Reviews
Reseñas

G.B. Conte, *Ope ingenii: Esperienze di critica testuale*. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2013, 123 pp. ISBN 978-88-7642-477-9.

Since the first advances of modern critical method began amidst the intellectual fervour of the Italian Renaissance, Classical scholars have been keen to collect, codify and critique rules and precepts for how to emend ancient texts; with the subsequent, but markedly slower, development of codicological and cladistic principles, the possibility of bringing between two boards all the tools one needs to correct works of literature with a commendable degree of success seemed to many a realisable prospect. The twentieth century therefore witnessed more than a dozen books that claimed to summarise and explicate the practice of textual criticism step by step. The best of these, however, were well aware that they could only take the reader so far: good critical method is predicated on the understanding that the intellect, however learned, must make one or more leaps by lateral thinking – and sometimes by instinct alone; the worst, by contrast, seemed assured that the devoted pupil and practitioner of their *aurea dicta* could thereby restore the *ipsissima uerba* of any text, however corrupt or even lacunose it had become in the course of its transmission. Needless to say, could such a book truly be written, it would long since have achieved quasi-biblical status in the world of scholarship, and the romanticism of textual emendation would have perished at a stroke.

With few (and notable) exceptions, the greatest textual critics of the post-Lachmannian era have tended to say little about critical method, and to have been understandably wary of anything announcing itself as a handbook; indeed, some of the most impressive emendators never wrote a word on the matter of method. It is therefore true to say that, in the twenty-first century, there is little pressing need for a new volume on textual criticism and its practice, since the aspiring critic can already consult the better parts of existing volumes with profit: Maas's *Textkritik*, West's *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Willis' *Latin Textual Criticism* and Pasquali's *Storia della Tradizione e Critica del Testo* – to say nothing of reading the masterly work of critics in action.

It is therefore very welcome that Gian-Biagio Conte has sought not simply to add to the series of such (often ill-guided) manuals of the past in his attractive little volume. Instead, what has been gathered, from over half a century's immersion in the studied correction and exegesis of Greco-Roman literature, is a treasure-trove of critical gems that have particularly impressed Conte by their ingenuity, skill and presumed veracity. Many of

the emendations contained in this collection are well-known showpieces, and have been discussed for generations by wide-eyed and admiring scholars across tables in pubs, tavernas and cafes; yet a small number are new ideas from Conte himself, which are hereby offered to the world afresh for judgment.

The volume is divided into three chapters that survey different categories of the text-critical enterprise: (i) Punctuation (pp.17-38), (ii) Interpolation and athetesis (pp.39-78), (iii) Corruption and conjecture (pp.79-110). These three sections are preceded by a brief preamble (pp.13-15) and rounded off by a short epilogue (pp.111-17). There is a broad coverage of authors on show, both Greek and Latin, prose and verse. Although the field of Latin poetry reflects Conte's career in providing the lion's share of examples, the overall range on show is commendable: alongside Lucretius, Catullus, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius, Seneca, Lucan, Martial and Juvenal, engaging examples are presented from Cicero, Petronius, Homer, the Attic tragedians and (among the more outré selections) Naevius, the *Priapea* and the New Testament.

In the introductory remarks Conte compares his selection to a philological 'museo' [9]. The term is well chosen: not only does it highlight the necessarily subjective aspect in curating such a collection of text-critical *spicilegia*, but it also suggests that those who engage with the collection can not only admire but also learn from the expertly selected and arranged offerings. Conte is candid about the freedom he has enjoyed in his selection: admiration for the conjectural work of (for the most part) other scholars has been his guiding principle. He hopes that the book will promote further work by scholars on textual problems, and that *cruces* which currently stand as *loci nondum sanati* may be at last healed by present and future generations.

Ab Ioue principium: the anecdote that opens the collection calls to mind no less a figure than Scaliger. Confronted with an unmetrical and unmeaning EOBET in a funerary inscription, the younger Conte saw that an error of capital script had unwittingly corrupted FORET. Similar reflections on the misreading of capitalis script had led Scaliger four centuries to unearth QVA ME ALIVS from QVAM FALLIVS at Cat. 68.41, and when applied to the context of Greek majuscule script in Latin had prompted Housman's palmary correction of Mart. *Lib. spect.* 21.4. Here as elsewhere in the volume Conte shows both a healthy respect and careful caution towards palaeographical arguments, comparing such a method to marriage: "molti lo rifiutano, molti lo sconsigiliano, ma inevitabilmente molti finiscono sposati" (15).

The first chapter starts, appropriately, with the minutiae of punctuation. Classical scholars are generally unduly subservient to the commands of printed punctuation: raised in a modern world where such typographical demarcations are made to do work in lieu of careful and clear sentence construction, scholars are liable to place inappropriate importance upon the particular punctuation they encounter in any given edition. Yet, for ancient texts, which were almost always devoid of punctuation, the onus for correct

interpretation should lie with carefully formed word order and syntax, which should leave the meaning of the utterance just as clear to a reader as the author desired it to be. It is therefore true to say that the incorrect punctuation of ancient texts is a common and regrettable vice of modern critics, and that corrections of such universally mistaken interventions deserve to be regarded as emendations in their own right: since it is very rare that any transmitted punctuation has ancient authority, each editor (and indeed reader) should be prepared to approach each and every sentence with an open mind.

It is therefore welcome that Conte's first chapter focuses attention upon this major – but comparatively unglamorous – area of criticism. Many of the suggestions on offer are well known, such as Housman on Cat. 64.243 and Soph. *OC* 981 (after Maehly), and Heyne on *Aen.* XI.18. Some newer ideas deserve serious consideration, however: Mario Martina's clever separation of *nec forti* (thus leaving the latter word to bear its proper force with *Aquilone recepto*) deserves serious consideration at Luc. IV.584; Conte suggests punctuating after *pia*, so as to refer the adjective to the household, at Ov. *Met.* VIII.631 (*sed pia Baucis anus*), which has already been implicitly accepted by at least one Ovidian.[1] Some ideas are perhaps a little more questionable: at Ov. *Am.* III.9.37 the text reads (without punctuation) *uiue pius moriere pius cole sacre colentem | mors grauis a templis in caua busta trahet.* Conte rejects the vulgate punctuation (*uiue pius; moriere pius; cole sacra;* etc.) and follows the punctuation usually attributed to Johann Jahn (but actually first suggested by Valckenaer *ad* Eur. *Hipp.* 1346), *uiue pius, moriere; pius cole sacra;* etc.; if this is indeed correct, an interesting question arises for how Ovid could be confident that the reader would reject the natural balance and rhythm of the line, which suggests uniting *moriere pius*, and instead opt for this chiastic arrangement; if he could not have confidence, does this matter for our reading of Latin poetic texts? Conte also approves of the bold repunctuation of ps-Sen. *Oct.* 195, which reanalyses *nempe* [sc. *metuit eam*] *praelatam sibi* as a quick jibe from Octavia, interrupting the nurse's flow; this change of speaker was first suggested by Bothe (who continued the comment to verse 197) but was refined to three words by Torkill Baden (not, as usually claimed, Ritter). At the awkward crux of Verg. *Geo.* I.181, a good defence is made for indicative *inludunt* over *inludant*, although no mention is made of the perfectly sensible *inludent* (as conjectured by certain *recentiores*). One might have hoped in this lively chapter for some brief and general discussion of the question of ancient punctuation; since this is admittedly not the ideal place for a detailed treatment, some pointed bibliography (such as Rudolf Müller and Otha Wingo) could have assisted the less well informed reader.

[1] A. Ramírez de Verger, *Cuentos de un Filólogo (La Palabra y los Textos).* Huelva: Universidad de Huelva, 2013, 12.

The second section turns to treat interpolation and athetesis, a notoriously thorny topic. The question of interpolation is always complex, since there are so many distinct reasons that could prompt the addition of material to a text, and even if some material is incorporated, it is possible that it was never actually intended to expand or increase the text into which it came to be included. Furthermore, in cases where supposedly interpolated text is attested in all manuscript witnesses, it is often difficult to establish criteria that will find widespread critical support for the proposed athetesis. Conte embraces the categorisations suggested by Tarrant in his influential 1989 paper '*Toward a typology of interpolation in Latin poetry*' but well explores many of the nuances and overlaps that complicate this framework.

The particularly interesting case of the opening lines of Euripides' *Phoenissae* and Sophocles' *Electra* are treated lucidly and informatively, along the compelling lines of Michael Haslam. A number of good suggestions are offered on the text of Ovid's *Met*.; in particular, a good case is made for defending *Met*. II.266, the concluding verse of the poet's list of mountains set ablaze by Phaethon, against Tarrant's proposed deletion. In considering Lucretius, healthy scepticism about interpolation is demonstrated: III.474-5 is rightly understood to be an incorrect incorporation rather than an active interpolation, and 'II.43b' is soundly rejected as an accidental conflation by Nonius or his source.[2] Although Juvenal is given some brief treatment (including Reeve's prudent deletion of X.356) it would have been fascinating to hear Conte's thoughts on the vexed 'Oxford fragments'. Some broader sensible remarks are offered (pp.62-3) regarding method, predicated on the correct notion that "un'edizione critica d'altronde è solo un'ipotesi di lavoro". It is important to reinject this notion into classical scholarship that each scholar is duty bound to challenge and question the text they seek to investigate: a good critical edition should provide the primary materials for such a scholar to proceed with confidence as they choose.

The third chapter moves to the wider and more multi-faceted category of corruption and conjectures, and there is some fine material on offer here. The chapter begins on an excellent note – salvaging Politian's splendid emendation at Lucr. *DRN*. I.122, which apprehends that the Pythagorean souls should *permanent* (rather than *permaneant*), but which has been absurdly rejected by so many generations of scholars. Celebrated emendations of Scaliger (Cat. 61.189-91), Bentley (*Aen*. X.704, 705 and 710), Porson (*Eur. Ion*. 1427-8) Diggle (Eur. *Suppl*. 508-9) and Delz (Stat. *Theb*. IV.452) are deftly disussed. At Verg. *Aen*. III.360 Silvia Ottaviano's elegant *tripodas laurusque Clari* is

[2] On interpolation in Lucretius see my '*Lucretius auctus*? The question of interpolation in *De Rerum Natura*' in J. Martinez (ed.), *Fakes and Forgers of Classical Literature: Ergo decipiatur!*, Leiden: Brill, 2014, 15-42; and on the question of 'fragments' preserved by the indirect tradition see my *The Early Textual History of Lucretius' De rerum natura*, Cambridge: CUP, 2013, 101-35.

supported for the transmitted *tripodas Clarii et laurus*; Mackail's *tripoda ac Clarii lauros* is spoken of in positive terms, but *ac* before a guttural is simply unacceptable; Schaper's most elegant rearrangement of *Aen.* III.464, *auro grauia sectoque elephanto*, to *auro grauia ac secto elephanto* is also rightly praised. Conte's own suggestion closes the chapter, at *Geo.* III.159, where the problem of connection and gender posed by *et quos* is removed by *si quos*, a cunning suggestion that removes many difficulties – and one that was actually first made *en passant* by Heyne himself.

The brief epilogue turns to survey the major contribution to textual criticism brought about by refinement of metrical knowledge: a few illustrative examples from Hermann, Porson, Ussing and Housman demonstrate that this area of scholarship must remain a vital part of the Classical scholar's expertise.

The book is appropriately dedicated to Adriano Prosperi and Michael Reeve, whose range of learning has laid the foundations for so many other scholars. Throughout this book Conte's tone is affable, his pace leisurely and his museum-tour packed with interest; the book's breadth of readership may well be extended by the simultaneous publication of an English translation.[3] Although the work requires a healthy amount of prior exposure and experience to problems of classical literature, those keen to scrutinise texts will profit from this expert arrangement of material. Let us hope that the twenty-first century will see scholars exercise their intellectual powers to similar ends with similar zeal.

David Butterfield
Queens' College, Cambridge
djb89@cam.ac.uk

[3] G.B. Conte, *Ope Ingenii*: *Experiences of Textual Criticism*m,Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Jesus Luque Moreno, *Hablar y cantar. La música y el lenguaje (concepciones antiguas)*, Granada: EUG, 2014, 476 pp. ISBN: 978-84-338-5650-0.

Jesús Luque vierte a lo largo de este libro una excelente confrontación y visión de conjunto más o menos metódica de estudios ya publicados con otros inéditos relacionados con el ramo de las teorías musicales, las doctrinas fónico-prosódicas y el análisis del lenguaje forjado en las gramáticas antiguas. De toda esta *poikilía*, el autor presenta en este libro un nuevo y original enfoque, a los ojos de hoy, sobre el lenguaje y la música, por un lado, y sobre las disciplinas o ciencias encargadas de ambas antaño y actualmente, por otro.

Con un total de once capítulos más una introducción y un catálogo bibliográfico final, el propio autor esboza y explica el orden de su exposición en un prólogo que podría ser considerado como programático. Así, luego de unas páginas con tintes propedéuticos en las que recuerda ciertas nociones básicas en el estudio del sonido visto desde el prisma de la acústica y la fonética modernas, el profesor Luque revisa las facetas varias que representan la música y el lenguaje, esto es, dos sistemas originados sobre material sonoro: la voz y el sonido (*vox* /*sonus*) y el sonido de la voz. Es precisamente en el binomio voz-sonido (de la voz) en lo que el autor, desde una perspectiva de latinista y filólogo, centra su atención en el primer capítulo, si bien ahonda en cada uno de estos conceptos en otras partes de su estudio.

En el apartado dedicado a las "Premisas", el interés del autor está en aclarar al lector el concepto de sonido, en su sentido más amplio, y el de sonido de la voz. Efectivamente, el elemento sonoro es compartido tanto por la música como por el lenguaje, siendo el medio material transmisor del mensaje y productor de la comunicación. Por tanto, y como aconseja el profesor Luque, para comprender los sonidos es menester conocer y reconocer los factores que los definen, además de los conceptos y términos relacionados con ellos, es decir, los conceptos de fuerza, energía, potencia, presión, medio de transmisión y proceso ondulatorio. En este sentido, tras la definición de "sonido" según la física acústica, de sus rasgos propios como movimiento harmónico (amplitud de onda, frecuencia de onda y resonancia) y tras diferenciarlo de "ruido", el autor destaca los tres rasgos que, a su modo de ver, más se relacionan con el estudio del lenguaje: intensidad, tono y timbre, a los que añade la duración o dimensión temporal. En cuanto al sonido de la voz, sin duda el epígrafe más extenso de todo el capítulo, es definido haciendo referencia a los aspectos recién dados. Con todo, este amplísimo análisis incluye diversos apartados en los que el autor dedica unas palabras a la producción del sonido de la

voz, recordando brevemente el proceso de fonación humana representado por Trubetzkoy, así como los seis aspectos de la producción del habla humana diferenciados por los fonetistas; a su capacidad semántica, en cuanto que la voz conforma la materia fónica del lenguaje proveyendo los códigos lingüísticos y en cuyo proceso de fonación se diferencian rasgos vocálicos, consonánticos y prosódicos; a los fonemas y prosodemas, donde se hace mención de los cuatro criterios básicos que intervienen en las diferencias de timbre, además de otros factores que participan en la producción del sonido de la voz, como el tiempo, la intensidad y el tono, que constituyen los prosodemas; a la prosodia, sin duda un *excursus* para puntualizar el sentido mismo de términos empleados hasta ahora, cotejando la concepción que de ellos se tenía en época antigua; a la articulación del flujo sonoro, a saber, fonemas, sílabas, palabras y frases, con un pormenorizado análisis y explicación de cada uno de estos elementos; y, en fin, a los prosodemas. En este último apartado que pone fin al primer capítulo, el profesor Luque se muestra más fonetista que musicólogo, pues profundiza en un exhaustivo examen de los rasgos y/o factores que intervienen en las unidades prosódicas distintivas, o sea, la altura tonal, la intensidad, ambos elementos como factores lingüísticos, la prosodia de la frase, con todo lo que ello implica, y el concepto de duración y sus tipos.

