La règle académique consistant à préciser les références par rapport à l’édition de référence de Littré — au même titre que l’on renvoie à Kühn pour le corpus galénique, principe suivi par les traducteurs — s’imposait ici. Des planches ont été ajoutées, en particulier dans les parties consacrées à la chirurgie, qui sont bienvenues, ainsi au livre VI (vol. 2) pour illustrer les techniques de suture (4 pages illustrées). Leur origine n’est en revanche pas toujours précisée (les pages 210-211 du volume 2 contiennent une gravure issue d’un livre ancien de médecine, sans que la source soit mentionnée). En somme, on doit saluer l’entreprise consistant à offrir une nouvelle traduction anglaise de ce texte important. Ces trois volumes trouveront incontestablement leur lectorat ainsi que leur place dans les bibliothèques académiques mais d’autres travaux plus approfondis et plus précis pourront aisément venir les compléter.

Frédéric Le Blay


Much has lately been written on Appian of Alexandria, an important Greek historian of the second century AD (notably works by K. Brodersen, A. M. Gowing, C. Carsana, B. Scardigli, and many others), as well as on Illyricum and Macedonia so that it is most difficult to be au courant with the scholarly literature on these subjects. However, what is always most important and indispensable — when studying classical writers — are reliable editions of Latin or Greek texts. Some are notoriously confusing because they are based on a deficient manuscript tradition, as is the case, e.g., with Pliny’s geographical books (nonetheless important to corroborate some of Appian’s names for Illyrian peoples), but editions of many Greek and Latin writers could still be improved, which is also true of Appian, who wrote a Roman history from its beginnings to the Roman conquest of the Mediterranean. It should be emphasized that the manuscript tradition of his Roman History is rather complicated, hence the new edition under discussion here is most commendable. Modern opinions concerning the historical value and reliability of Appian’s work are not unanimous (although recently he has been voted more confidence), and equally different are the assessments of the historian that have been transmitted to us from late antiquity. Thus Photius, one of the best Byzantine scholars and patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century, the author of the Library, highly valued his Roman History, praising his clear and matter-of-fact style and his aspiration to historical truth. According to his judgement, Appian knew better than anyone how to interpret strategic matters and how to render his narrative vivid, often with a deep insight into human psychology. Appian’s description of Octavian’s Illyrian War in the years 35-33 BC (based, it is true, on Augustus’ Memoirs), to which almost half of his Illyrian book is dedicated, certainly confirms this impression. An anonymous antiquarian in Vaticanus graecus 141 recommended Appian’s History only to those who wished to become acquainted with history divided into nations, and indeed, this is the most important “innovation” of
Appian, since in addition to the five books on the Civil Wars he also wrote histories of the peoples subjugated to the Roman state, the ninth being dedicated to Macedonia and Illyria. Apart from the five books of the Bellum civile, books 6-8 are preserved, while unfortunately only fragments are extant of the ninth book, the Macedonian History (Makedonike), mainly from Byzantine compilations composed by the order of the Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus about AD 950. On the other hand, the Illyrian History (Illyrike), which actually was only an appendix to the Macedonian History, has been preserved in its entirety, due to the fact that Appian discussed the need to compose it at the very end of the fifth book of the Civil Wars, to which it was later attached, although Appian himself appended it to his Macedonian History. Greek was never widely read, neither in the Middle Ages nor in the modern era, therefore Appian was translated into Latin by Pier Candido Decembrio; his translation was printed in 1477, but was severely criticised by Henri Estienne in his edition of Appian in 1557. Many centuries of various editions and translations have passed since these early publications, the new French one is now the latest. As a curiosity it may be mentioned that the philosopher Karl Marx, who was impressed and influenced by Appian’s History, did not read it in translation, but in the original Greek. Nowadays this could only be expected from a few scholars, therefore the French translation by Paul Goukowsky is not merely welcome but indispensable. The Illyrian booklet including the fragments of the lost Macedonian book is one of the eight published in the series “Collection des Universités de France”, in which Goukowsky also edited the books on Spain, Mithridates, Syria, and Africa, as well as books I and III of the Civil Wars. Appian’s Illyrian book is the only Illyrian history preserved from antiquity. The region was poorly known (and still is!), but was historically and strategically highly important, since the First Illyrian War in 229 BC against the Illyrian kingdom of Agron and Teuta marked the first Roman intervention in the Eastern Mediterranean. Macedonian history, on the contrary, even if only preserved in fragments of Appian’s work, is also rather well known from other classical sources, since the conquest of the powerful Macedonian kingdom following the Roman victory over Perseus represented a much more important milestone in the Roman conquest of the East than did the defeat of the last Illyrian king Genthius, which occurred almost at the same time. Goukowsky’s Greek edition of the Illyrian History has superseded the until now standard Viereck-Roos edition of the book (Appiani Historia Romana, vol. I: eds. P. Viereck et A. G. Roos. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, Lipsiae 1962; editio stereotypa correctior, addenda et corrigenda adiecit E. Gabba). It brings some new readings, since Goukowsky carefully compared the extant manuscripts. Of these changes the most significant is probably the one in paragraph 57 of the Illyrike, where he proposed new identifications of Octavian’s commanders. During the siege of the capital of the Iapodes, Metulum, Octavian’s army was not successful at first. The Romans built two ramparts against the town wall and from them erected four bridges onto the top of the wall. The barbarians fought them off and eventually three bridges collapsed. This caused panic among the Romans and none attempted to step on the fourth until Octavian leapt down from the tower and dashed onto the bridge at a run. The crucial sentence has previously read: “His two commanders, Agrippa and Hiero, ran with him, as well as his bodyguard Lutus, and Volas...” The emended sentence now proposes a new reading: “Parmi les
Il y eut Agrippa et Cicéron qui s'élançèrent avec lui, et en outre Lupus le garde du corps, ainsi qu'Aviola...". Cicero here would have been M. Tullius Cicero, Cicero's son of the same name, whose distinguished career may have partly been due to Octavian's repentance for his father's murder. The introductory “Notice”, providing the context within which to place Appian's narrative, in places overlaps with the commentary that gives short necessary explanations to names and events mentioned in the Greek text. An essential bibliography and four maps complete the book. The entire French text contains no diacritical signs on Slavic letters, which seems unusual for a philological publication. For anyone who would want more information on historical matters, it will be necessary to consult books cited in the bibliography, particularly because both historical introductions are mainly based on data from other classical writers, and partly on old publications, which may still be fundamental on some questions but on some may be obsolete, whereas more recent works are often inadequately cited. True, some of them do indeed “traitent généralement de questions sans incidence sur la compréhension des textes anciens” (p. 130, n. 35, concerning the Second Macedonian War), but some, on the contrary, are important new contributions, which have greatly advanced the previous knowledge. Additional citations of modern scholarly literature would be welcome for several important issues concerning the regions in question, and there are some inexact statements, as for example that the Romans would have discovered the sources of the Danube during the war against the Istri (p. 7). But the book certainly has fulfilled the main task for which it was published: to provide a reliable Greek text and translation, as well as a short commentary that can guide the reader to use additional literature.

