

EDITORIAL

For the first time since 2000, the number of items in an issue has topped 200; as usual, the multitude and range testify to the vitality of the discipline. Currently popular areas can be identified at a glance. In history and archaeology, regional studies are clearly very much a growth area: in this issue, for example, the reader will find reviews of publications on the Corinthian Gulf, northern Caria, Acarnania, the Veneto, western Calabria, central Spain, and southern Spain (pp. 220–6, 274–80). Social and economic history are strong (pp. 249–58), as are studies of identity and political concepts (pp. 198–200, 202–9). Amid an average-sized haul of books on Greek drama, we find a scholar (J. Holzhausen, rev. J. Gibert) prepared to question the notion that revenge was always a positive value for the Greek audience (p. 25), and a ‘remarkable’ book on the image of Athens in tragedy (J. Grethlein, rev. A. Michelini, p. 33). We review two commentaries on books of the *Aeneid* by Nicholas Horsfall, and two volumes of the new Budé Lucian by Jean Bompaire. There are commentaries on Homer (one on the complete *Iliad* and one on *Il. 2*), and on works of Empedocles, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, fragments of Stesichorus and satyric drama, Philostratus, Dio of Prusa, Cicero, Horace, Ovid, Seneca, the *Pervigilium Veneris*, Lactantius, and Jerome. Jeremy Trevett ranks the first volume of M. R. Dilts’s new OCT of Demosthenes as ‘a fine achievement’ (p. 52). Those who turn their attention to late Latin will learn from Roger Green (p. 163) that ‘good commentaries on Juvenecus are becoming more numerous’. Ancient philosophy continues to flourish: Plato, the Old Academy, Aristotle, Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics, and Neoplatonists are all represented (pp. 53–72, 91–7). Works dealing with epigraphy in this issue are few but important: Rhodes and Osborne’s *Greek Historical Inscriptions* (p. 315) will be on every Greek historian’s shelf, and there are also major studies of the Lindian Chronicle (p. 319) and of Greek and Roman funerary inscriptions (p. 324). Late antiquity and early Christian history attract the now customary degree of attention (pp. 290–300).

In particular, it is interesting to observe scholars working independently on the same or closely related topics. One may note, for example, a book aiming to recover the femininity of Ovid’s heroines, which may be placed beside that of Effrosini Spentzou (reviewed in *CR* 54.2 [2004], 390–2); and whereas the last issue reviewed a work comparing Greek with Indian thought (*CR* 54.2 [2004], 420–3), this time the spotlight turns on comparison with China (G. Lloyd and N. Sivin, rev. C. H. Kahn, p. 183). In the present issue, we include reviews of a book on childhood in Greece and of another on childhood in Rome (pp. 211 and 300); two books on Roman popular culture, one more literary, the other more artistic, are juxtaposed (pp. 311–15); there are two books on the survival and reception of Greek tragedy (pp. 35–8); and a collection of essays on ‘Ancient Anger’ sits comfortably next to another on the ‘Rivalrous Emotions’ (pp. 178–82). Certain debates continue through several published works and, in time, may be able to be chronicled from the pages of *CR*: for example, reflection on commentary-writing, which came to the fore in *CR* 53.2 (2003), 472–4 and was given special prominence in *CR* 54.1 (2004), 5–12, continues here on pp. 169–71.

A glance through our pages will reveal many collaborative volumes that started life as conferences, colloquia, symposia, and other scholarly gatherings. Conference volumes frequently come in for standard criticisms, and our reviewers often point to a

lack of coherence, but this is not by any means true in every case. In this issue, there are several obviously well-thought-out collections of this kind. Sometimes the unifying factor is a distinguished honorand: Brian Shefton in the case of Kathryn Lomas's volume on the Western Greeks (p. 202), the late George Forrest in the case of the volume edited by Peter Derow and Robert Parker on Herodotus (p. 44). There is a collection on Epicurus, and another on the emotions in Hellenistic philosophy (pp. 70, 175). Also well received are the proceedings of the third International Conference on the Ancient Novel (held at Groningen in 2000) (p. 87), the proceedings of an Erice seminar on grammatical texts (p. 165), a collection of papers on medical 'actions and gestures' (p. 186), and the 'small book with a big title and subject range' arising from the second Nordic Symposium on Gender and Women's History in Antiquity (p. 296)—this last, extending from the Bronze Age to Byzantium, evidently shows that wide-ranging volumes do not always strike reviewers as diffuse. A social historian examining all these examples of cooperative enterprise would soon find it necessary to question the traditional 'lone scholar' model of classical research.

In any issue, a number (usually quite small) of the reviews that we commission turn out to be strongly critical of the books they discuss, and this can lead to complaints from authors who feel that their work has suffered unjustly. It can be particularly discouraging for younger scholars to receive an unfavourable or unconstructive review from a more senior member of the profession, especially when academic institutions accord weight to reviews of publications when considering applications for promotion and so on. If—as in an ideal world we might wish to—we were to publish authors' replies to reviews, we would have to treat everyone equally and offer space in each issue to any of 200 authors whose work was reviewed last time; constrained as we are by the limitations of the printed word, we clearly cannot do this. The most that we can do is to pass on the author's comments (if asked) to the reviewer, and to correct serious misrepresentations of fact if any occur (as far as we can see, they are very rare). As editors, we certainly do not go out of our way to find unsympathetic reviewers; but it is not our place to decide between a reviewer and an author when they disagree, since in any particular case we are likely to be personally less expert than either. It may turn out in the course of time that the author's views win general assent against those of the reviewer—and we say this without intending the least disrespect to the distinguished and ever-growing company of those who review for us.

Whatever view one takes of these matters, perhaps most of us can agree on one thing at least: the views of every scholar, however senior or junior and at however glamorous or obscure an academic institution, are likely in practice to be questioned sooner or later—that is, if they are at all interesting. If a review journal undertook to protect scholars from questioning of this kind, it would indeed betray a paradoxical understanding of its own rôle. Reviewers should of course treat authors with respect as fellow-professionals (indeed, most academic reviewers are themselves academic authors, so they should know what it feels like); it is equally important for us to retain the confidence of our readers, who would not thank us if we tried to place limitations on the candour with which reviewers could express their opinions.

Royal Holloway, University of London

J. G. F. POWELL

National University of Ireland, Maynooth

J. H. D. SCOURFIELD

doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni001