Ken Gardner (‘Paul the Deacon and Secundus of Trento’) presents a convincing inquiry into the extent to which Paul the Deacon’s *History of the Lombards* is indebted to the lost chronicle of Secundus of Trento, whilst John Moorhead (‘The West and the Roman Past; from Theodoric to Charlemagne’) traces changing attitudes in the West to the Roman past as far as the Carolingian period, rightly perceiving one of the functions of perceptions of the past to be a society’s exercise in its own self-definition. Roger Scott provides an able epilogue to the volume along with some pertinent generalizing conclusions.

One ought not to demand encyclopaedic amplitude in a volume of essays like this, only a reasonably representative spread. There are certainly aspects of late antique historiography that are not strongly represented — the epitomators, the chroniclers, the biographers, the hagiographers, for example — but the editors (and their contributors) are to be congratulated on a well-balanced and very readable spread of interesting studies. They amply demonstrate that here is a fruitful field for further study.

(I spotted very few *errata*: on both p. 30 and p. 48 for ‘per’ read ‘pro’, on p. 121 for ‘herefore’ read ‘therefore’.)

G. W. Clarke


As a Bible concordance this volume is a well and carefully produced piece of work. Omitting the 363 most common words (a, about, above, according, etc. etc.), it sets out otherwise to be a complete concordance of the ‘New King James Version’. Its limitation for the serious student is that it does not (like the Young’s and Strong’s concordances of the old King James Version) indicate the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words that lie behind the English translation. Since a concordance is a work intended for the serious student, this is a defect indeed.

A reviewer can hardly write of the enterprise of producing such a concordance without also commenting on the enterprise of producing a ‘New King James Version’ of the Bible. The significance of the old King James Version for the use of the Bible in English is indisputable, and to try to produce an English Bible preserving ‘the majesty, beauty and authority of the King James Bible while up-dating grammar, punctuation, and no-longer-used and misunderstood words’ is a commendable aim. But since 1611 great numbers of ancient biblical manuscripts have been discovered and immense
toil has gone into the textual criticism of both Old and New Testaments, so that the production of a translation 'based on the same manuscripts as the original translation' neglecting all of this can hardly be commended. Moreover, the discovery of texts in languages cognate to Biblical Hebrew has increased our understanding of the original language of Old Testament immeasurably. To those, therefore, who would wish to come as closely as possible to what was originally written, the enterprise of producing the New King James Version seems regrettable.

Francis Foulkes