El capítulo II, "*Ars grammatica* y *Ars mvsica*", pretende demostrar la hermandad entre la lingüística o filología –esto es, el lenguaje– y la musicología o música en el mundo antiguo, para lo cual el profesor Luque reúne una serie de consideraciones generales acerca de los estrechos vínculos que guardan una y otra disciplina. Dicha relación, patente ya en las más antiguas reflexiones conocidas al respecto, perduró en escritos de la Antigüedad tardía y se transmitió a otros medievales y modernos, convirtiéndose, así, en una tradición multisecular. Prueba de ello son los trabajos de autores de época varia, aunque de temática común y compartida, como los de Quintiliano, Adrasto, Teón de Esmirna, Calcidio o Favonio Eulogio, el *Somnium Scipionis* de Macrobio, el *De musica* y el *De ordine* de Agustín de Hipona, las *Nuptiae Philologiae et Mercurii* de Marciano Capela, la *Musica disciplina* de Aureliano de Réôme o el *De musica libri septem* de Francisco de Salinas. De todo este material, el autor selecciona no pocos pasajes en los que evidencia y sustenta la tesis propuesta a lo largo de todo su estudio. Culmina este capítulo con unas breves anotaciones acerca de otros puntos de vista relacionados con el estudio de la gramática desde el prisma del análisis del lenguaje. En este sentido, pues, su atención se centra en el componente prosódico-fonológico y en la articulación rítmica del flujo sonoro del habla, aspectos en los que, desde la época antigua, se combinan las disciplinas gramatical, musical y rítmica, entendida esta última como independiente de ambas, aunque estrechamente vinculada a ellas. Habida cuenta de que Cicerón y después Quintiliano ya fueron conscientes de la manifiesta relación entre música y retórica –un aspecto que remonta a Isócrates y a los primeros sofistas–, autores anteriores,

como Platón, Aristóteles, Demócrito o Hipias ya dieron fe de ello. Surgió, así, una tradición en la que las letras se acabaron concibiendo como los signos gráficos de los sonidos del lenguaje, de la música e incluso de los números, un aspecto que se estudiará más detenidamente en el capítulo VII y, como colofón, en el último.

En el tercer apartado, "*Vox* / *Sonus*: definición", Jesús Luque hace un magnífico análisis de este concepto músico-gramatical tras diferenciar, de las muchas acepciones de *vox*, la que coincide con el concepto de *sonus*. Sabiendo que, en el ámbito latino, *vox* alternó con *sonus* para hacer referencia a todo tipo de sonido, en el ámbito griego, en cambio, dicha alternancia se vio más limitada, pues el campo semántico de φωνή es mucho más restringido y especializado, concurriendo con φθόγγος, ψόφος y ἦχος, esto es, 'sonido, nota musical', 'sonido inarticulado, ruido' y 'resonancia', respectivamente. Autores tardíos, como Boecio, corroboran la confluencia de estos términos y conceptos griegos y latinos, así como el empleo de φωνή y *vox*, especialmente, en otros ramos distintos de la realidad sonora. Así las cosas, y teniendo en cuenta que la definición más antigua de sonido, común para griegos y latinos, es de origen estoico, llegando a remontar al primer pitagorismo en lo que a sus conceptos y principios base se refiere, los escritos técnicos gramaticales, musicales y otros de índole diversa fueron su vía de transmisión y difusión. De todos ellos, Jesús Luque presenta en estas páginas la definición que de *vox* se conserva al comienzo de los tratados de gramática y, a partir de ahí, analiza muy concienzudamente la que ha sido considerada por la tradición como la definición canónica de *vox*, presente en las obras de Mario Victorino, Prisciano, Carisio, Donato, Dosíteo, Audax, Máximo Victorino y Diomedes, cuya definición se hace remontar a Varrón, *fons et origo* de toda la tradición. Las variantes que pudieran aportar y conservar los seguidores de cada uno de estos hombres letrados se incluyen, asimismo, en el estudio del profesor Luque. En este sentido, el grueso del capítulo está dedicado a analizar todos y cada uno de los sintagmas y expresiones que conforman aquella definición canónica, para lo que el autor se apoya en el testimonio y explicación de autoridades de la Antigüedad grecolatina. Concluye este epígrafe con una pequeña muestra de la difusión de esta misma definición en otros campos de estudio, como la música. Así, además del testimonio del pseudoplutarqueo *De musica*, se encuentra en la tradición pitagórica y en la aristoxénica de época varia.

Como complementación del anterior, el capítulo cuarto, "*Vox* /*sonus*: Clasificación", trata los tipos de voz y la articulación del *sonus vocis*. Tomando como base aquellos textos griegos y latinos de tradición estoica y gramatical, la propuesta clasificatoria del profesor Luque es doble, aunque ajustada a parejas de opuestos. Así, partiendo de la capacidad de estar o no vinculada a un significado y de la capacidad de ser o no escrita –criterios que remontan a Prisciano–, el primer par de términos que conforman la primera

tipología de *vox* es *articulata* / *confusa*, denominaciones que leemos en los gramáticos latinos, salvo en Prisciano, quien prefiere *inarticulata* a *confusa*, mostrando una vinculación más estrecha con el correlato griego ἔναρθος / ἄναρθος, sin duda de tradición estoica. La segunda pareja, en cambio, resulta ser *litterata* / *illiterata*, términos que evocan, aun en parte, la clasificación de voz propuesta por Diógenes: articulada (ἔναρθος) e inarticulada (ἄναρθος), siendo aquella susceptible de ser o no escrita (ἐγγράμματος / ἀγγράμματος) y, por ende, significativa (σεμαντική) o no significativa (ἀσήμαντος). Henos, por tanto, ante dos tradiciones distantes en el tiempo aunque relativamente cercanas en sus propuestas: mientras que Diógenes diferencia entre la voz de los animales y la de los hombres, pudiendo ser ésta no articulada o articulada y portadora o no de significado, Prisciano distingue entre articulada letrada o iletrada e inarticulada letrada o iletrada. Sea como fuere, y en vista del empleo, por parte de los autores antiguos, de términos tan alejados y, a la vez, tan próximos, el profesor Luque se detiene a aclarar las interpretaciones que del término *articulata* se han ofrecido a lo largo de los tratados por él manejados. Así, esta voz es empleada con el sentido de *explanata*, con el de *scriptilis* y contenida, de alguna manera, en la oposición esotica λέξις / λόγος, esto es, la secuencia fónica material y el enunciado portador de significado (*dictio* / *oratio*). El capítulo culmina con unas palabras acerca de la articulación del *sonus vocis*, o sea, el aspecto fónico del habla, en general, y de la voz humana, en particular, concebido como articulado.

Es un hecho ampliamente demostrado que el sonido musical es obviado en las clasificaciones de *vox* / *sonus* que se han conservado. De ahí, la pretensión del capítulo quinto, "La música y el estudio del lenguaje", de ahondar en este aspecto. El vínculo tan estrecho que existía entre el sonido del habla y el sonido de la música no pasaba inadvertido para los hombres de estudio de la Antigüedad, como lo demuestra la combinación de la teoría lingüística y de la musical en el ámbito fonético, prosódico y musical. Un buen ejemplo de ello es la doctrina sobre el acento, donde gramáticos y músicos comparten y enlazan no solo denominaciones, sino también conceptos. Con todo, Mario Victorino y Diomedes son los únicos autores de textos sobre el lenguaje que incluyen, en sus páginas, la relación entre el sonido del habla y el de la música. Si bien Probo aparenta seguir esta misma tendencia, es un hecho aceptado hoy en día que en su tratado no aparece una alusión explícita a los sonidos de la música *sensu stricto*. De esta manera, partiendo de aquella clasificación de la *vox* en *articulata* y *confusa*, la novedad de Mario Victorino radica en diferenciar en la primera dos *species*, el sonido musical de los instrumentos (*vox articulata musica*) y el del lenguaje (*vox articulata communis*). Por su parte, Diomedes, aun identificando el sonido musical con el de los ὄργανα, cataloga este sonido como *vox modulata* y como un tercer tipo independiente de los otros dos. Así, Diomedes designa aquellas *vox confusa*, *vox articulata* y *vox modulata* como *eloquium*, *tinnitus* y *sonus*,

respectivamente, dependiendo de la función que cada voz desempeñe: sonido del lenguaje, sonido de la música o ruido. La voz del habla y la música, por tanto, fueron consideradas y tenidas en cuenta tanto en tratados musicales, en los que sus autores dejan a un lado la *vox confusa*, el sonido no articulado y el ruido, como en los rítmicos, retóricos, poéticos, ortográficos y métricos.

Sea como fuere, todos aquellos que en la Antigüedad se dedicaron al estudio del sonido del lenguaje y de la música evidencian en sus escritos un sistema jerárquico de sus constituyentes, un aspecto considerado igualmente por el profesor Luque en el sexto capítulo de su trabajo, "La articulación jerárquica". Partiendo de la concepción del lenguaje y de la música como un sistema gradual en el que unos componentes mínimos e indivisibles se integran en otros y éstos, a su vez, en otros y así sucesivamente, Jesús Luque aborda a lo largo de estas páginas la problemática que presenta la determinación de los conceptos empleados por griegos y romanos en esta visión jerárquica de los componentes del lenguaje (letra, sílaba, palabra, oración) en claro paralelo con los constituyentes del μέλος (nota, intervalo, sistema). Dicho enfoque presenta una dilatada tradición que parece remontar, aun sin datos fehacientes, a la doctrina estoica, entre cuyas filas se pronunció al respecto Diógenes de Babilonia, si atendemos a Diógenes Laercio. Con todo, según el profesor Luque, se ha querido ver el *origo* de esta jerarquía en el ámbito músico-pitagórico, siendo el trasunto lingüístico una progesión similar a aquella. No faltan, en cambio, quienes estiman la cuna de dicha organización en la enseñanza elemental del lenguaje y de la lectura, una postura respaldada por la idiosincrasia de la escritura. Para Jesús Luque, en fin, la jerarquía lingüística es consecuente en sí misma desde el punto de vista fónico prosódico, pues sus elementos resultan ser las tres unidades rítmicas naturales en la articulación del habla, esto es, en la producción del lenguaje. De ahí que, para él, su complicidad en la escritura y en la lógica sea tenida como un rasgo secundario y ulterior en el análisis gramatical.

Aunque Hipias se mostraba en la misma línea estoica, el profesor Luque trata por separado la estructura lingüística y la estructura rítmica, por un lado, y la estructura lingüística y la estructura harmónica, por otro, para hacer comprender el tratamiento de esta ordención escalonada en el lenguaje y su correlato en la harmonía. Así, Aristóxeno de Tarento fue el primero que, tras discriminar entre ritmo de la música y elementos del lenguaje –algo que no encontramos ni en Platón ni en Aristóteles–, presentó ordenados jerárquicamente los constituyentes de la voz articulada en el habla normal, en claro paralelo con los de la melodía. A partir de Platón, además, las analogías entre el habla y la melodía o el canto son cada vez más frecuentes. En este sentido las encontramos en Aristóteles y en los tratados técnicos musicales de Aristóxeno, Adrasto, Nicómaco de Gerasa, Arístides Quintiliano, Calcidio, Favonio Eulogio, Macrobio y Baquio Geronte, en cuyo texto reconoció las mismas tres características que los gramáticos también registraron en las

letras: figura (σχῆμα), nombre (ὄνομα) y capacidad (δύναμις) en cuanto a valor fónico. Con todo, el alcance y difusión de esta ordenación gradual tuvo una inmensa trascendencia en el antiguo análisis lingüístico, cuya inclusión en tratados de índole retórica, gramatical y métrica deja clara huella al respecto.

En el capítulo siguiente, "Letras y notas: los «elementos» del sistema", el profesor Luque se detiene en el concepto de unidad mínima y en los aspectos o facetas que en ella se reconocen. Aun con una organización que dificulta la lectura del mismo, dados los saltos en la explicación y/o concreción de algunos de los conceptos tratados en él, su análisis comienza con un detenido examen de esos "elementos" en su máxima expresión y concluye con lo que él llama los "accidentes" de la letra o *elementum*. Tras una breve reflexión acerca del origen y evolución de la escritura alfabética, Jesús Luque ofrece un somero repaso de la reflexión teórica de la(s) letra(s) en Grecia y en Roma. Mientras que aquí dicha teorización aparece tanto en tratados de gramática como en escritos de ortografía o métrica, destacando nombres de estudiosos interesados en la materia (Apio Claudio, Fabio Píctor, Cincio Alimento, Ennio, Accio, Lucilio, César, Varrón, Mesala Corvino o el propio emperador Claudio), allí se presenta contenida en la doctrina estoica de la teoría de la voz / sonido y en los manuales de gramática, retórica, música y rítmica. De otra parte, la letra entendida como στοιχεῖον –esto es, como componente mínimo del habla– es algo que remonta a Platón. Habida cuenta de que este término también se empleaba para designar los primeros principios del mundo físico, Eudemo de Rodas, discípulo de Aristóteles, siguió al filósofo de Atenas en lo que a la denominación de las letras se refiere, si bien él, como más tarde Dionisio de Halicarnaso, alternó este término con ἀρχή en cuanto que alude a los comienzos. No obstante, aunque el origen y ámbito primigenio de tamaño empleo ha originado posturas y opiniones varias, los usos que de στοιχεῖον da Platón en *Crátilo* son los que, en realidad, interesan al profesor Luque, pues son los que influyeron en la tradición del análisis lingüístico. Es más, es en Platón donde se dan los primeros ejemplos del empleo de στοιχεῖον / γράμμα para indicar una misma realidad. En este sentido, mientras que la aportación estoica en el estudio de la voz y de su componente mínimo es capital, para Aristóteles el término στοιχεῖον no indica sino el componente elemental de alguna entidad en la que se analiza y descompone. En estrecha relación con esta concepción aristotélica está Dionisio de Halicarnaso, cuyo tratamiento de estos elementos se asemeja en demasía al que, más tarde, presentarán los manuales de gramática. El interés del profesor Luque en este concepto se refleja en el análisis de la propia voz *littera*, de la que afirma ser un tecnicismo vulgarizado en Roma desde tiempos antiguos y muy difundido en la lengua coloquial, llegando a adoptar todos los sentidos del griego γράμμα. La etimología de una y otra forma es algo esperado, por parte del profesor Luque, justo a continuación, aunque es pospuesto para más adelante: mientras que γράμμα presenta una raíz fiable, la etimología de *littera* es más compleja,

dando lugar a diversas teorías, entre las que destaca aquella que hace derivar el término de *legitera*, en general, o en alguna de sus facetas, tal y como lo entendieron Diomedes, Mario Victorino o Isidoro de Sevilla. A ello han de añadirse las definiciones de letra dada por los teóricos antiguos, para quienes, bajo esta denominación, se combinaban dos acepciones: la de ser tenida como sonido o fonema y la de designar los signos gráficos de tales sonidos. No obstante, se echa en falta en este análisis del profesor Luque otro semejante aplicado al término *elementum*, algo que relega a otra parte más avanzada de su estudio. Con todo, su oscura etimología propició, desde antiguo, que se hicieran diversas propuestas.

