With the publication of this volume, containing books V-VII of the *Anabasis of Alexander* and the *Indica*, P. A. Brunt has completed the new Loeb edition of Arrian. The Greek text is again that of A. G. Roos, revised by G. Wirth (Teubner 1967), with a few minor changes, noted in a highly selective apparatus. Conjectures (nearly all proposed by earlier scholars) are admitted mostly for the sake of clarity and limited to sentences that seem grammatically (VI 23.1) or otherwise (VI 29.9; opinion may differ at V 7.3) odd or inconsistent with what has been said before (VI 29.6). B. rightly retains ms.-readings against conjectures that seem either wanton (VI 27.4) or caused by the inopportune harmonizing of Arrian’s spelling of names (varying in different passages according to his use of different sources) or similar efforts, for example to make *Anab.* VI 21.3 agree with *Ind.* 22.10. In both cases B.’s choice is backed by sound argument: Arrian’s lack of originality in dealing with his sources is indeed paramount (see further) and, in VI 21.3, there is no need to smooth away the incorrect information on the territory of the Oritans, since Ptolemy (Arrian’s probable source for that passage) “was indifferent to ethnography” (373 n. 2). As compared with its predecessor, the Didot based (Dubner 1846) edition by E. I. Robson (1929-33), the new text constitutes a notable improvement, that will meet the needs of many historians and philologists. But, as B. himself indicates, students specially interested in textual criticism will, as before, have to turn to the Teubner edition. The facing translation takes Robson’s English text as its starting-point. Yet there are sensitive changes: the former’s ‘archaising’ style is abandoned and his (too) many inaccuracies corrected: the result is a more readable and, above all, more reliable text. Every translation, inevitably, leaves some room for discussion of details. One may ask whether at VII 16.7 ‘regret’ is the best possible rendering.
of ‘pothos’: the presence of so many embassies in Babylon described in the context (VII 17) might suggest a translation such as: Alexander had to die “when people’s yearning after him culminated”. The average breadth of the Indus is wrongly given at V 20.9 as above forty stades: perhaps a printing error for ‘about forty stades’.

However, the chief value of this new edition, and at the same time its most striking novelty when compared with both the old Loeb Arrian and standard Loeb aims, lies in the explanatory notes, appearing at the bottom of nearly every page or supplied in the form of several Appendixes (435-572). It is amazing how much information, and how many ideas B. has managed to pack into these notes. One reviewer, commenting on the 178 pages of introduction and appendices of the first volume, already observed that B. gives us “the first half of an extended monograph” 1). The second half is now available, with comments on Alexander rivalling Dionysus and Heracles, on Indian questions (geographical, topographical, chronological and historiographical as well as concerning ‘Indian Sophists’), on the complex problems associated with Alexander’s return from India and his last plans, on Nearchus’ voyages and other items relating to matters dealt with in the last three books of the Anabasis and/or in the Indica. A discussion of Arrian’s speeches and letters and of the date and character of his work concludes this array of essays. These do not, as B. himself stresses (VII), claim to provide a systematic commentary. Yet the frequency of the notes, indicating parallel passages, discussing minor problems or referring to fuller treatment in the appendices, brings this edition altogether close to an ‘annotated’ one. Leaving the question of form aside, the chief difference with the (still useful) 19th century German Arrian-editions ‘mit Anmerkungen’ lies in the scope of the commentary. Whereas C. Sintenis (1867) and K. Abicht (1871) mainly discussed grammar, style and translation, B.’s focus is clearly on the historical elucidation of Arrian’s narrative.

A short summary cannot do justice to B.’s scholarship. One of his stronger points is the emphasis on method. One cannot but agree with the observation that excessively rational criticism, ancient as well as modern, may sometimes suppress facts of relevance. A case in point are the stories of Alexander emulating Dionysus and Heracles, often too easily dismissed as fictions, invented for his glorification by flattering historians (435-442). According to B. a more adequate explanation is reached if one takes into account the typical religious mentality of ancient Greeks and Romans “always