

Plutarch's complicatedly explicit ways of proclaiming that Sparta and Rome are cities that owe a significant portion of their beginnings to divinely ordained origins. Drawing a conclusion similar to Roskam's, Van der Stockt sees Plutarch as a promoter of the *civitas Dei* as a realm of justice, not on earth, but in heaven, and thus one to be aspired to, though unlikely to be achieved.

T. Whitmarsh concludes Part 3 by examining what Plutarch says about religion in a contemporary city, as opposed to a city of divine providence. Admittedly, Whitmarsh does not talk so much of religion *of the city* specifically, but mostly about how Plutarch's *On Superstition* fits into a larger sacro-political discussion of divine belief, stressing the work as a nuanced attack on Epicurean thinking on the gods. Whitmarsh also makes a strong argument that *deisidaimonia* ('superstition') extends beyond philosophical haggling to a warning against alien cults, including, specifically, Judaism. The work, as Whitmarsh provocatively argues, makes an impromptu push for proper piety in the face of both philosophical and foreign religious threats.

In the afterword Athanassaki presents elements that are amenable for future research. Her discussion on the relationship among 'Autopsy, Emotions, and Composition' strikes me as a particularly apt direction. Other areas highlighted are 'Ritual and Politics', 'Plutarch and His Sources' and, adding a brief expansion to the most intriguing section of Mossman's essay, Plutarch's use of 'Civic Art'.

*Plutarch's Cities* is a comprehensive discussion of myriad aspects of Plutarch's thinking and presentation of cities. While not quite every essay ideally fits the theme, the dynamic ways of looking at cities of the present, past and intellectual spheres in Plutarch's works makes this collection a thorough, important and highly valuable one.

Bowdoin College

MICHAEL NERDAHL

[mnerdahl@bowdoin.edu](mailto:mnerdahl@bowdoin.edu)

## ARRIAN'S *EKTAXIS* – TEXT, TRANSLATION, COMMENTARY

CAMPBELL (D.B.) *Deploying a Roman Army. The Ektaxis kat' Alanōn of Arrian*. Pp. xiv + 214, figs, map. Glasgow: Quirinus Editions, 2022. Paper, £15.99, €18.80, US\$20. ISBN: 979-8-80386862-0.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X2300149X

Scholarship on Graeco-Roman military writing has long struggled to categorise Arrian's Ἔκταξις κατὰ Ἀλανῶν (*Acies contra Alanos*), a curious amalgam of literary essay and operational memorandum, concerning a campaign he undertook, as legate of Cappadocia, against invading Alans in c. 135 CE. Defective textual transmission exacerbates interpretative challenges posed by idiosyncratic form, language and content, and uncertain compositional setting. This opusculum has rarely lacked scholarly interest, including recent translations into several languages, but C. now provides the first formal commentary, with a revised text and English translation.

In a succinct, well-written introduction C. clarifies what is known or commonly believed about Arrian's career and writings, and locates the *Ektaxis* in historical, geostrategic and literary-cultural contexts. C. accentuates the influence of Xenophon's

*Cyropaedia*, which accounts for stylistic features and coheres with Arrian's broader authorial persona, even if *imitatio Xenophontis* is not a compelling end in itself. A description of the unique manuscript, mid tenth-century *Laurentianus plut.* 55.4 (F), outlines its history from 1491, when Janus Lascaris acquired the codex in Greece for the Medici, though understandable brevity potentially distorts (pp. 20–1). The preceding era is not entirely 'a mystery': interstitial annotations (11<sup>v</sup>, 12<sup>r</sup>, 197<sup>v</sup>, 255<sup>v</sup>), dated 1408–50, place F in the possession of the Lascaris Leontares family, a distinguished military-gubernatorial lineage. The implied transfer of F from Lorenzo de' Medici to his son Giovanni (later Pope Leo X) elides the reality that Lorenzo died before F arrived in Italy in 1492, while Giovanni acquired it, by purchase, only in 1508. F is not 'to this day found' in Michelangelo's *plutei*, but stored in a modern vault. The discussion (pp. 23–4) of the removal of single folios at 180|181 (beginning of Arrian's *Technē taktikē*) and 199|200 (end of Arrian's *Ektaxis*) follows older scholarship in identifying reuse of blank parchment as the likeliest motive. This would be unsurprising, given the well-resourced copyist's practice of starting each work on a new recto or verso. However, viewed in a wider context of F having lost at least 51 folios, these two instances become less remarkable. C. describes the minuscule script as 'difficult to read . . . as it incorporates various idiosyncratic ligatures and abbreviations'. On the contrary, the text is clearly written; ligatures are rare and unexceptional; abbreviations are virtually absent. Regarding eight *recentiores*, C. largely rehearses A. Dain's analysis (1934); subsequent research, notably on F's earliest descendant, *Parisinus gr.* 2522, is omitted.

C.'s account of pioneering scholarship, editions and translations is meticulous and intrinsically useful. One could add A.K. Nefedkin's annotated Russian translation (*Stratum plus* 1999.3). In particular, C. outlines the genesis of J. Scheffer's *editio princeps* of Arrian's two military treatises, printed, with Maurice's *Strategicon*, in Uppsala in 1664. Although based on É. Bigot's transcription of F, Scheffer's mistaken identification of a *Mediolanensis* left generations of scholars assuming a 'lost' codex, until Dain (1934) unravelling this puzzle. C. reasons that Bigot 'provided Scheffer with a copy of a Milan codex in connection with his edition of Maurice, thus explaining the Swedish scholar's confusion' (p. 25). In his preface, however, Scheffer merely remarks that Bigot offered him Arrian's military writings 'cum de cura nostra in Mauricium intellexisset' (in fact, the *editio princeps* of Maurice printed under Scheffer's name is a collation prepared by L. Holste in Rome in the 1640s/50s: now *Upsaliensis gr.* 43).

