

at the end of the book nor at the end of each article; all bibliographic references are in the footnotes. This practice may have been the wish of the publisher, but for an academic reader it is a nuisance. All in all, this set of articles is enjoyable due to the wide perspective of the first part and the detailed case studies backing them up in the second.

Marja Vierros

SIOBHÁN MCELDUFF: *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source*, Routledge, New York – Abingdon 2013. ISBN 978-0-415-81676-2 (hbk), ISBN 978-0-203-58861-1 (ebk). IX, 266 pp. USD 125.

Siobhán McElduff's fascinating study of how and why Romans translated may come as a shocking revelation to those of us used to contemporary views on translation, which emphasise an objective faithfulness to the source text. Especially when it comes to literary translations of Greek works, the Roman approach seems to have been the diametrical opposite of ours: a translator was expected to assert his own personality and to contribute something of his own to the source text, the result being literary texts that hardly qualify as "translations" in the modern sense. Not only was the source text freely paraphrased, but it was usual to combine several originals, leave out portions of the source and to add new interpolations. Literary translation was seen as something completely distinct from technical translation, or the work of the professional interpreter. This was ultimately based on a class distinction: a member of the Roman literary elite was expected to affirm his persona by boldly taking command of the source text and therefore set himself apart from the menial and detail-oriented work of grammarians and interpreters, who, as salaried employees or slaves, were his social inferiors. The literary translator also competed with his source, trying to create something superior: literary translation was a form of the *aemulatio* which constitutes one of the central aspects of ancient culture. Translation as an expression of Roman elite personality had a twofold use: it could enforce the unity of the literary elite, as in the use of translated poetry as gifts between elite Romans, and it could also be used as a weapon in literary debates. Cicero's translation of Attic speakers in an attempt to undermine the efforts of his denigrators in the Atticist school of orators is a case in point (pp. 106–21).

McElduff's book, which is centred on the social role of the Roman literary translator, reflects recent advances in translation studies, and it is obvious that the older text-oriented methods that were content to compare the source text with its translation are not an appropriate tool for the analysis of Roman translation (pp. 12–5). One central aspect that must be constantly borne in mind is that the Roman literary elite was generally literate in Greek and therefore perfectly capable of reading the source texts in the original: unlike in our culture, translations were not aimed at a public that would otherwise not have had access to the translated work. Although Roman comedy is generally considered a more popular art form, even Terence's prologues to his plays imply that at least a part of his audience knew the Greek models of his plays or was at least aware of their existence (pp. 84–94).

Importantly, McElduff sees the evolution of Roman translation as a form of conquest contemporary to the Roman subjugation of the Greek East in the third to first centuries BCE. The appropriation of Greek literary capital ran parallel to the importation of slaves, artefacts

and libraries, and many Roman authors use surprisingly military metaphors in their discussions of translation. To translate meant to take command of a text and to transport it to Rome as one would transport war trophies. One notable exception to this thinking seems to have been Cato the Elder: although he himself read (and allowed his sons to read) Greek works in the original, he appears to have feared that translation would result in too great a contamination of Roman culture by Greek influences (pp. 59–60).

McElduff's book is divided into six chapters of which the first discusses interpreters and official translations and the remaining five, literary translation and its discussion from Livius Andronicus to Aulus Gellius. McElduff's chapter on official translation, primarily from Latin to Greek, demonstrates how radically it differed from literary translation. Although the Greek version of Augustus' *Res gestae* sometimes departs from the original, it exhibits a strangely Latinate and unidiomatic style, which, of course, may have served to underline Roman dominance in the Eastern provinces (pp. 33–8). As the opposite of Latin literary translation, it illustrates that exaggerated faithfulness to the source text could be interpreted as an acknowledgment of its superiority, something which literary translators were desperate to avoid.

The second chapter of the book covers the origins of Roman epic, focusing on the differences between Livius Andronicus and Ennius in their assumption of Greek models: whereas Livius created a work on Greek mythology in Saturnian verse, an ancient Italic poetic form, Ennius used the Greek hexameter to portray Roman history. At the same time, however, by casting himself as Homer's reincarnation, he attempted a previously unparalleled appropriation of Greek culture (pp. 55–9). Similar boldness is expressed by Cicero's *De optimo genere oratorum*, intended as a preface to his (possibly uncompleted) translations of Aeschines and Demosthenes, where he implies that what follows are the "true" Athenian speakers and that his translation has rendered the originals unnecessary (pp. 117–20). As McElduff points out, Cicero here seems to have painted himself into a corner by eliding his own literary persona which he was otherwise anxious to assert.

