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category rather than as ‘lying’ history or mythography – rewards the effort (his own, and that of the reader of Heroikos alongside this commentary) admirably. (An important companion to this aspect of the present work is the fiction and meta-fiction of Lucian as elucidated by K. Ni Mheallaigh, Lucian’s Self-conscious Fiction: Theory in Practice (Diss. Trinity College Dublin 2005)). G.’s identification of the dialogue with the genre of Schwindelliteratur, particularly the tradition of Homer-correction (the mainstay of the genre’s subject matter), is over-simplified, however: G. is right, in a sense, to state that Philostratus is no more concerned with truth than other writers of Schwindelliteratur, and yet the Heroikos is not merely a sophistic game of Homer-correction. There are different kinds of truth: Philostratus’ tone and major concerns in this dialogue, irony notwithstanding, are far closer to his own Life of Apollonius than to Dio Chrysostom’s Troikos and certainly to anything by Lucian; and his explanation of the sources and methods of Homeric composition rings true in many places, allegorically or metaphorically, as an examination of how the biases and peculiarities in local traditions and individual poets can eventually lead to a canonical and universal work of literature.

Other major themes of the introduction and commentary include the cult of Protesilaos and hero cult in general, and their place in contemporary religious discourse; Epicurean elements in the dialogue; and its reception from antiquity to the Renaissance. An exhaustive thematic bibliography of scholarship on the Heroikos, and a plethora of appendices and indices (including an index locorum for each volume) complete this work, which will now be indispensable for anyone studying Philostratus, the Second Sophistic, Greek hero cult, or ancient fiction and theories of fiction.
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Up till now there has not been an edition of Philostratus’ Life of Apollonius attaining modern critical standards, but C.P. Jones’ new Loeb text may well serve as a good stand-in until that edition finally comes along. It starts with a clear and well-written introduction (1.1-30), covering the life of the author (1-3), his Life of Apollonius (3-7: structure, materials and sources, the possible extent of Philostratus’ own invention, further models and influences), an overview of what we know about the ‘historical’ Apollonius and what aspects of him Philostratus chose to describe and emphasize (7-13), the travels of this Philostratean Apollonius (13-17), and the

‘After-Life of the Story’ and of its hero (17-21). Then follow brief but again very readable and clear sections on the manuscripts (22), on previous editions and translations (23-5), and on ‘The Present Text and Translation’ (25-7); the final section is a short but very useful and up-to-date bibliography (27-30).

On p. 25, J. modestly claims to give an ‘interim text’, which takes as its starting point Kayser’s editio minor of 1870, but removes a number of overly bold emendations, while taking account of other conjectures, both pre-1870 (but rejected or neglected by Kayser) and post-1870. As a result, the two volumes present much interesting textual material which cannot be found in any other edition of this text. To give an impression of the extent of this material: Book 1 has 36 textual notes, Book 2: 34, 3: 51, 4: 46, 5: 37, 6: 52, 7: 46, 8: 31. I checked the textual notes in Books 1 and 6 and found most of them worthwhile reporting (among them some proposals by J. himself), though not all equally convincing (in 6.40.2 ἄκασµένος is probably a mistake for ἄκασµένος). There are also (mostly short) explanatory notes on matters of content, keyed to the translation and separately numbered.

The translation builds on J.’s own (abridged) 1970 translation, but he has now made ‘many alterations in the interest of style and accuracy’ (27). Compared with Conybeare’s Loeb, his English sounds indeed smoother and more modern while being on the whole faithful to the text. In the parts that I checked I noted one mistake that I would call major (at 1.24.2 J.’s ‘Down to the time of Daridaeus eighty-eight lasted who could write in the Greek way’ ignores ἔτη which is connected to ἄρθρον, while Conybeare has it right: ‘up to the time of Daridaeus, 88 years after their capture, they continued to write in the manner of the Greeks’) and one minor one (in 1.25.1 J. translates τρία…ἡµίπλεθρα as ‘three plethra’).

All in all, this is a welcome edition to the Loeb Classical Library.
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It is not disputed that the place of Greek literature in late antiquity is understudied. Assessments of literary endeavours in the third to the sixth century are confined to key works and suffer from the same biases which colour the study of the late antique world; especially unfavourable comparisons with the classical canon, the privileging of classicising works over chronicles and saints’ lives, and of Greek (and Latin) works over those in non-classical languages. This volume, which grew out of a one-day conference held in Oxford in 2004,