C.'s text of Arrian's *Ektaxis* is a carefully considered revision of A.G. Roos's Teubner edition (1928; rev. G. Wirth 1968), based on C.'s consultation of F and judicious appraisal of, seemingly, all readings and conjectures offered since the *editio princeps* (and sometimes before), though a critical text begins with A. Eberhard 1885 (revising R. Hercher 1854), who first utilised F directly. In some respects, C.'s apparatus more accurately charts the editorial history, while refraining from a recent tendency to accumulate irrelevant variants in *recentiores*. The absence of line numbers hinders in longer passages, especially when unconventional sequencing places preferred readings after rejected alternatives. Prior editorial interventions are inconsistently indicated: few are parenthesised in the text; most are signalled only in the apparatus. Divergences from Roos are mostly minor or cosmetic. C. is sensitive to Arrian's Atticism (e.g. 2: ἐπὶ δυοῖν K. Müller [cf. 1.1, 1.2], preferred to ἐπὶ δύο F, Roos), but eschews automatic Atticising (e.g. 1.2: δεκάδαρχοι F [cf. *Anab.* 7.23.3; *Tact.* 42.1] against Attic/Xenophontic δεκάδαρχοι Eberhard). C. admits several emendations that improve Roos' text: e.g. 2: ὅσπερ Scheffer/Roos > ὡσπερ F; 25.1: θειασταί F > ὀπλίται M. Pavkovic; 26.2: λόγχαζ F > λουπάζ Rance. Misprints and errors are rare: 2: αὐτοί > αὐτοῖ. 18: prints Βοσπορανῶν without registering that F reads Βοσποριανῶν (Roos), despite 3.3: Βοσπορανοί

F (Roos); both forms are valid. 21: text and apparatus misreport αὐτῆς (Attic contr. ἐαυτῆς) in F, correctly αὐτῆς. 25.2: emendation of Attic ξυμμαχικοῦ F to συμμαχικοῦ (Eberhard) seems procrustean, given erratically transmitted ξυμ-/συμ- across Arrian's writings. 26.2: λουπάς > λουπάς 31.3: ταῖς πελέκεσιν F, corrected τοῖς (Eberhard/Roos).

Previous translations, some widely criticised (B. Bachrach 1973; J. DeVoto 1993), show the difficulties of rendering Arrian's diction and syntax, typified by paratactic sequences of third-person imperatives and imperatival infinitives. C.'s translation is clear and accurate, balancing precision and readability, and exposing many shortcomings in its predecessors. Only refinements are suggested: 10: τοὺς δὲ ἐν κόσμῳ ἰόντας, 'those who are <proceeding> in good order'. 12.2: ἐν τοιῷδε is arguably circumstantial rather than locative. 17: εἰς ἀκοντισμὸν προβεβλήσθων τοὺς κοντοῦς, 'thrust their lances forward ready for hurling': despite cited comparanda, action and purpose seem incongruent. 26–8: ἐπελαύνω thrice correctly 'charge', but 29: 'advance'.

The well-arranged commentary is easily navigable. More than half is devoted to the first third of the text concerning Arrian's marching column (1–10), where the primary task is to identify participating units, troop-types and officer-grades in Arrian's classicising circumlocutions, with some scope for prosopographical inquiry. C. revisits extensive older scholarship on the *exercitus Cappadocicus* with recent epigraphic material, notably military diplomas. The second half concerns Arrian's battle-array (11–24) and plan (25–31). C. engages with numerous studies that have sought to describe, explain and/or contextualise Arrian's deployment, in relation to both the longer-term evolution of Roman tactics and detailed aspects of the armament, deployment and operation of units/sub-units. The absence of consensus on many points is evident. Regarding broader perspectives, an introductory section (pp. 131–5) prioritises rebuttal of selected arguments in a few studies over a wider survey of scholarship or investigation of preceding tactical developments. Selectively citing battles back to the 40s BCE, C. adheres to a notional 'standard battle-array' (p. 133), from which Arrian's is, by implication, a departure or aberration, rather than one option in an evolving repertoire of context-based deployments. The treatment of specific points is more successful. On the much-disputed identification of Arrian's legionary κοντός, C. persuasively favours *pilum* over *hasta* or unattested 'pike'. The discussion of unquantifiable textual disruption in F is balanced and sensible, assessing diverse prior opinions, though a complete understanding of the legionary formation (16–17, 26) remains elusive. Some choices are questionable. At 17, in apparent distinction to οἱ πρωτοστάται, 'the men standing in the front rank', F reads corrupt <...> ὑπεροστάται. As 'the most obvious correction' (p. 147), C. prefers A.B. Bosworth's ὕστεροστάται, supposedly 'men standing behind' (i.e. the second rank). C. does not acknowledge that ὕστεροστάτης is otherwise a hapax in an eighth-/ninth-century epigram, in reference to the 'lowest-/last-ranking' monk (Lampe *s.v.*). Alternatively, Müller's (previously Holste's) δευτεροστάται is semantically cogent and widely attested in erudite military vocabulary. Other aspects of C.'s interpretation leave old problems unresolved: for example, how men of the third rank can 'stab' (παίειν 26.2) the Alans with *pila*, if they are, in C.'s view, at least eight feet away (pp. 139–40, 171, 175–6), with two ranks standing in between. Some topics warrant further bibliography: for example, Arrian's legionary κοντοφόροι/λογχοφόροι (18) and Sarmato-Alanic armament (17, 31). Nonetheless, even here, C.'s exposition of evidence and arguments is valuable, and, overall, his commentary becomes essential for future inquiries.

Centre for Advanced Study, Sofia

PHILIP RANCE   
philip.rance@gmail.com