Marjeta Šasel Kos


J'ai toujours considéré que l'étude des rêves, dont regorge la littérature grecque, était d'une importance capitale pour la connaissance de la pensée et de la mentalité helléniques. Ce n'est donc pas sans raison que j'ai proposé, il y a plus de trente ans, une étude thématique du rêve dans la littérature grecque dans un article paru dans Les Études Classiques, 47, 1979 et intitulé Quelques idées grecques sur le rêve, d'Homère à Artémidore (p. 107-123). C'est donc avec un grand plaisir que j'ai appris par l'avant-propos de ce très récent livre qu'un groupe de chercheurs se réunissait régulièrement depuis le 14 septembre 2007 dans les locaux de l'Université Paul-Valéry de Montpellier avec comme projet de commencer une nouvelle traduction des Œnειροκριτικα d'Artémidore. Si le présent volume ne procure pas encore cette traduction qui nous est promise, il offre les résultats de la réunion du lundi 30 mars 2009. Les huit chercheurs qui nous présentent ici le fruit de leur travail se servent de la traduction souvent modifiée d'A. J. Festugière, Artémidore, La clef des songes, Paris, Vrin, 1975 et du texte grec établi par Roger Pack, Artemidori Daldiani libri V, Leipzig, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, 1963. Les deux directeurs du volume, à qui l'on doit déjà l'avant-propos, Christophe Chandezon et Julien du Bouchet, évoquent dans