At least ostensibly, the most modest of the Roman authors discussed seems to have been Lucretius, although even he infers that the reason why his *De rerum natura* is necessary for the Roman public may lie in the literary quality of Epicure's prose (pp. 147–9): despite his open adulation of his source text (Lucr. 3,1–10), he still manages to convey the impression that he is, in fact, improving on it. In opposition to Cicero, who was boldly confident in his ability to discuss Greek philosophy in Latin, Lucretius also voices a complaint about the poverty of the Latin language (pp. 149–52; Lucr. 1,136–140), later echoed by Seneca (pp. 161–4; Sen. *epist.* 58,1) and Gellius (pp. 178–9; Gell. 11,169). Even such complaints, however, were ultimately self-serving, as they could be used to accentuate the translator's genius in overcoming seemingly impossible obstacles.

The title of the book does not always come across as entirely apposite: many of the examples McElduff cites are little more than discussions of, or allusions to, translation and difficult to construe as actual theory. Nevertheless, they provide the reader with a generous overview of the subject, underlining the impression that a general consensus as to what constitutes good translation seems to have existed in the Roman world for nearly three centuries. Aulus Gellius, as the latest author discussed in the book, also comes across as the most "modern" in his unprecedented emphasis on a closer fidelity to the source text (p. 184) and can be seen to anticipate the views of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, which, as McElduff acknowledges, were radically different from those of the classical age. A short discussion of these later

developments would, in my opinion, have contributed to the usefulness of this otherwise excellent and mind-opening study.

Scott McGill's *Plagiarism in Latin Literature* (Cambridge – New York 2012), also reviewed in this volume, makes an illuminating companion to this book, shedding further light on the concepts of literary imitation and literary originality in the ancient world.

Seppo Heikkinen

ALISON E. COOLEY: *The Cambridge Manual of Latin Epigraphy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2012. ISBN 978-0-521-84026-2 (Hb); 978-0-521-54954-7 (Pb). 531 pp. GBP 69.99 (Hb), 27.99 (Pb).

To judge from the reviews I have seen, this admirable book has been received with favour, and I can only join those who have had good things to say about it, for it is a most impressive achievement and among the introductions to Latin epigraphy (of which there is no shortage) this is surely one of the most, if not *the* most, informative one, and one which I think should be read from beginning to end by those wishing to be introduced to the subject. Here I must stress the need of reading the whole work, for although this book has a logical structure, being divided into chapters and sections, etc., it leaves at places the impression of being a rather loose narrative in which certain subjects seem to turn up whenever the author came to think about them. For instance, section 3. 2. 5, "Working with stemmata" (p. 360ff.), deals with inscriptions known only from early copies. The expression 'stemma' refers to the fact that inscriptions now lost are sometimes known from two or more early descriptions which may present variants in the text. These descriptions, when copied by later epigraphists, produced a textual tradition divided into 'stemmata' (*CIL* VI 1314, the inscription of Lutatius Catulus concerning the *tabularium*, not seen after the early 15th century, is cited as an example). However, this section is not at all only about stemmata, for the mention of Renaissance epigraphists leads the author to turn, as an afterthought of sorts, to the history of epigraphy in general from Cyriacus to Gruter (p. 362–70). Again, the chapter on "Dating inscriptions" (3. 4, p. 398ff.) contains much of the usual material on consular dating, etc., but also a few pages (p. 409–14) on Roman names, which thus do not receive a chapter or section of their own. Having discussed Roman names and their evolution, the author must have come to think of the fact that the same names could be used by several generations of the same family, and this again is illustrated by the inscriptions of the Lucilii Gamalae of Ostia (their inscriptions being cited as nos. 78–85). This is of great interest (cf. below on *CIL* XIV 375 and 376), but one would not have expected it to have been dealt with under the heading "Dating inscriptions". Section 2. 3 on "Epigraphy in society" begins with sub-section 2. 3. 1 "Monuments, not documents", which does not (as some readers might perhaps expect) deal with the archeological aspects of inscriptions (not a very prominent subject in this book in any case, although note p. 286ff. on the "production and design of inscriptions"), but rather with such aspects as the "subjectivity" (p. 227) of inscriptions – which of course were not meant to be objective 'documents' in the first place – or the role of inscriptions in illustrating everyday life and manners (cf., e. g., p. 226 on banquets). All this is most interesting and useful; however, this sub-section is followed by another (2. 3. 2, p.