REVIEW


The Muses are the daughters of Memory; the characteristic quality of the scholar of classical literature (I was brought up to think) is the ability to remember and find parallels, word by word and phrase by phrase. The structure of the mature mind, then, is intertextual.

Databases and computer-based techniques for searching them represent a vast increase in the potential of memory. J.C. Yardley (Y) in *Justin and Pompeius Trogus* sets forth the results of Packard Humanities Institute Latin disk searches on words and phrases in Justin—though Y has also made use of other tools: ‘TLL, OLD, and the lexica and commentaries on the various authors’ (4).

Justin was a summarizer, and the book he summarized (Pompeius Trogus’ *Philippic History*) is lost. Hence a methodological challenge: what does a parallel in Justin’s text imply? That Trogus echoed a phrase he had read or heard somewhere, or that Justin did? Y’s solution is to divide his book into two parts: parallels with Sallust, Caesar, Livy and Cicero he assumes were echoed by Trogus, whose phrases were copied in by Justin; and he places these parallels in part 1, together with words and phrases that seem, for various reasons, to be ‘more likely to come from Trogus than Justin’ (5). Part 2 is principally about ‘Justinisms’ in Justin, though Y also assigns poetic elements in Justin’s text to part 2, thus begging a question about how poets after Virgil used Virgil (although Y admits [188] that it is ‘in most cases impossible to tell whether we are a facing a poeticism taken directly from Virgil by Trogus [or by Justin], or whether it is a matter of the later author being indebted to the Augustan poet’).

Y’s and Waldemar Heckel’s arguments for assigning Justin to a period in the vicinity of AD 200 are taken as read (5). Five and a half pages of parallels with the pseudo-Quintilianic *Declamations* are suggestive and may to a degree tend to confirm this view on dating, but caution seems indicated: *ab ultimis litoribus Oceani* (Justin 12.13.1) is closely paralleled by *ex ultimo litore Oceani* ([Quintilian] *Decl. Maior*).
3.4)—but how far does that fact go towards showing that Justin must have read the *Declamations*, or been a teacher of rhetoric (cf. 5)?

The proof, if the case is proved, comes in the accumulation of parallels. Y in this book has documented over two hundred pages' worth, and few will doubt, for example, that he has demonstrated that Livy's work exerted a strong influence on Trogus (ix). Perhaps he has also gone as far as anyone can towards elucidating the relationship between the text of Trogus and that of Justin—but imponderables remain. Who can tell, for instance, how many of Y's 'Justinisms in Justin' started as 'Trogisms in Trogus'?
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