Plut., *Pel.* 3.5), he is using a particular manifestation of a figure with whom all his readers can be expected to be familiar to make the point that Pelopidas was a wealthy man but not haughty (*gauros*) on that account. The parallel between Euripides' Kapanews and Pelopidas does not exist outside of Plutarch's *Life*, but Pelopidas' wealth and his