Sea como fuere, *littera* (γράμμα) y *elementum* (στοιχεῖον) son empleados por los artígrafos para indicar diferentes aspectos de los componentes del lenguaje oral y escrito, por lo que no son tenidos como sinónimos. Serán los gramáticos quienes diferenciarán ambos conceptos: *elementum* resulta ser la articulación mínima del *sonus vocis* –o sea, una entidad fónica– y *littera*, en cambio, el signo gráfico que representa dicho sonido en la escritura. Esta diferenciación se mantuvo durante un tiempo, como lo evidencian las obras de los artígrafos griegos, Prisciano, Marciano Capela y Boecio, si bien se acabó perdiendo con el tiempo.

En cuanto a los accidentes, tradicionalmente se reconocían en la Antigüedad tres: el nombre, la figura o grafema y la entidad fónica y valor funcional. A ellos se añadió una cuarta propiedad: la "posición" o puesto que ocupa la letra en el orden alfabético y sus posibilidades combinatorias. Aunque este último no es considerado propiamente un accidente, es un hecho que en la tradición gramatical griega se llegaron a contar hasta seis, entre los que se incluía aquella "posición". De cualquier manera, luego de aclarar que por ἐκφώνησις / *pronuntiatio* –variante fónica que escapa a la representación gráfica alfabética– se entiende toda variante prosódica (acento, cantidad y aspiración), el profesor Luque plantea la cuestión de si estos accidentes son propios de las letras o de los elementos. Según él, vista la concreción conceptual de *littera* (γράμμα) y *elementum* (στοιχεῖον), estas peculiaridades son, en realidad, las de los *elementa*, si bien, cuando se aplican a las letras, no es sino como resultado de la abusiva identificación que de ambos términos llegó a hacerse en la Antigüedad. Con todo, aunque según Dionisio de Halicarnaso esta doctrina está vinculada al ramo de la enseñanza elemental, se han visto en ella raíces estoicas. Las definiciones de letra a lo largo de la época antigua y tardoantigua dan fe, no obstante, de las modificaciones hechas, por parte de los gramáticos, en las enseñanzas y concepciones estoicas y aristotélicas al respecto. En los escritos de música, empero, también se tienen en cuenta los accidentes del sonido considerando la significación que de στοιχεῖον presenta cada musicólogo. Así, mientras que Aristóxeno, Nicómaco de Gerasa, Arístides Quintiliano o Boecio lo identifican como "comienzo" o "rudimento", Baquio el Viejo y los *Excerpta*

ex Nicomacho lo toman como "elemento constituyente". Es más, el propio Baquio afirma que la nota consta de tres accidentes, que resultan ser los mismos que los vistos en la letra por los gramáticos y por Varrón en las prosodias. En el ámbito gramatical latino se documentan dos sistemas de accidentes: uno que comprende un solo objeto (*littera*) con tres aspectos y que presenta dos variantes, y otro que propone tres objetos distintos y que, como el anterior, también incluye dos variantes. El más antiguo de estos sistemas, llamado por Jesús Luque "primer sistema" y atestiguado en el siglo II, es la primera versión del primer sistema, más cercana a la doctrina estoica y conocida por los latinos a través de los gramáticos griegos. La segunda versión, en cambio, es la "doctrina vulgata" presentada por los gramáticos latinos de los siglos IV y V y el de Donato y sus seguidores. Antes de explicar el segundo sistema, el profesor Luque vuelve a hacer un *excursus* para precisar nuevamente el nombre de las notas, lo que complementa aquellos apartados del comienzo de este capítulo donde ya se trató este aspecto de manera más detenida. A Asper se debe la primera versión del segundo sistema, donde se reconoce la *littera* de tres maneras y aplicable a tres cosas distintas: al nombre, a la figura y al valor, a lo que se podría añadir la posición o distribución. Escauro, en fin, es el responsable de la segunda versión del sistema, donde se sugiere una nueva tríada terminológica para designar tres realidades diferentes. Sin embargo, como ya hiciera en otras ocasiones, el profesor Luque relega la explicación de este sistema a un apartado más adelantado y no ahora, como se esperaría.

La última sección del capítulo aborda la cuestión del vínculo que debe mediar entre el *sonus vocis* y su representación escrita, es decir, entre la escritura y la pronunciación. Desde la época de la República, se reconocían en Roma dos tendencias al respecto: la capitaneada por Accio, defensor de una escritura fonética, que subordinaba lo escrito a lo oral, a lo que se acogieron luego Cicerón y César; y la presidida por Lucilio, que ponía la escritura al servicio del significado de las palabras, una tendencia seguida por Nigidio Fígulo y Varrón. Aunque los tratadistas de la primera época imperial conocieron, combinaron y conciliaron ambas posturas, se acabó imponiendo una ortografía normativa que trató de solucionar los problemas de la corrección gráfica distinguiendo lo oral de lo escrito y analizando todo lo susceptible de ser registrado por la escritura. Así, los ortógrafos partieron del alfabeto y tomaron conciencia de sus valores fónicos para usarlo con eficacia y corrección, paliando las dificultades que pudieran surgir en esta correspondencia, acudiendo a criterios semánticos o gramaticales, como hicieron Velio Longo y Agustín. El capítulo culmina con la concreción y matización de "nota", en su aspecto gramatical, en los autores latinos antiguos y tardoantiguos.

Visto y estudiado todo lo pertinente al sonido de la voz, materia prima originaria del sistema lingüístico y del musical, el profesor Luque trata en el octavo capítulo, "El ritmo", precisamente este constituyente formal de

dicho material sonoro. A pesar de que Arístides Quintiliano ya fue consciente de la complejidad en el uso del término ῥυθμός, cuya multiplicidad de significaciones hizo que se aplicara a diversos ámbitos más allá del de los fenómenos audibles, la definición aristoxénica de ritmo como "ordenación de los tiempos" sufrió sucesivas reelaboraciones, aunque no modificaciones. Aceptando, además, la cualidad connatural que implica el ritmo, las definiciones modernas continúan insistiendo en el factor motriz o temporal, evocando, así, al tarentino. Centrados en el ritmo del lenguaje, de las fases de la producción del habla, el profesor Luque únicamemte analiza al detalle tres: la organización temporal, marcada por patrones de tono vocal, ritmo e intensidad; la organización prosódica, donde se manejan factores de tono e intensidad considerados como rasgos suprasegmentales diferentes a los rasgos de tono, sonoridad o intensidad; y la organización rítmico-métrica, fundamentada en la determinación de la producción o percepción del ritmo. Así, todo este amasijo en lo que a la articulación del *sonus vocis* se refiere se complica un poco más cuando se pretende hacer un uso artístico del habla. El lenguaje versificado no es sino el resultado de un proceso de estilización y estereotipación de determinadas formas del habla normal, pudiendo llegar a fijarse algunas de ellas como "formas métricas". Este proceso, en fin, es denominado por el profesor Luque como "habla marcada" y es tenida como *origo* del sistema musical y del sistema versificatorio. En este sentido, el estudio de sus componentes fónicos comporta la dificultad, que no la imposibilidad, de la conciliación de conceptos y, especialmente, términos con la música. Jesús Luque dedica la última parte del capítulo a ciertos aspectos de la teoría rítmico-métrica, que finalmente se consolidó en el seno de las antiguas artes musicales y se difundió, más tarde, al ámbito de la retórica y de la gramática. Ritmo y metro, por tanto, se contraponen como género y especie, como serie infinita y serie finita, como secuencia indefinida y secuencia definida o delimitada. Sus grados de abstracción, además, también difieren entre sí, ya que, mientras que éste es un ritmo secundario lingüísticamente determinado y realizado a base de materiales lingüísticos, aquél es algo más abstracto y genérico que la métrica. Nótese, en definitiva, la imbricación mutua de sendos conceptos, provocando dificultades terminológicas ulteriores. De ahí que el profesor Luque se detenga en los dos últimos epígrafes de este capítulo a explicar y a aclarar los orígenes de la noción de "ritmo" (ῥυθμός), "número" (ἀριθμός) y "harmonía" (ἁρμονία), en el ámbito griego, y las denominaciones *rhythmus* y *numerus* en el latino.

Teniendo como base todas las nociones relacionadas con el ritmo presentadas y analizadas hasta ahora, Jesús Luque aborda en el capítulo noveno, "El fraseo: miembros de la articulación de la cadena fónica (*carmen*, *colon*, *caesvra*, *melos*)", ciertos juicios acerca de los segmentos mayores en la articulación rítmica de la cadena fónica, esto es, las unidades musicales del lenguaje superiores a la palabra. Semejante reflexión girará en torno a una

serie de términos y conceptos de un alcance incuestionable en este ámbito: *carmen*, patrón básico en la organización artística (poética) de la cadena hablada y génesis de su organización temporal; y *colon*, o sea, la articulación básica en dicha organización, un término que remite al anterior y que conecta, empero, con *melos* y con *caesvra*. Todo ello, según el profesor Luque, situará al lector en una perspectiva adecuada para retomar la organización rítmica del lenguaje artístico, el *numerus* y el ritmo. Aunque al comienzo del capítulo dedica unas páginas al concepto *carmen*, indicando la complejidad semántica que aporta este término, su etimología y su consideración al respecto por parte de obras léxicas y de autores antiguos, no será hasta más adelante cuando Jesús Luque vuelva a analizar con más detalle este concepto vinculado ahora con los de *colon* y *melos*. Estas vueltas hacia atrás y hacia delante en la lectura de ciertos pasajes de este ingente estudio dificulta la línea conductora y de comprensión de su contenido. Algo parecido ocurre con la inclusión del segundo epígrafe de este capítulo ("*In principio vox*"), más adecuado, quizá, cuando trató el lenguaje versificado en el capítulo anterior. Sea como fuere, el autor analiza y presenta, desde diversas perspectivas, los miembros del sonido vocal. Por un lado, se ocupa del *colon* y *comma*; por otro, de la *caesvra*, *colon* y *comma*; y por otro, en fin, del *colon*, *melos* y *carmen*. La primera pareja –*colon* y *comma*–, junto con otras unidades, se incluyen en un sistema jerárquico de entidades que los métricos reconocen en la articulación del lenguaje versificado y que, al mismo tiempo, mantienen una estrecha relación con lo que el profesor Luque llama la "doctrina sobre el poema", un apartado autónomo en el ámbito de los metricólogos alejandrinos. Con todo, tales conceptos no presentan un rasgo de exclusividad para dicha doctrina, ni para la métrica, ni para la retórica ni tampoco para la gramática. La doctrina articulatoria, en fin, desciende de las primeras etapas de la teoría musical.

El segundo grupo de términos –*caesvra*, *colon*, *comma*– no son considerados sino como entidades distintas desde el punto de vista de su relación con el esquema rítmico, si bien en otros ámbitos la diferenciación que pudiera haber existido entre ellos se fue difuminando, provocando, así, la intercambiabilidad entre ellos. Para el profesor Luque, la antigua doctrina rítmica de la μουσική está detrás de la doctrina métrica. A partir del último pasaje del tratado de Aftonio dedicado a Horacio, el autor analiza el tercer y último grupo de términos y conceptos –*colon*, *melos*, *carmen*– desde el punto de vista de la dicción, la melodía y el ritmo, por un lado, y desde el pormenorizado estudio y etimología de cada uno de ellos, por otro. En dicho examen, ostenta un especial interés por la forma *carmen*, poniéndola en relación con *carpere* y con *canere*, dedicando unas líneas a tratar de aclarar qué se entiende por cantar y en qué se diferencian el canto y el habla.

El capítulo décimo, "La oralidad del lenguaje literario", mantiene una conexión, si no una continuación más precisa, del anterior, pues en él el autor

plantea cuestiones relacionadas con la ejecución oral de los textos literarios tanto en verso como en prosa, lo que adquiere capital trascendencia en el caso de la antigua literatura grecorromana si se tiene en cuenta el carácter oral que la revestía y la imposibilidad de conocer directamente dicha ejecución oral. En este sentido, es más que necesario para un correcto análisis de los textos antiguos tener presente que fueron concebidos en y para una interpretación oral, siendo siempre recitados o leídos en voz alta. El profesor Luque, por tanto, aborda este penúltimo capítulo desde dos perspectivas: desde la de la ejecución oral de los versos y desde la de la articulación y ejecución de la prosa. En el primer caso, advierte que, a día de hoy, ha de plantearse considerando sus justos términos y sabiendo discernir los fenómenos de dicho nivel de funcionamiento de análisis de otros. Para ello, dice, es menester atender a las unidades rítmicas naturales y a las unidades del sistema métrico, en cuanto que se trata de una ejecución propia del terreno de las relaciones entre las unidades rítmico-métricas del sistema versificatorio y las unidades rítmicas naturales de la producción del habla. El profesor Luque incluye, asimismo, en este contexto la cuestión de hasta qué punto la ejecución oral del verso recitado, y no cantado, implica o no una entonación y/o acentuación peculiar, una práctica a mitad de camino entre el habla normal y lo que actualmente se concibe como canto. Este aspecto cobra capital interés en el caso de los versos antiguos, sobre cuya entidad fónica únicamente se pueden hacer conjeturas. Habida cuenta de que en la antigua Grecia y en Roma las divergencias entre los conceptos de canto y habla no eran las mismas que las que se tienen a día de hoy, y teniendo presente la vacilación, a lo largo del tiempo, en lo que a la relación entre música y poesía se refiere, para Jesús Luque la historia de las formas métricas es la historia del proceso de su paso desde el canto al recitado. Para ello, aporta testimonios de Quintiliano, Persio, Arístides Quintiliano y Boecio, principalmente.

El segundo enfoque implícito en este análisis de la oralidad del lenguaje versa sobre la articulación y ejecución de la prosa, es decir, sobre su estructura rítmica general. La amplitud, dificultad y complejidad de semejante estudio es innegable, vista la presencia de conceptos y términos que no han sido bien definidos ni definibles y que se hallan inmersos en un vasto marco temporal. A toda esta complicada situación ha de añadirse la polivalencia de las disciplinas y la multiplicidad de los términos, así como la continua incorporación de nuevos ramos y enfoques de estudio a una *traditio* ininterrumpida. A una vertiente teórica tal se une otra práctica basada en el análisis de los propios textos, en cuyo examen es indiscutible la dificultad de reconocimento de las unidades articulatorias. En vista de la enormidad que supone el estudio y la exposición de este complejo proceso, el profesor Luque lo emprende desde la más elemental y primitiva formalización del habla, designada por él "habla marcada", desde el *carmen*, desde la antigua μουσική griega al verso recitado –con los problemáticos conceptos implícitos de στίχος, *versus*,

periodus, *colon*, *comma* y *caesvra* en el lenguaje versificado–, a la prosa artística –donde se incluye la *compositio*, la *concinnitas* y el *numerus*–, a la codificación escrita de ese verso y de esa prosa y a la ulterior lectura y análisis de dichos textos escritos. La parte final del proceso aquí descrito tampoco puede obviar el desarrollo y perfeccionamiento de la escritura, en general, ni de la actividad filológica, en particular. Esta última implica, a su vez, tener en cuenta las diversas técnicas de depuración, fijación, presentación, copia y lectura de los textos, donde la evolución en lo que a la funcionalidad, representación y teorización de la puntuación de éstos se refiere pone punto y final al capítulo.

Como cierre a todas las reflexiones hechas a lo largo de estas páginas, el profesor Luque no quiere dar por concluido su estudio sin antes hacer unas últimas consideraciones al respecto desde el punto de vista de la astrología y la magia o la religión. Así, en el capítulo final, "A modo de corolario: letras y notas", el autor se refiere a las letras y sonidos o notas musicales que, a su vez, dada la concepción metafísica que de la música se tenía en la Antigüedad, están implícitamente relacionadas con los astros. En este sentido, el profesor Luque no puede obviar el número siete, al que dedica un epígrafe como cifra mágica, cósmica y mística, según testimonios de Filón de Alejandría, Plutarco y Marcos el Mago. Tras estas palabras preliminares, el resto del capítulo gira en torno a ese misticismo de la música y el lenguaje. Así, sabemos por diversas fuentes –Amiano Marcelino, Demetrio o Nicómaco de Gerasa– que combinaciones varias de las vocales griegas fueron empleadas como fórmulas de plegarias o como imprecaciones mágicas. Sabiendo de la correspondencia entre astros y vocales por parte de los antiguos griegos, testimonios de Arístides Quintiliano, Porfirio o Juan Lorenzo Lido, que se muestra pitagórico al respecto, demuestran que el orden de éstas en equivalencia con aquéllos no fue siempre el mismo. Otros documentos, en cambio, afirman que lo que en realidad se asigna a cada planeta no es una vocal, sino una ordenación determinada de vocales. Así lo manifiesta una inscripción de un teatro de Mileto y las explicaciones de Pausanias, Jámblico y Teodoreto. Eusebio de Cesarea, además, refiere que ciertas fórmulas vocálicas se emplean asociadas a nombres indecibles de ciertas divinidades y personajes propios de la mitología judía, en vez de a los planetas. Sea como fuere, el número siete aparece asociado, como se ha visto, a las vocales y a los planetas.

Aunque el profesor Luque no lo menciona en estas páginas, esta cifra se tenía por sagrada y venerada, ya que, además, era el número de los sabios, el día del nacimiento del dios Apolo (el séptimo día del mes *Bysios*), el número de las puertas de Tebas y el de las cuerdas de la lira. Con todo, el autor se detiene en la integración de las siete vocales en el sistema harmónico cósmico, obviando la cuestión planetaria, sus respectivas esferas y cómo éstas, con sus sonidos aritméticamente sistematizados en aquella harmonía cósmica, se representan en las siete cuerdas de la lira, proveyendo, en fin, los siete

tonos de la octava. El pilar de su análisis, por tanto, es doble: por un lado, tiene en cuenta la base alfabética del sistema de siete vocales, evocando, así, lo dicho en el capítulo sexto; y por otro, las concibe como el alma y vida del sonido del lenguaje, en cuanto que éstas son las únicas que tienen voz propia y que pueden, por ello, ser nombradas por sí mismas y formar una sílaba sin el apoyo de ninguna otra letra. En este sentido, para el profesor Luque los elementos vocálicos conforman lo esencial de la *vox* / φωνή. La parte final del capítulo y del libro está dedicada a la metafísica de los sonidos de la música y del lenguaje, bajo el prisma pitagórico, y a la identificación entre letras y notación musical, un epígrafe que el propio profesor Luque reconoce que queda fuera del campo de estudio presentado a lo largo de estas páginas. El pensamiento pitagórico llegó a reconocer, a través de los escritos de sus adeptos más destacados, una entidad metafísica en cuanto trascendencia cosmológica tanto para los sonidos de la música como para los del lenguaje y sus constituyentes mínimos, llegando a equiparar las notas musicales con los elementos de la lengua.

Amén de dos erratas localizadas ("avarios", en la página 345, y "las antiguas concepciones del respecto", en la página 352), se echan en falta un índice temático o de términos y otro onomástico previos a la bibliografía, una herramienta de innegable valor para el futuro lector interesado en esta materia. No obstante, y pese a la ausencia de un último apartado que compendie las principales conclusiones de este denso estudio, el valiosísimo catálogo bibliográfico citado a lo largo de las páginas de este libro supone un magnífico epílogo al conjunto de esta obra, a cuya distribución contribuirá la excelente edición, presentada en un formato pulcro, elegante y cuidado.

Fuensanta Garrido Domené
Universidad de Huelva
fuensanta.garrido@dfesp.uhu.es

Koen De Temmerman, *Crafting Characters: Heroes and Heroines in the ancient Greek novel*, Oxford: OUP, 2014, 432 pp. ISBN 978-01-9968-614-8.

This attractive book has originated from Koen de Temmerman's (hereby KDT) doctoral dissertation which was awarded the *Triennial Prize for Humanities* in 2008 by the Royal Flemish Academy of Belgium for Science and the Arts. The main topic is the understudied topic of characterization of the novelistic protagonists. In it, KDT succeeds in questioning and challenging some ongoing scholarly assumptions about the supposedly ideal, typical, symmetrical, and static portrayal of the heroes and heroines of the ancient Greek novels[1]. KDT approaches each novel separately following the recent scholarly tendency.[2] In what follows, I will give a summary of each of the five chapters and selectively discuss some characteristic examples of analysis.

The Introductory Chapter: Greek *ethos,* KDT rightly argues, does not altogether translate the modern term 'character'. KDT broadly follows Christopher Gill's distinction between 'objective' conceptions of characters, which were intended as social moral exempla, and modern notions of 'personality', notions of 'idiosyncratic self' (p. 9-11). KDT yet attempts to demonstrate that, albeit less notably, the protagonists of the Greek novels display some trends of idiosyncratic treatment. KDT's methodology relies on narratological approaches that examine characterization as focalized through the narrators and/or focalizers but also considers the reader's gradual deciphering of the characters through the plot (pp. 28-29). Then KDT turns to the *progymnasmata* to extract a list of techniques of characterization that would have been familiar to the novelists and their readers: e.g. name giving; direct characterization; indirect, i.e. metaphorical *exempla;* metonymical, such as emotions, social context, actions, speech, appearance; setting (p. 41). He thus opens his analysis with an interesting blend of modern structural narratology and intertextual theory with ancient terminology.

In the first chapter, Callirhoe's *sophrosyne* is analyzed alongside the mythical *exempla* of Penelope and Helen and notably focalized through Chaereas. KDT follows the heroine as she develops from an inexperienced noble girl to a woman who craftily controls her interpersonal relationships.

[1] Mainly voiced by M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four essays*. Ed. M. Holquist, transl C. Emerson and M. Holquist, Texas 1981. E.g. J. Morgan.

[2] Cf. T. Whitmarsh, *Narrative and identity in the ancient Greek novel*, Cambridge 2011; S. Montiglio, *Love and Providence*, Oxford 2012.

In the second part we follow Chaereas' heroic transformation, military deeds and rhetorical performance, that are patterned on mythical exempla such as Achilles, Odysseus, Diomedes, and Agamemnon. Most intriguing, is KDT's analysis of Callirhoe's moral dilemmas and of her internal conflict (pp. 61-63), which becomes characteristic of her 'personality' (p. 65). Equally fascinating are the intratextual[3] symmetries between the Plangon and the Artaxates incident (pp. 71-73) as well as the comparison of Chaereas' 'life' with the (admittedly postdating) Plutarchan *exemplum* of Themistocles and Alcibiades. Chaereas 'abrupt change' , the author argues, was later used for depicting Callisthenes' behaviour in Achilles Tatius.

The second chapter studies Xenophon's *Ephesiaca* as a test-case of *apheleia,* namely of stylistic simplicity, which is effected through indirect characterization. The model here is Xenophon of Athens and the theoretical framework may be found in Ps.-Aristeides' *Ars Rhetorica*. The novel presents two contrasting protagonists: Anthia, who behaves rationally when Habrocomes reacts emotionally (p. 136). KDT reads closely the Cyno episode as an intratextual parallel of the Manto one to highlight the change in Habrocomes' reaction, from impulse to moderation. Less convincing are the downplay of the Hippolytean metaphorical analogue and the questioning of the Odyssesus-Penelope model for the couple the Hippolytean metaphorical analogue for the hero that he limits to the opening scene and the Odysseus-Penelope one for the couple (p. 142-143), on which previous scholarship has extensively focused. Unlike Chariton, Xenophon who writes within a (depending on the dating) more or less established tradition does not make thorough use of the mythical *exempla* because these were already a well-embedded part of the novelistic narrative.

Among the most interesting analysis of KDT is the discussion of Achilles Tatius. The novel, notoriously, focuses primarily in the homodiegetic embedded narrator, Clitophon. The 'multiple signalling of possible narratorial unreliability' (p. 157) of the Phoenician narrator challenges the readerly interpretations. KTD invites us to read Clitophon's tale as a fictionalized and/or 'mythologized' version of the true story rather than a myth-like true story (p. 161). Clitophon's subversive *sophrosyne* is once more revisited here but the author adds an interesting comparison of Clitophon with Habrocomes and Ninus (pp. 163-166). The most exciting part of this analysis is the intertextual study of Clitophon's self-fashioning and his focalization of Leucippe as an 'ideal' novelistic heroine through generic formulas of gnomic wisdom rather than his own.

The Longus chapter discusses how the novel gives a description of the *physis* of the two young protagonists and how it is further developed and complicated by the 'cultural norms regarding sexual and social matters' (p.

[3] See A. Sharrock, and H. Morales, *Intratextuality,* Oxford 2000.

206). KTD examines the erotic development and metamorphosis of Chloe into a 'giver of life' (p. 212), and her gradual effacement which opposes her dynamic, for the plot, desire, that opens the novel. Contrarily, the reader is prompted to follow Daphnis' increased control over erotic, social, and rhetorical matters. The novel, KDT argues, although attempts a psychological description of the protagonists it does not describe their individual personalities but casts their individuation behind the broader literary and socio-cultural categories of 'youth' and 'rustic upbringing'. Like Chaereas, Daphnis' itinerary to adulthood is described in 'realistic' and not 'ideal' terms (p. 243). More controversial is the study of the 'apple episode' (p. 243), a demonstration of Daphnis' rhetorical skills, which KDT does not relate to his earlier argument about Daphnis' formal *paideia* (p. 208) that would have endowed him with such a mythological background. Equally implausible in my view is Chloe's metamorphosis into a harmonious *locus amoenus* that supposedly reflects the harmony that dominates the end of the aetiological myths (p. 212). Indeed Chloe's eagerness to learn about *eros* contrasts her to the tragic ends of mythical virgins but has been interpreted as an indication of 'Longus' control over his own fictional world' as argued by John Morgan.[4]

KDT's attempt to follow the characters as they evolve during the plotting finds its most successful articulation in the analysis of Heliodorus' protagonists. The author demonstrates how the novel's opening depicts the hero and the heroine as ideal protagonists through a 'stock of novelistic motifs', well-known to the reader (p. 249) and how the retrospective zooming into the characters' pasts maps the path towards this idealization. For example, Charicleia's rejection of marriage when at Delphi and her Penelopean *sophrosyne* displayed at the Thyamis event illustrates her gradual understanding and reshaping of the notion of chastity, from virginity to faithful monogamy. Then KDT explores the rhetorical articulation of *sophrosyne* and shows how Calasiris teaches Charicleia, who then teaches Theagenes, how to avoid direct confrontation with potentially dangerous rivals through careful witty speech. We would like to see more in depth how Calasiris and Charicleia exemplify the teacher/philosopher-pupil relationship attested in the statesmen's biographies, noted by KDT, but only briefly discussed (p. 267-268). The chapter closes with an interesting overview of body language and rhetorical performance during the protagonists' recognition at Meroe and with a deconstruction of the Achilles and Andromeda paradigms for Theagenes and Charicleia respectively.

A few additional comments: I sometimes found it difficult to follow the application of the extensive theoretical background presented in the Introduction throughout the chapters. In the partial analyses it is not always easy to see how each protagonist is studied according to each of

[4] J. R. Morgan, *Daphnis and Chloe*, Oxford 2004, p. 172.

the direct/indirect introductory categories, e.g. Daphnis' and Chloe's names are only explored in a footnote (p. 228 note 62) although 'naming' is an important ancient tool for characterization (see Intro. 41). This incongruity is probably due to KDT's decision to follow the characters' development as each plot evolves rather than classifying their characteristics *a posteriori*. Also unannounced comes the otherwise interesting theme of *apheleia* in Xenophon. Occasionally the author repeats extensively previously well-analyzed passages, such as Callirhoe's association with Penelope and/or Helen or Chloe's virginity, whereas he condenses more innovative and interesting topics that the reader expects and hopes to be analyzed further, such as the comparison of Chaereas with Plutarch's *Lives* and biography. Furthermore, some interpretative jewels such as the analogue of Phoenix's and Charicleia's limited rhetorical performance (pp. 297-298) are often hidden under an overload of close-text analysis and would probably deserve to be developed fully elsewhere. Finally, probably due to the book's length, the author the author often summarizes or paraphrased most of the discussed passages and gives the Greek in brackets within his text epigrammatically, making it thus more difficult for the uninitiated reader of the Greek novel reader to follow the text and the argument, e.g. Theagenes' Achillean description (pp. 282-293).

Typos and spelling mistakes are extremely rare: e.g. τὸεὕρημα p. 228, n. 62.

The book's greatest strength is that it offers an engaging close reading of the novelistic characters and a plethora of interesting intratextual and intertextual (especially between the novels) observations. This kind of detailed approach requires that the reader is familiar with the plot of each of the Greek novels and the relevant scholarship, discussed in the rich footnotes and up-to-date literature. Although this kind of scrutinized reading makes the book more demanding for the broader, non-specialized public, it is a valuable addition to the scholarly analysis of the Greek novels and will provide an inspirational point of reference for future studies on ancient Greek characterization

Anna Lefteratou
CRC EDRIS, Univeristät Göttingen
alefter@gwdg.de

Joachim Latacz, *Homers Ilias. Studien zu Dichter, Werk und Rezeption (Kleine Schriften II),* herausgegeben von Thierry Greub, Krystyna Greub-Fracz und Arbogast Schmitt, Berlin-Boston : De Gruyter, 2014. xviii + 684 pp. ISBN 9783110306194.

Der zweite Band der Kleinen Schriften L.s stellt zugleich die Festschrift zu seinem 80. Geburtstag dar. Herausgeber sind der Klassische Philologe Arbogast Schmitt und die beiden Kunstwissenschaftler Thierry Greub und Krystyna Greub-Fracz, die – wie sie in der Gratulation schreiben – eine persönliche Freundschaft mit L. verbindet. Das Buch enthalte die wichtigsten Arbeiten L.s zu Homer aus den letzten 20 Jahren und stelle damit – in den Worten der Herausgeber – ein "Grundbuch" sowohl für Studierende und an der Literatur der Antike Interessierte als auch für die internationale Forschergemeinschaft dar. Die Aufsatzsammmlung vertritt den Anspruch, ein Gesamtbild Homers und seines Werkes zu bieten. Sie enthält sowohl Arbeiten, die sich an ein breiteres Publikum richten als auch solche, in denen L. zu in der Forschung umstrittenen Fragen Position bezieht.

Der erste Teil der Sammlung ist der Person Homers gewidmet: Er besteht aus einem Artikel aus der Themen-Reihe einer beliebten deutschen Wochenzeitschrift (Spiegel Special Geschichte), zwei wiederabgedruckten Lexikon-Artikeln aus dem "Neuen Pauly" und dem wiederabgedruckten Beitrag L.s aus einem 2011 erschienenen Homer-Handbuch.

Der zweite Teil versammelt Aufsätze zur Vorgeschichte der homerischen Epen: Sein Hauptthema ist die Einführung der Schrift in Griechenland und ihre Bedeutung für die Epik. Die frühesten griechischen Inschriften werden präsentiert – wobei es zu Überschneidungen zwischen den einzelnen Artikeln kommt – und ein Überblick über die wichtigsten Gattungen der frühgriechischen Literatur geboten (inklusive einer Liste von Standard-Textausgaben). Von den 6 Aufsätzen dieses Teils stammen 3 aus Ausstellungskatalogen. Den Abschluß bildet L.s Lexikon-Artikel "Epos II: Klassische Antike" aus dem "Neuen Pauly".

Der dritte Teil behandelt die Ilias: Ein Überblick über Inhalt und Aufbau des Epos ist aus dem 2008 erschienenen Katalog zur Ausstellung "Homer. Der Mythos von Troia in Dichtung und Kunst" wiederabgedruckt, dem auch schon zwei der drei Ausstellungs-Katalog-Beiträge des vorhergehenden Teils entnommen sind. Neben einigen kleineren Aufsätzen nimmt der Abdruck von L.s Lectio Teubneriana ("Achilleus. Wandlungen eines europäischen Heldenbildes") hier den breitesten Raum ein. Ein Teil zur Odyssee, wie man ihn in einem "Grund(lagen)buch" zu Homer eigentlich erwarten sollte, fehlt in dem Band.

Der vierte Teil "Schauplatz: Troia" enthält Beiträge L.s zur im Zuge der Ausgrabungen Manfred Korfmanns neu erwachten Diskussion um die historischen Hintergründe und die Historizität des Troia-Mythos. Seine gerade unter Althistorikern nicht unumstrittenen Thesen zu diesem Thema hat L. in seinem 2010 in 6. Auflage erschienenen Buch "Troia und Homer. Der Weg zur Lösung eines alten Rätsels" weit über altertumswissenschaftliche Fachkreise hinaus bekannt gemacht. Auch L.s Beitrag zur Debatte um die provokanten, wissenschaftlich aber kaum fundierten Thesen des als Übersetzer antiker Literatur hervorgetretenen Dichters und Komparatisten Raoul Schrott, die anlässlich des Erscheinens von dessen Buch "Homers Heimat. Der Kampf um Troia und seine realen Hintergründe" 2008 die Feuilletons deutschsprachiger Zeitungen bewegten, ist hier durch zwei kurze Artikel vertreten.

Abgeschlossen wird der Band durch Arbeiten L.s zur Homer-Rezeption, darunter zwei weitere Beiträge aus dem Ausstellungskatalog "Homer. Der Mythos von Troia in Dichtung und Kunst", der den "Kleinen Schriften II" damit nicht weniger als 5mal als Quelle dient, und ein Beitrag aus den Prolegomena des unter L.s Herausgeberschaft an der Universität Basel begonnenen Ilias-Gesamtkommentars.

Hauptintention der "Kleinen Schriften II" scheint die Popularisierung der von L. vertretenen Forschungspositionen unter einer breiteren deutschsprachigen Leserschaft zu sein. Der Sammelband enthält immerhin zwei englischsprachige Aufsätze: "Between Troy and Homer. The So-Called Dark Ages in Greece" (1994) und "A Battlefield of the Emotions: Homer's Helen" (2007), die zuvor an nicht ganz so leicht zugänglicher Stelle erschienen waren. Neben den zahlreichen Wiederabdrucken finden sich darin auch zwei "Originalbeiträge", bei denen es sich jedoch genauer betrachtet nur um die deutschen Original-Fassungen von L. bereits in englischer Sprache publizierter Arbeiten, eines Lexikon-Artikels "Achilleus" und eines Aufsatzes zu Wolfgang Petersens Film "Troy", handelt.

Der Band bietet zweifelsohne einen Überblick über das Schaffen L.s und einen Einblick in die Diskussionen, die die deutschsprachige Homer-Forschung in den letzten beiden Jahrzehnten bewegten. Aber kann man ihn wirklich als Grund(lagen)buch zu Homer bezeichnen? Kann man Studierenden wirklich guten Gewissens die Anschaffung eines um 129,95€ nicht gerade preisgünstigen Buches empfehlen, das zum größeren Teil aus wiederabgedruckten Lexikon- und Handbuch-Artikeln und Beiträgen für Ausstellungskataloge und Feuilletons besteht?

Martina Hirschberger
martina.hirschberger@hhu.de

A. M. Bowie, *Homer:* Odyssey *Books XIII and XIV,* Cambridge: CUP, 2014, 272 pp. ISBN 978-05-2176-354-7.

Bowie's commentary on *Odyssey* books 13 and 14 will be of great value to undergraduates who are encountering Homer for the first time as well as to graduate students and Homeric scholars who are seeking insightful discussion of these pivotal books of the epic. Basic grammatical analysis of forms is complemented by historical, linguistic, and literary commentary so that everyone will find B's discussion of interest.

This volume consists of an introduction, Greek text (with selective critical apparatus), 143 pages of line-by-line commentary, a glossary of linguistic terms, 14 pages of useful bibliography, and 2 indices (one on subject, one on Greek words).

The introduction includes commentary on the literary importance of books 13 and 14 as the "hinge" which brings Odysseus from the realm of the Phaeacians to the more "normal way of life" in Ithaca; the "Ideology and Sociology" of the epic; and sections on Homeric metre, the Homeric language, and the history of the text (focusing on Alexandrian scholarship).

In terms of poetic composition, B. does a fine job of showing how the poet can "create a lengthy episode out of very simple elements" (8), primarily the units of disguise, recognition, and "narrative" (tales that defer recognition, such as the story of Odysseus' scar). Indeed, repeated scenes are "central to the story…[for] the poet of the *Odyssey* seems to have set himself to show how it is possible to introduce into it a whole range of variations on the theme that is at the heart of the work: 'Who is the beggar?'" (14). These variations evoke different responses such as humor, pathos, and a sense of loss (14). When in book 13 Odysseus meets Athena in disguise as a young man who "could so easily have been his own son," B. notes "how Homer can use such type-scenes not just to expand the narrative, but also to increase the emotional complexity of the work" (135).

Regarding "ideology," B's remarks upon how unusual it is for the epic genre to have "lower-status" characters, such as Eumaeus, as prominent figures with "laudatory epithets" (16, 163). In fact, B. thinks of the *Odyssey* as "a very radical and innovative kind of epic" which introduces "low" characters into a "high" genre and "avoid[s] tales of aristocratic exploits in battle…in favour of stories of everyday life" (23). The implied comparison between Homer's description of Eumaeus' home with that of Priam's palace is "serious," not parodic: "a humble dwelling thus takes its rightful place in epic verse" (19-20). In the commentary itself, B. observes that Eumaeus'

sacrifice in book 14 receives "the same kind of detail as those [sacrifices] made by grand Iliadic heroes…again, *Od.* blurs the distinctions between aristocrat and pig-farmer;" B. concludes that "in *Od.* correct performance of sacrifice is one of the great indicators of the moral status of those whose homes Od. comes to;" after examples of those who fail to sacrifice correctly (Cyclops, Circe, Calypso, Odysseus' companions in book 12, and the suitors), he remarks that "Eum. does everything correctly and his moral caliber is stressed" (218). Thus the *Odyssey* makes "clear that aristocratic birth alone is no guarantee for nobility of character" (18 note 62). Indeed, given the "almost unrelievedly gloomy picture" in accounts of Troy, the second half of the epic in effect "devalues" the Trojan War as a great Greek triumph (23-25).

In addition to basic grammar (nouns, verbs, syntax, etc. with examples and English translations), the introductory section on Homeric language includes a succinct, accessible discussion of Indo-European linguistics which explains roots, grades (vowel gradation or *Ablaut*), and the Indo-European case system (31-33, 39-42). This interest is reflected in his note on prepositions which "originally had an independent quasi-adverbial existence" (43). In fact, the preface explicitly lays out the goal for treating Homeric language from a historical perspective: "This is not the result of a desire to deluge the reader with philological erudition, but of a conviction that, if one has an idea of how linguistic forms and constructions came about, they are more comprehensible and so easier to learn and retain" (ix). This practice is successfully demonstrated in the commentary to follow (such extensive grammatical and linguistic discussion if not found in other CUP commentaries).[1]

One of the greatest boons to intermediate Greek readers is B's willingness to define, explain, and give examples of a wide range of grammatical, linguistic, and literary terms. For example, he explains cognate accusative (5), gnomic aorist (102), "periphrastic (i.e., roundabout)" (153), "vehicle" and "tenor" for similes (101), *mise en abyme* (7 note 24), Grassman's law (34 note 115), closure (2 note 7), "'cletic' from καλέω ('call')" (154), and what is meant by a "seed" in narratology: "the planting of an apparently incidental idea in a narrative which will turn out to be significant later" (159 s.v. 13.404, here referring "to the nameless swineherd [which] gives no indication as to how important he is to be in the coming events"). While Homerists may not require these explanations, undergraduates will be exceedingly grateful for such kindnesses. Much like Homer's relationship with his audience, B. welcomes a wide range of readers.

The line-by-line commentary itself continues this broad discussion of grammatical, linguistic, historical, and literary features of books 13 and 14. There is basic grammatical aid for forms (I give examples below):

[1] E.g., Homer, *Odyssey. Books VI-VIII.* Ed. By A. F. Garvie, Cambridge 1994.

"ἔσχοντο is middle in form, but passive in sense" (93 s.v. 13.2);

"καταειμένον 'clothed', perfect passive participle of (κατα-) ἔννυμι < ϝέσ-νυ-μι, as in Latin *ves-tis"* (154 s.v. 13.351);

"τράφεν 'were brought up', 3rd p.pl. aorist passive of τρέφω" (195 s.v. 14.201);

"ὄσσομαι shares the root *ok^{w}- with ὄσσε, Latin *oculus* 'eye(s)'; it usually means 'see' in a figurative as opposed to physical sense" (197 s.v. 14.219).

B. helpfully notes that "ἔπω 'busy oneself with', from the root **sep*- (here in the zero grade), is to be distinguished etymologically from ἕπομαι 'follow', from **sek^{w}*- (cf. Latin *sequor*)" (169-70 s.v. 14.33).

I whole-heartedly applaud B.'s decision to discuss Homeric vocabulary with constant reference to Indo-European roots, Sanskrit and Latin cognates, and Mycenaean (Linear B) precursors. For example, the reader learns that "εἴρω 'I bid', < the IE root **verh$_1$*- (cf. Lat. *verbum*; Eng. *word*), whose derivatives in Greek and other IE languages can have a formal, religious or juridical overtone: cf. ῥήτρα 'spoken agreement, law' (as 14.393), ἄρρητος 'not to be spoken, secret', and so 'numinous, sacred' (Beekes 393)" (95 s.v. 13.7). (There is frequent citing of Beekes' etymological dictionary and de Jong's narratological commentary as well as the scholiasts and Eustathius—and in book 14 Hesiod's *Works and Days*.)[2] B. later employs the Sanskrit "counterpart" of the phrase ἱερὸν μένος to explain how "ἱερός in Greek can be used to mean both 'strong' and 'sacred'" (99). B. also acknowledges uncertain and unknown etymologies, such as λυκάβοντος (190 s.v. 14.161), ἀποφώλιος (197 s.v. 14.212), ἀμαιμάκετον (206 s.v. 41.311), and Eumaeus' name (174).

Certain paragraph-long notes are brilliant recapitulations of central features of the epic which scholars have discussed for millennia, such as the role of poets in Homeric epic (100); the means and social significance of acquiring material wealth (with many examples—104); the allegorical interpretation of the Cave of the Nymphs as well as what archaeology has shown--and whether this suggests that the poet himself visited this cave (112-14); the recurring appearance of olive trees in *Odyssey* (115); instances in Homer and Mesopotamian epic of divine anger and concern for honor (118-19); and the danger of ignoring divine warnings (124-26). B. contrasts the connotations of ambush as a positive skill in the *Odyssey* with the "cowardly tactic" of the *Iliad* (142). There is valuable discussion of the Greeks' "caricatural" view of the Phoenicians juxtaposed with the historical reality (143); Athena's fifteen disguises in the *Odyssey* (149); actual and figurative dogs (167); the narrator's second person address of Eumaeus (and Menelaus and Patroclus--173-74); the importance of one's polis to personal identity "which suggests that the

[2] R. S. P. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden 2010; I. J. F. de Jong, *A Narratological Commentary on the* Odyssey, Cambridge 2001.

polis was already an important concept in Homer's time" (193); the "striking example of the self-deprecating way" (in his lying tale) Odysseus speaks of throwing away his weapons during battle (203 s.v. 14.277—with relevant passages ranging from the lyric poets to Aristophanes and Plato); the use of iron in Mycenaean and Archaic Greece (and the difference between cast iron and "chased" objects—208 s.v. 14.324); and a half a page on the oracle of Dodona which speculates on how divination might have taken place as well as mentioning "the oak as a source of divine knowledge…[with] the Druids, who…took their name from that tree (< **dru-(w)id-*, 'oak-seer'; cf. (ϝ)ιδεῖν, Latin *videre*)" (208 s.v. 14.327). I have to say that I love this stuff!

The heart of books 13 and 14 comprises two extended one-on-one conversations. In his analysis, B. reveals how Odysseus cautiously tests both Athena (in disguise) and Eumaeus, withholding information before (re)establishing his relationship with god and swineherd. For example, in book 13, the disguised Athena delays naming Ithaca when Odysseus asks where he is (137). B. notes that Odysseus' speech at 13.250-86 "inaugurates the use by Od. of the 'false tales' which are a particular feature of the second half of *Od*" (139). Athene's response moves in tone "from grudging but affectionate admiration (287-92), to exasperation (at her failure to trick?, 293-5), to complicity (296-9), to an almost childish pleasure at his not having recognised her (299-302), and finally to a pragmatic approach to his problems (303-10). The familiarity between goddess and man is remarkable" (144). After Odysseus attempts to justify his attempted deception, "the intimacy between goddess and mortal in the subsequent discussion deepens, and the equality between them is marked by the way, that, taking the episode as a whole, they both speak roughly the same number of lines" (148). We also learn that in this scene Odysseus is the only one to ever address Athena as γλαυκῶπι (157 s.v. 13.389) and that book 13 has the only instance of a divinity exchanging one form of disguise for another *within* a scene (s.v. 13.288).

B. also traces the trajectory of the conversation in book 14 (in which direct speech dominates more than in any other book with 76.7%--170). B.'s focused analysis leads to the conclusion that Eumaeus "skillfully shows himself at once (a) reluctantly less generous than he might be, (b) careful of his masters' resources, and (c) canny enough to know how to behave in tricky circumstances" (174). After a meal and wine, B. charts the growing friendliness between Odysseus and Eumaeus by noting "in his addresses to Eum., Od. moves from ξεῖνε (53) to φίλε (115, 149) to his actual name here [14.440]. For the first use of a name at a crucial moment, cf. 16.204, when Od. finally persuades Telemachus that he is his father" (221 s.v. 14.440). We also come to appreciate the five-part "crescendo in the beggar's references to Od., from interest in who he might be (115-6), to a claim on oath that he will soon return (151-2), to claimed knowledge about him and a near meeting

(321-33), to the offer to be killed if Od. does not return (391-400), to actual acquaintance with him here" (223 s.v. 14.457-506).

Syntax and enjambment is profitably used to reveal mood and character. For example, early in Eumaeus' second speech "a good deal of enjambment… suggests a warm enthusiasm and a certain confidence. Once the swineherd gets to the subject of his master however the lines become end-stopped as a graver tone descends" (173 s.v. 14.55-71). Later we learn that "the fragmented syntax helps convey the fervour of Eum.'s attitudes to wrong-doing. The paratactic mode of composition can, to ears and eyes accustomed to more syntactic forms of language, appear strange, but it enables authors to make their points in a forceful and idiomatic manner" (179 s.v. 14.85-88). We also see (with the frequent enjambment in lines 14.363-8), "the constant fragmenting of the regular rhythm of the metre reflecting the agitated state that Eum. is put in by the beggar's attempts to talk about his master's return" (213 s.v. 14.363).

B. often convincingly captures the tone of a particular passage, e.g., as Odysseus refers to himself (when attempting to obtain a blanket for the evening): "the grandiose formulaic address [διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ] strikes an almost comic note, especially as it is used by Od. to himself…The grandiose beginning is complemented by the unusual poeticisms [examples given]…which contrast with what look like much more colloquial, clipped expressions in 487-9: the clash of styles perhaps aims at a studied incompetence in story-telling, or may be put down to the drink" (227 s.v. 14.486).

Frequently intermediate Greek students are most concerned with translation, yet B. emphasizes some wonderful dramatic moments in the narrative. He notes that by having the guest Odysseus unusually ask his host a question, "Homer…holds back the revelation of Od.'s name until the climax of [Eumaeus'] speech" (184). Later when Odysseus hands the cup of wine to his host Eumaeus, B. remarks on "a kind of parody of [this courtesy] when Od. gives the Cyclops a cup of wine after he has made dinner of two of his men" (182). The "voluntary revelation" of the names of Penelope, Laertes, and Telemachus "is a sign of Eum.'s growing intimacy with and confidence in the beggar" (191 s.v. 14.172-73). B. notes that "the irony is particularly strong" at 14.145 and 14.147 when Eumaeus laments the absence of Odysseus who is "not here" or "far away" as his master sits across from him (186 s.v. 14.145). And a nice discussion (building on earlier scholarship) explains why Eumaeus is "ashamed" to name Odysseus but would rather call him ἠθεῖος (186-87 s.v. 14.146—with reference to scholarship on the idea that names have a magical power). B. also points out puns and word play, e.g., five times in seven lines, there is a play on "truth" (ἀληθής) and "wandering" (ἀλάομαι (184 s.v. 14.125).

The quality and price are attractive features. There are very few typos:

I found only "a another" (164) and "origninally" (248); also Diomedes, not Idomeneus, picks Odysseus as his partner for the night raid in *Iliad* bk. 10 (141). The bibliography ranges widely both in terms of subject and scholarly chronology.[3] On "dropping objects as an expression of surprise at cardinal moments," the examples only come from the *Odyssey* (Andromache at *Iliad* 22.448 is not mentioned—169 s.v. 14.31).

I trust that the great value of this work is revealed by the representative examples I've introduced. In his preface, B. presents his goal as "rescuing the reputation of these books" which have "received the least complimentary criticism, as being too leisurely and devoid of incident" (ix). He succeeds admirably in demonstrating how "very tightly constructed" the second half of the *Odyssey* is. We should be grateful for his efforts.

James V. Morrison
Centre College, Kentucky US
morrison@centre.edu[4]

[3] I missed L. Pratt, *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar: Falsehood and Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics*, Ann Arbor 1993.

M. Davies and P. J. Finglass (edd., trans., comm.). *Stesichorus: The poems*. Cambridge classical texts and commentaries, 54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Xiv + 691 pp. ISBN 978-11-0707-834-5.

Davies and Finglass provide a complete edition of Stesichorus, with introduction, Greek text and *apparatus criticus*, commentary and bibliography (I am not sure why the word "Translation" appears on the title page, since my version has no translation). The edition offers a new enumeration system, and while this is never an easy adjustment the change is necessary in light of the multiple numeration schemes available until now. A concordance to the edition of Davies[1] is provided.

The work is co-authored in the sense that Finglass, with help from Davies, reworked Davies' 1979 Oxford dissertation into "not a revised or updated version of the original dissertation, but a new book in its own right, a work of genuine collaboration" (xii).[2] Authorship of each section of the book is clearly stated in the table of contents. In addition, a number of noted scholars contributed assistance and their contributions are noted by initials (e.g. "MLW" represents "M. L. West, *per litteras*" (612). Finglass contributed the Greek text and apparatus, and we are informed that "the newly-numbered fragments should be cited simply as 'Stesichorus fr. 1 Finglass' etc." (xii).

The authors' presentations are generous and conservative. Multiple viewpoints are presented for each issue, with copious annotation, and many questions are left open for future researchers. It is not uncommon to read statements such as "This [reference to sea travel] could be the Greeks' return from Tenedos, Aeneas' intended voyage to the west, the original voyage to Troy of the Greeks, or of Paris and Helen, or something quite different" (453, on **121** from the *Sack of Troy*). The result of such intellectual generosity is, for the reviewer at least, a feeling of confidence in the text and interpretations offered.

The introduction takes up the vexing issue of Stesichorus' date, placing his activity to "some of the period between 610 and 540" (6). Extensive information is presented about Himera, with its mixture of Doric and Ionic peoples, and about other areas associated with Stesichorus, as well as the poet's life and works. Dialect and recitation of his work in antiquity are also discussed. In each case generous citation is offered. The authors take the position that

[1] M. Davies, ed., *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Oxford 1991, I.

[2] As in the work reviewed, page numbers are here cited in bare Roman type, fragment numbers in bold.

Stesichorus' poetry was choral. To the reviewer, the most interesting part of Finglass´ discussion of style is a treatment of Stesichorus' "redundancy."

Finglass' Greek text is complete (327 numbered fragments) and conservative. Only what Finglass is reasonably sure Stesichorus wrote is printed. The apparatus is brief; generally only proposals accepted into the text and the relevant MS readings are reported, with rejected proposals treated in the commentary. Finglass is sparing of his own emendations and supplements; for example, in the apparatus to *Thebais?* (the title is not certain) the name "Finglass" appears only once, while the name "Parsons" appears more than twenty times. One might lament that more of Finglass' work was not put into the text; for example, in the commentary to line 255 of *Thebais?* Finglass introduces his own proposal with the word "perhaps" and then rejects the other proposals made for the line (388).

The collection begins with fragments from known works, printed in Greek alphabetical order (**1–186**), then "*Fragmenta Incerti Carminis*" (**187–321**), followed by "*Fragmenta Fortasse Stesichorea*" (**322–25**) and "*Fragmenta Spuria*" (**326–27**). Five fragments are printed which do not have fragment numbers in Davies' edition: **185–86** (*Boarhunters*, from P.Oxy 2359), **293** (a commentary from P.Oxy. but previously not published), and **321** and **325** (the first a commentary from P.Oxy. 2506 placed among "*Fragmenta Incerti Carminis*," the latter also a commentary but from P.Oxy. 5094 and placed among "*Fragmenta Fortasse Stesichorea*"). Within individual works the fragments which can be placed in order are presented first, followed by miscellaneous fragments. When possible the fragments are grouped under one number (e.g. **91a–91g** on Stesichorus' blinding). Late citations are occasionally branded as "derivative" and printed in the commentary but not in the text. Some of these have had (and will have) defenders, although the passages will now not have fragment numbers assigned.

The commentary provides copious information on the myths of each work and on Stesichorus' contributions to the stories. The metrical analyses are particularly informative, as the authors document in detail the processes used to reconstruct patterns from papyri which are often in very poor condition. The metrical schemes are then used to deduce placement of the smaller fragments, which in turn contribute to the overall understanding of the larger fragments. The authors believe that the theme of *The Games for Pelias* arose in visual art in response to "foundation, or refoundation, of the panhellenic competitions" (217) and that the myth was treated in now lost epic. The many *Geryoneis* fragments are persuasively reconstructed, with the many smaller fragments placed at the end and not commented upon (the edition of Curtis, which must have become available to the authors very late, only prints 26 of the 79 fragments in Finglass' collection).[3] The editors treat

[3] P. Curtis, *Stesichoros's* Geryoneis, Leiden and Boston 2011.

Helen and *Palinodes* together and extensively (forty-five pages of commentary by both authors on Finglass' five pages of fragments, mostly *testimonia*). The authors hold for two *Palinodes*, but are not able to reconstruct much of the second. For *Thebais?*, or the "Lille Stesichorus," the authors accept the ordering of Lloyd-Jones and Parsons and comment that "The new text presented by Parsons's article has *de facto* become the *editio princeps*" (368) along with Ancher's supplement from P.Lille 111 C.[4] Particularly masterful is the reconstruction and interpretation of *Oresteia* from eleven fragments; the authors see this poem as particularly influential upon later poetry such as Attic tragedy.

The "*Fragmenta Incerti Carminis*" are of two types: **187-269**, from P.Oxy 3876 and for which there is an introduction, and **270-321**, miscellaneous material from a variety of sources. The authors are pessimistic about discovering the mythological content of the former, although a number are far from hopeless (e.g. **191**, apparently Meleager and Althaea, or **196** and **203**, perhaps the same story, or **247**, where a tantalizing variety of myths is suggested by Finglass in the commentary). The authors occasionally speculate on the source works. Some of the fragments in this section might be better among "*Fragmenta Fortasse Stesichorea*"; **222**, for example, arouses as much doubt concerning authorship as **324**. "*Fragmenta Spuria*" is reserved for fragments belonging to *works* which are spurious, namely *Calyce* and *Rhadine*. The authors place at the end of the commentary some "Fragments Conjecturally Ascribed to Stesichorus," 8 fragments "where the conjecture is far from certain" (606); these pieces are neither printed with the fragments nor assigned Finglass numbers.

The bibliography, which encompasses 68 pages and approximately 1700 items, is somewhat difficult to use, being divided into 5 categories: "Abbreviations: Reference Works"; "Abbreviations: Scholars' Names"; "Editions and Commentaries on Stesichorus"; "Works Cited by Author's Name"; and "Works Cited by Author's Name with Date." There is occasional confusion, as for example when one encounters a citation of "Denniston" with page number, it is unclear whether to look under the first, second or third category since Denniston produced various types of work, although not an edition or commentary on Stesichorus (it is in fact in the first category, but the only abbreviation in that category consisting of a surname). The "Index of Subjects" does not include ancient authors and the "Index of Greek" is sparse. Perhaps an *index locorum*, a full *index verborum* and a list of papyri would have extended the length of the book unduly.

[4] P. J. Parsons, "The 'Lille Stesichorus'", *ZPE* 26, 1977, 7-36 (documenting Lloyd-Jones' contribution); G. Ancher, "P.Lille IIIC + P.Lille 76 abc (+ 73)", *ZPE* 30, 1978, 27-35.

This work will be an indispensable tool for anyone reading Stesichorus at any level of proficiency.[5]

D. Thomas Benediktson
University of Tulsa
tom-benediktson@utulsa.edu

[5] I would like to thank the University of Tulsa for an appointment as Emeritus Professor and the University of Washington for an appointment as Visiting Scholar.

Luísa de Nazaré Ferreira, *Mobilidade poética na Grécia antiga. Uma leitura da obra de Simónides*. Coimbra: Universidade. Humanitas Supplementum, 2013, 470 pp. ISBN 978-98-9721-031-0.

Mobilidade poética na Grécia antiga. Uma leitura da obra de Simónides es un estudio profundo, interesante y novedoso sobre Simónides de Ceos. La profundidad se la da el análisis minucioso de los textos griegos, comentados con un conocimiento realmente exhaustivo de la bibliografía pertinente en cada momento; el interés viene de la propia figura de Simónides, uno de los líricos canónicos, al que la tradición dotó de una atractiva biografía que también es analizada en detalle por Luísa de Nazaré Ferreria (LN). La novedad, en fin, está en el hecho de haber situado el estudio de este autor en el marco más general de la movilidad de los poetas antiguos. El volumen está organizado en una introducción y tres grandes apartados; cada uno de estos bloques se organiza a su vez en breves capítulos que facilitan y orientan la lectura. A continuación repasaré de manera conjunta cada uno de estos bloques temáticos.

El estudio se abre con un capítulo introductorio, "Introducción. La tradición de los aedos y de los rapsodos", en el que se analizan, en primer lugar, los testimonios de *Ilíada* y *Odisea* que ofrecen informaciones complementarias sobre el tema de investigación propuesto. En *Ilíada* se encuentran sobre todo referencias a manifestaciones de tipo poético y musical que podemos remontar a tiempos muy lejanos. Entre ellas, destaca la presencia de aedos en los funerales de Héctor y el conocido pasaje en el que es castigada la *hybris* del tracio Támiris y que podría ser, en opinión de LN, la única referencia en la *Ilíada* a la movilidad poética: Támiris viene de Ecalia y parece asistir a una competición poética. En *Odisea*, en cambio, son más numerosos los pasajes que permiten reconstruir las condiciones de actuación de los aedos. Los versos en los que aparecen Demódoco y Femio son los que requieren una mayor atención, pero también se comentan otros, como *Il.* XVII 380-387, el primer testimonio sobre los aedos como profesionales asalariados cuyos servicios, como los de adivinos, médicos o carpinteros, pueden ser requeridos desde cualquier lugar. El testimonio de Hesíodo (*Op.* 650-662) es también fundamental porque da cuenta de competiciones poéticas con ocasión de celebraciones fúnebres y acredita que los poetas se desplazaban para participar en ellas; asímismo, se estudian los versos 165-176 del *Himno a Apolo*, que incluyen la famosa referencia a "un hombre ciego que habita en Quíos", verso que forma parte de la controvertida reconstrucción de una biografía para Homero. Para el estudio de la movilidad de los poetas arcaicos, lo que LN

destaca de este himno es el testimonio, de gran valor histórico y social, "de un aedo jónico que se traslada a Delos con frecuencia, que conoce otras tierras, participa en competiciones poéticas y se vanagloria de ser el mejor" (p. 40). En cuanto al *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, lo fundamental de este texto pseudobiográfico no es tanto la veracidad de lo relatado sino su verosimilitud: era creíble que Homero y Hesíodo se hubieran encontrado en alguno de sus viajes y hubieran competido entre ellos. Finalmente, se analizan diversos testimonios sobre aedos y rapsodos en la edad arcaica, sobre su importante papel en la difusión de la poesía épica y sobre la diferente valoración de que eran objeto por sus contemporáneos. Los grandes festivales, como las Panateneas, eran para ellos ocasión de desplazamiento y de ganar dinero.

Parte I. Datos preliminares. Se analizan en este bloque dos tipos de testimonios sobre la movilidad de los poetas arcaicos: en primer lugar, los que dan cuenta de su asistencia a concursos poéticos y musicales; en segundo lugar, la atracción que las cortes de los tiranos ejercían sobre esos mismos artistas. Este capítulo, tan bien documentado como el resto, es quizá uno de los más interesantes. Recojo un único ejemplo, el legendario y bien conocido episodio protagonizado por Arión de Metimna y narrado por Heródoto. Una vez más advierte LN de que, independientemente de la historicidad de los hechos, es mucho lo que se puede aprender de estas anécdotas. Arión, personaje cuya existencia histórica no es segura, es el primer poeta del que se cuenta que gozó de la protección de un tirano, Periandro de Corinto. Cuenta Heródoto que, después de ganar mucho dinero viajando por Italia y Sicilia, en su viaje de regreso a Corinto se vio obligado a lanzarse al mar por los marineros que querían quedarse con su dinero. Salvado por un delfín, llega a Corinto y denuncia lo sucedido ante Periandro. El relato de Heródoto da fe de varias cosas: el poeta podía ganar mucho dinero con su profesión; los viajes que emprendía no estaban exentos de peligros; finalmente, Heródoto confirma lo que testimonian también los vasos, que los poetas cuidaban mucho su apariencia y vestimenta en sus actuaciones, y es que Arión se arrojó al mar con sus mejores galas, con las que se había revestido para su recital, y fueron esas vestiduras las que le sirvieron para probar su relato ante Periandro y delatar a los ladrones.

Parte II. El espacio de movilidad de Simónides. La movilidad de Simónides se analiza siguiendo dos hilos conductores, el de las fiestas públicas a las que acudió y el de los patronos a los que estuvo asociado. Un estudio pormenorizado de los textos permite a LN obtener información sobre los diversos tipos de fiestas en las que participó el poeta (ejecución de himnos, odas de victoria, ditirambos) así como sobre las cortes que lo acogieron. La relación del poeta con los Pisistrátidas en Atenas, su papel como cantor de la libertad de la Hélade en las Guerras Persas, su vinculación con las familias aristocráticas de Tesalia o con los tiranos de Sicilia, todos estos elementos son analizados a través de los fragmentos pero sin perder de vista el contexto histórico y las

razones que, además de su fama poética, pudieron condicionar sus viajes: por ejemplo, su desplazamiento a Tesalia tras la muerte de Hiparco y la expulsión de Hipias. También se estudian en este bloque los motivos biográficos en la leyenda de Simónides. Aunque breves son muy interesantes estas páginas en las que se discuten las fuentes antiguas que conforman la biografía legendaria de Simónides, en las que es presentado a través de tres características: su afán de dinero (caricatura tras la cual probablemente está la profesionalización de su trabajo); su increíble memoria (se le atribuía la invención de un curioso procedimiento mnemotécnico) y su condición de sabio.

Parte III. *Fragmenta Selecta*. Una lectura de la obra de Simónides. En este tercer bloque LN comenta la obra de Simónides. La razón por la que este material se ha organizado temáticamente es que, como señala la autora, la mayor parte de las veces no sabemos con exactitud el subgénero al que pertenecen los fragmentos conservados. Se trata de una magnífica opción que da ocasión al lector de profundizar en los temas que el poeta privilegió en su obra. Este material se organiza en tres apartados, siendo el primero el más extenso. Bajo el epígrafe "El canto en honor de los hombres" se analizan los testimonios en los que se reflexiona sobre la condición humana, el elogio del esfuerzo individual (competiciones deportivas) y el elogio del esfuerzo colectivo (la lucha contra los Persas). El comentario de cada uno de los textos es exhaustivo y, como ya señalaba al inicio de esta reseña, la bibliografía se maneja de un modo impecable, sin dejar de lado ninguno de los aspectos relevantes para el comentario –lingüísticos, estilísticos, históricos, sociales, filosóficos, etc. —, pero sin desbordar al lector: no es una bibliografía acumulativa, defecto en el que últimamente se incurre demasiado, sino una bibliografía en la que, en cada momento, sabemos por qué y en relación con qué se cita cada referencia. Destacaría, quizá, el comentario de los Frgs. 541 y 542, sobre la condición de hombre *agathós*. Los versos de Simónides tienen en este caso un enorme valor que desborda lo puramente literario y que hacen que podamos inscribirlos en el estudio de la moral, considerando la aportación del poeta a la noción de acción *voluntaria / involuntaria*, asunto que ha sido abordado sobre todo en relación con la tragedia pero al que la poesía de Simónides tiene mucho que aportar. Tras el repaso por los poemas en los que se celebran las victorias olímpicas, las composiciones relativas a las Guerras Persas, tan representativas de la obra de Simónides, plantean problemas serios de autoría que son abordados, una vez más, con detalle. Las páginas dedicadas al mito son más breves, pero igualmente interesantes. Destacamos el delicado análisis del Fr. 543, sobre el mito de Dánae, obra maestra de la lírica griega, en palabras de la autora, y que "preserva uma das imagens mais memoráveis da maternidade de toda a literatura grega e uma das mais antigas da literatura ocidental", p. 337. Cierran este bloque unas páginas destinadas a analizar la presencia de la naturaleza (fenómenos astronómicos y atmosféricos, mundo animal y mundo vegetal) en la poesía de Simónides.

Tras unas páginas de conclusiones se cierra esta monografía con la Bibliografía y lo Índices (Índice de fuentes antiguas, de autores modernos, general y de términos griegos).

Quiero acabar esta reseña recordando los méritos principales de este trabajo de investigación sobre Simónides. Para empezar, considero un gran acierto haber inscrito el trabajo en el marco general de la movilidad del poeta, una perspectiva interesante y que permite atender a asuntos clave de *realia* (las dificultades de los viajes, la organización de competiciones poéticas, el papel de las cortes de los tiranos). También resulta muy adecuada para el comentario la organización temática de los fragmentos, de un modo que permite percibir con nitidez las líneas generales del pensamiento de Simónides y profundizar en cada uno de los temas. La bibliografía, ya lo he señalado, es muy adecuada y se emplea de manera ejemplar. Finalmente, la traducción de los fragmentos, literal y a la vez literaria, merece también ser destacada. Esta monografía se publica en la cuidada serie *Humanitas Supplementum*, editada por la Universidad de Coímbra, y tras la cual hay un elenco de filólogos clásicos, entre los que se encuentra la Dra. Luísa de Nazaré Ferreira, con una sólida formación lingüística y literaria de la que este volumen es una excelente muestra.

Marta González González
Universidad de Málaga
martagzlez@uma.es

Esteban Calderón Dorda, *Esquilo*, *Tragedias*, V. *Prometeo encadenado. Fragmentos de otras tragedias sobre Prometeo*, *Introducción, edición y traducción*, Madrid: CSIC Alma Mater, Colección de Autores griegos y latinos, 2015, pp. xi-cxix, 1-52; cxxiii-cxxvi, 53-68. ISBN 978-84-00-09927-5.

Con il volume a cura di Esteban Calderón Dorda dedicato al *Prometeo* ed ai frammenti di altri drammi su Prometeo si conclude la collana delle tragedie di Eschilo pubblicata a Madrid dal Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas a partire dal 1997. Lo stesso studioso aveva precedentemente curato la traduzione e le note nel quarto volume, *Tragedias*, IV. *Coéforos*, *Eumenides*, Madrid 2010, con introduzione e testo a cura di F. R. Adrados. Al *Prometeo* eschileo Calderón Dorda ha dedicato precedentemente i contributi Ironía y tragedia en el *Prometeo encadenado*, in G. Bastianini-W. Lapini- M. Tulli (edd.), *Harmonia. Scritti di filologia classica in onore di Angelo Casanova*, Firenze 2012, vol. I, pp. 151-164, e *Io, personaje trágico esquíleo*, in F. de Martino-C. Morenilla (edd.), *Teatro y sociedad. A la sombra de los héroes. Personajes secundarios en la acción dramática*, Bari 2014, pp. 51-68. L'introduzione, ampia e ben documentata, si articola in sette parti (pp. XV-LXXXVII). 1. *El drama y sus personajes* (pp. XV-XXV), con riferimenti al mito di Prometeo, in particolare alla sua trattazione in Esiodo, ed un primo esame della struttura e dei personaggi dell'opera, «evocación dramatica de un conflicto y de un castigo», in cui il protagonista passa dall' ἁμαρτία al πάθος e da qui al μάθος, in un dramma che appare «pobre en acción teatral, con un desarrollo lineal sin peripecias, sin sorpresas, y sin anagnórisis, pero rico en tensión dramática y con un agudo análisis de las pasiones humanas en un contexto divino. Culpa, justicia, expiación se distinguen entre los grandes temas del teatro de Esquilo y constituyen el problema de fondo del *Prometeo encadenado*». 2. *La obra* (pp. XXV-XXXVIII), sullo svolgimento della tragedia, in cui i dialoghi di Prometeo con il coro delle Oceanine e con gli altri personaggi offrono una visione poliedrica del medesimo problema e della punizione che affligge l'eroe. Emerge la φιλανθρωπία che muove Prometeo fino a condurlo all' ἁμαρτία e che segna la differenza fondamentale tra Zeus e Prometeo dal punto di vista tragico. Prometeo non è solo il benefattore dell'umanità per le *technai* che trasmette, ma soprattutto il difensore degli esseri umani dalla prepotenza tirannica di Zeus. L'interpretazione del mito offerta dal poeta, grazie alle innovazioni apportate, trasforma il mito in dramma. 3. *Caracterización de los personajes* (pp. XXXVIII- LIII), con osservazioni sull'*ethos* del protagonista, che, in sintesi, «piensa como un dios y sufre como un hombre»; sulla sua opposizione

«a la figura ausente pero todopoderosa del rey de los dioses», il cui *logos* assume un aspetto visibile attraverso le due personificazioni di Kratos e Bia; sulla sua unica arma, la conoscenza del segreto che minaccia il potere di Zeus e sulle sue caratteristiche, la φιλανθρωπία e l' αὐθαδία; su Zeus, presentato come un *tyrannos*, il cui potere è 'nuovo', ma non definitivo; sulla complessità del ruolo del coro, con le Oceanine 'alleate' di Prometeo, che poco prima della fine del dramma lo inviteranno a deporre l' αὐθαδία ed a cercare l' εὐβουλία, ma con la decisione finale di legare la propria sorte a quella del Titano; su Oceano, con il suo «tono didáctico» che rappresenta «la sabiduría tradicional»; sulla tremenda sorte di Io, l'unica mortale del dramma, con il suo *pathos* parallelo a quello di Prometeo, con il legame costituito dalla violenza che entrambi subiscono ad opera di Zeus, ma anche dalla figura di Eracle, discendente di Io, il futuro liberatore del Titano, con la differenza che «mientras en el caso de Prometeo el conocimiento iluminado conduce al reconocimiento y la aceptación, para Io no hay explicación que palíe la desesperación de su causa»; su Kratos e Bia, esecutori della volontà di Zeus; su Efesto, personaggio dal volto amabile; su Hermes, al contrario, spietato nei confronti di Prometeo. 4. *La trilogía* (pp. LIV-LXVI), con i numerosi problemi legati alla trilogia di cui presumibilmente faceva parte il *Desmotes* secondo il Catalogo (T 78 Radt), che includeva *Lyomenos* e *Pyrphoros*, al possibile contenuto dei due drammi, alla posizione occupata all'interno della trilogia dal *Pyrphoros* (primo o terzo dramma), o ancora alla possibile identificazione del *Pyrphoros* e del *Pyrkaeus*, quest'ultimo, verosimilmente, il *Prometeo* satiresco che chiudeva la tetralogia dei *Persiani*, e soprattutto alle questioni fondamentali della riconciliazione tra Zeus e Prometeo e della giustizia di Zeus. 5. Autenticidad y datación del *Prometeo encadenado* (pp. LXVI-LXXXIV), con l'analitica discussione del delicato problema dell'autenticità e la conclusione che «los argumentos aducidos para negar la paternidad esquílea del *Prometeo encadenado* ofrecen resultados discutibles o, en cualquier caso, no decisivos de cara a una consideración espuria de la tragedia»; per la datazione, con tutta la necessaria prudenza, Calderón Dorda ritiene possibile «la última etapa del poeta», anche dopo l'*Orestea*; 6. *Sinopsis de la obra* (p. LXXXIV), con la distinzione delle parti della tragedia. 7. *Nuestra edición y traducción* (pp. LXXXIV- LXXXVII), con il chiarimento del ricorso alle varie edizioni precedenti, alla ricerca della soluzione testuale di volta in volta preferibile, con l'adesione ad un criterio maggiormente conservatore rispetto all'edizione teubneriana di West, presa come punto di riferimento. Per la traduzione, in prosa, Calderón Dorda ha ritenuto opportuno mantenersi il più possibile aderente al testo; le numerose note facilitano l'interpretazione. Seguono *Bibliografía* (pp. LXXXIX-CXV), distinta in *Ediciones y traducciones*; Estudios sobre el texto del *Prometeo encadenado*; Estudios generales y particulares sobre el *Prometeo encadenado*, e *Sigla* (pp. CXVII-CXIX). *Texto y traducción* della tragedia

(pp. 4-52) sono preceduti dall'*Argumento* (p. 2) e dall'elenco dei personaggi (p. 3). Ai frammenti delle altre tragedie che riguardano Prometeo è premessa la *Bibliografía* (pp. CXXIII-CXXVI), anche qui distinta in *Ediciones y traducciones* e Estudios particulares sobre los fragmentos de los *Prometeos*. Seguono *Texto y traducción* (pp. 54-67) dei soli frammenti che comprendono versi, per i quali lo studioso ha mantenuto la numerazione dell'edizione di S. Radt. Precedono quelli per cui le fonti non precisano a quale dei drammi conservati con il titolo di *Prometeo* si riferiscano (187a, 188,188a, 189, 189a Radt); seguono quelli del *Prometeo liberado* (190-192a, 193, 195-196, 198-201, 203-204 Radt), del *Prometeo encendedor del fuego* (204a-d, 205, 207 Radt) ed infine del *Prometeo portador del fuego* (208 e 369 Radt).

Nell'edizione dei frammenti si può aggiungere, nell'apparato critico del fr. 20. 2 (= 204b. 2 Radt), accanto alla proposta <δ' ἔχω> di A. H. Sommerstein, l'alternativa dello stesso studioso <φορῶ> (A. H. Sommerstein, *Notes on Aeschylean Fragments*, «Prometheus» 36, 2010, pp. 193-212, p. 201). A p. 64, nota 60, il riferimento a *Pr*. 576 non è τηλέπλανος, proposta del Seidler non riportata peraltro in apparato, ma τηλέπλαγκτος (τηλέπλαγκτοι πλάναι, come si legge nel testo e nell'introduzione, p. LXXII). Interessante l'interpretazione accolta per l'*hapax* ἀρίστιππος (fr. 22. 12. 5 = 204d. 12. 5, Radt), di non facile interpretazione dato il presumibile riferimento alla neve (χιών), al quale l'unico dizionario che lo riporti, il *Diccionario Griego-Español*, a cura di F. R. Adrados, vol. III, Madrid 1991, attribuisce il significato 'excelente para los caballos' (cf. I. Kazik-Zawadzka, Les *hapax eiremena* et les mots rares dans les fragments papyrologiques des trois grands tragiques grecs, Warszawa 1962, p. 30). Calderón Dorda, seguendo la compianta Concepción Serrano Aybar, Ἀρίστιππος A. *Fr*. 204d. 12 Radt, «Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos», I, Madrid 1994, pp. 291-297, intende 'de espléndidos caballos'. A proposito del fr. 26 (369 Radt), ai riferimenti bibliografici si può aggiungere il contributo del Sommerstein citato, pp. 210-211 e note 55-57.

Il volume, come gli altri della collana, si rivolge ad un pubblico vasto, non necessariamente di specialisti. L'esauriente introduzione, con le osservazioni inserite nel costante riferimento agli studi precedenti, la traduzione, caratterizzata da una notevole chiarezza, il ricco corredo delle note, infine, forniscono gli elementi necessari per un'adeguata comprensione del testo ed offrono lo spunto per ulteriori approfondimenti.

Francesca Angiò
francesca.angio@tin.it

Zsolt Adorjáni, *Pindars sechste olympische Siegesode. Text, Einleitung und Kommentar* Leiden and Boston : Brill, Mnemosyne Supplementa 370, 2014, xiv + 394 pp. ISBN 978-90-0427-435-8.

Only three years after his first monograph (*Auge und Sehen in Pindars Dichtung*, Hildesheim 2011), Zsolt Adorjáni has completed a detailed edition, with full introduction and commentary, of Pindar's *Olympian Six*, one of that poet's most attractive works. This volume, the result of work on his Habilitationsschrift at the Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest, is a notable achievement in Pindaric scholarship, and will be essential reading for anyone concerned with this poem.

Adorjáni's weighty book begins with an illuminating 'Vorwort' in which he explains some of its features. There follows a list of manuscripts, mediaeval and ancient (why not put the ancient ones first?), the text of the poem with two detailed apparatuses (one of testimonia, the other of manuscript variants and conjectures), a concordance of divergences between Adorjáni's edition and that of Snell–Maehler, a translation into Latin, and a translation into German. All that constitutes the first part of the book; the second is a five-page discussion of the metre of the poem, straightforward dactylo-epitrites. The third part is the introduction proper or 'Prolegomena', itself divided into three sections: 'Prosopographische Untersuchungen zu *Olympie* 6', 'Entstehungszeit und Aufführung von *Olympie* 6', and 'Die Einheit von *Olympie* 6' (a shorter version of which appeared in *Hermes* in the same year as this book). The Commentary takes up the fourth and main part of the volume, extending over more than two hundred pages, and including three pages of addenda. The fifth and sixth parts comprise the Bibliography and Indexes, the latter appearing under the following headings: 'Loci classici laudati', 'Auctores vulgari eloquentia usi', 'Index nominum', 'Index rerum notabilium, 'Index vocabulorum Graecorum', and 'Index scholarium antiquorum necnon recentiorum'.

Adorjáni's text is virtually identical to that of Snell–Maehler. Of the seven differences that he lists, three are relatively trivial matters of punctuation, and one a matter of dialectal colouring. That leaves three substantive changes: his adoption of Wilamowitz's conjecture τελεσθεισᾶν for manuscript τελεσθέντων at 15, his retention of the paradosis ὑπ' ὠδῖνός τ' ἐρατᾶς at 43, where Snell–Maehler print Wilamowitz's conjecture ὑπ' ὠδίνεσσ' ἐραταῖς, and his retention of the paradosis ἀκόνας λιγυρᾶς, albeit with one letter capitalised, as Ἀκόνας, at 82, instead of adopting Hartung's transposition λιγυρᾶς ἀκόνας. The first two can be argued for, and Adorjáni does so in

the commentary; the last introduces an unwelcome hiatus, and the capital is odd. (Adorjáni argues that the whetstone in question is a kenning for the Muse, but even if that is correct, and I have reservations, that would not demand a capital in Greek as per the conventions of modern editions.) But the similarity of his text to that of Snell–Maehler is a good thing. By no means all of their decisions were right, but in general their text is the product of good judgment, and an edition of Pindar which looked very different from theirs would be a surprise. The apparatus is much more detailed than that of Snell–Maehler, yet not overly full, and the Latin comments that it includes are usually helpful.

The content of the introduction and commentary is sober, judicious, and interesting. The only fault that I would note is a certain excessive length in both. In the introduction, Adorjáni frequently cites great slabs of the poem, always following them with a translation; but a text and translation appear elsewhere in the book. The text is already (rightly) repeated by means of the lemmata to the commentary; we do not need further continuous, lengthy citations in the introduction too. Also, Adorjáni often cites every scholar known to him who agrees with a particular point of Pindaric interpretation – sometimes giving more than a dozen references. In such cases it is preferable to cite only the first person who came up with the idea, plus anyone else who made a subsequent particularly notable contribution to the issue; too many such references can seem like overkill. And frequently too many parallels are cited, and quoted, to illustrate fairly basic matters. Attention to all these points could have saved Adorjáni's publisher several pages, and made the text that bit tighter. The lengthy commentary could do with more paragraphing, too – occasionally a page has no paragraphs at all, making it harder to consult. Despite all this, Adorjáni is not on the whole verbose, and his work, even if it takes a long time to read, is nevertheless readable.

Adorjáni's command of the bibliography and knowledge of editions are extremely good, but occasionally there are gaps. So W. S. Barrett's *Collected Papers* (Oxford 2007) are unknown to him, which means that he misses the discussion of a passage in *Olympian Six* by Barrett at p. 264 n. 92 of that volume (where read 6.100 for 6.10), and probably much useful material elsewhere – I would be surprised if nothing else in that rich trove of learning had any bearing on the interpretation of Pindar's poem. Simonides' lyric fragments should be cited from Poltera's edition rather than from *PMG*; if the latter is nevertheless used, it should be cited by the continuous numeration that runs throughout the book, not by the separate individual numeration given to each poet. Wherever possible, poets from the 'Greek Anthology' should be cited from the editions of Gow and Page (*Hellenistic Epigrams*, *The Garland of Philip*, and, by Page alone, *Further Greek Epigrams*). Adorjáni's addenda suggest that since the completion of his manuscript he has started to go through the works of the late Martin West (he refers to several

there, when only two are cited in the main bibliography): the beginning, I hope, of a life-long passion.

P. J. Finglass
University of Nottingham
patrick.finglass@nottingham.ac.uk

Simon Hornblower, *Herodotus. Histories. Book V*. Cambridge: CUP, 2013, xxii + 352 pp. ISBN 978-0-521-7034-0-6.

Dopo i commenti ai libri VIII e IX, curati rispettivamente da Angus M. Bowie (2007) e da Michael A. Flower e John Marincola (2002), esce ora per la "yellow and green series" di Cambridge il commento al libro V di Erodoto, a cura di Simon Hornblower. Reduce dall'impresa del commento complessivo a Tucidide, H. si cimenta così adesso con Erodoto, sia pur solo limitatamente a un libro. Dopo l'opera fondamentale di Heinrich Stein e il più modesto tentativo del suo concorrente Karl Abicht, in effetti, solo Bernhard Abraham van Groningen aveva tentato di scrivere, da solo, un commento a tutti i nove libri, ma con ambizioni piuttosto limitate (e ancor più limitate, benché molto utili, sono le annotazioni che accompagnano l'edizione di Philippe-Ernest Legrand per la Collection Budé). La complessità dell'opera richiede il ricorso ai più vari specialismi: già Reginald Walter Macan commentò i libri IV-IX proseguendo, sia pur su ben diversa scala, il lavoro svolto, per i libri I-III, dall'orientalista Archibald Henry Sayce, mentre Walter Wybergh How e Joseph Wells si ripartirono le fatiche; e analoga scelta di dividere i libri tra differenti commentatori è stata compiuta nella collana della Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, il cui Erodoto si avvia alla conclusione con la prossima uscita del volume dedicato al libro VII.

Come lo stesso H., però, opportunamente ci ricorda (pp. 1-4), la divisione in libri dell'opera erodotea è artificiosa, e non d'autore. Proprio la cesura tra i libri V e VI appare specialmente arbitraria, giacché "more than perhaps any other two books of Hdt., 5 and 6 together form a unit or block" (p. 3). La ragione di tale scelta, da H. non indagata, risiederà nel fatto che la divisione in libri corrisponde a una ripartizione in rotoli, probabilmente di età alessandrina (ved. da ultimo *Quaderni di storia* 77, 2013, 69-118): chi divise in libri il testo erodoteo, oltre a voler probabilmente raggiungere il numero di nove corrispondente alle Muse, si attenne anche a criteri di contenuto, isolando ad es. il *logos* egizio come libro II, e non potè quindi non riscontrare, alla fine dell'attuale libro IV e all'inizio del VII, due chiare cesure nella narrazione; ma la porzione di testo compresa tra questi due estremi era troppo lunga (oltre 4500 righe standard) per un unico rotolo, sicché si rivelò opportuna una ulteriore divisione, che fu individuata in corrispondenza della morte di Aristagora. La necessità di affrontare insieme i due libri è però ben chiara (e lo fu ai responsabili della Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, che ne affidarono il commento, uscito a Milano [e non a Firenze, come si legge a p. ix] tra il 1994 e il 1998, al medesimo studioso, il compianto Giuseppe Nenci). Nel caso della

collana di Cambridge, H. ha in realtà lavorato anche al libro VI, ma assieme a Christopher Pelling; e il commento a cura dei due studiosi, di prossima uscita, conterrà anche elementi utili per la comprensione del libro V, sicché - come è detto nella *Preface* - il presente volume "is planned as one of a pair with an edition of and commentary on bk. 6 in the same series" (p. vii).

Nella stessa *Preface* H. rammenta inoltre di aver elaborato il commento anche a partire dall'attività di insegnamento per il Master of Arts allo University College di Londra. Occorre in effetti ricordare che la collana per cui il volume esce si propone - come recita la presentazione sul sito della Cambridge University Press - di fornire commenti "aimed primarily at undergraduate and graduate students", che a tale scopo "discuss texts as works of literature while providing all the guidance with grammatical and syntactical matters needed by today's students". Già solo questo pone al commentatore una sfida non facile. Nell'affrontare uno storico, del resto, si ha senza dubbio a che fare con un testo letterariamente costruito (e in maniera spesso molto complessa), ma d'altro canto è indispensabile, per comprenderlo, confrontarsi anche con il piano degli eventi, con la dimensione dei fatti narrati; anzi, solo se si tenta di ricostruire i fatti si può capire come l'autore li abbia raccontati, e quindi le sue strategie letterarie. Il problema è che, non di rado, la ricostruzione dei fatti passa principalmente per l'autore stesso, in assenza di altre fonti; e nel caso di Erodoto, la sua "malizia", o se si preferisce la sua tendenza a giocare con le fonti, complica ulteriormente il quadro. Di conseguenza, in particolare nel caso di Erodoto, è difficile perseguire la scelta di un commento meramente letterario o meramente storico; e lo stesso aspetto linguistico, a fronte di un modo di esprimersi ricco di sfumature e ironie, gioca un ruolo spesso decisivo per l'interpretazione letteraria o storica.

Sulla base di queste premesse, sia pur per un commento dalle ambizioni in primo luogo didattiche (ma per le "Schullectüre", addirittura a livello di ginnasio, era innanzitutto pensato lo stesso commento di Stein), la scelta compiuta da H. di commentare il testo a tutto raggio, dal punto di vista linguistico, letterario e storico insieme, è senz'altro da condividersi. Raggiungere un punto di equilibrio non era però sempre facile. Rispetto alla laconica secchezza di Stein (ma anche al più verboso Macan), non solo nell'introduzione ma anche nelle note H. ha dato spazio a questioni che vanno largamente al di là dell'esigenza di spiegare il singolo passo, indulgendo a considerazioni generali su Erodoto e dedicando veri e propri *excursus* alle vicende storiche narrate, o ad aspetti di storia, civiltà, letteratura greche. Una tendenza del genere si avvertiva già ad es. nel commento di Nenci, e spesso ha una sua efficacia. Talora però emergono elementi idiosincratici, per quanto interessanti (tipica la grande attenzione che H., sulla base dei suoi studi degli ultimi anni, dedica agli aspetti onomastici; quando a p. 206 si afferma che "(n)aming is curiously preminent hereabouts" si sospetta una ipersensibilità *e parte subiecti*). Qualche volta, poi, la sovrapposizione dei diversi piani

crea un andamento non del tutto lineare, con note che vanno in direzioni varie e un certo effetto di disordine (si vedano ad es. le annotazioni ai capp. 82-88 alle pp. 233-41). Notevoli poi alcuni casi in cui H., allontanandosi dal semplice piano degli eventi narrati, accompagna il lettore a riflettere sul contesto contemporaneo e la storia successiva, anche se con prudenza dubita che Erodoto faccia lo stesso: di qui ad es. l'uso sagace - che forse non molti *undergraduates* coglieranno - delle virgolette a p. 273, dove a proposito dell'affermazione di Ippia al cap. 93 si parla di "Hippias' prediction or 'prediction' of future trouble", e cioè di una previsione di cui Erodoto potrebbe essere cosciente o che comunque, se così non è, noi possiamo leggere con il senno di poi.

La stessa introduzione (pp. 1-47) testimonia di questa ricchezza e complessità di piani, con qualche stravaganza: dopo una parte dedicata alle questioni di struttura del libro, si passa infatti a considerare le cause della rivolta ionica e la cronologia interna del libro, per poi soffermarsi sul ruolo dei rapporti di parentela e i nomi di persona, e quindi sulla religione (con una appendice sulla lingua a cura di A.M. Bowie e una brevissima nota sul testo). Non è naturalmente possibile rendere conto, in questa sede, di tutto e ci soffermeremo solo su alcuni aspetti.

Partiamo dal testo. Pur fondandosi su quello di Karl Hude (di cui occorre citare la terza edizione del 1927, non la seconda del 1912, come invece si legge a p. ix), H. ha avuto modo di mettere a frutto vari suggerimenti di Alan Griffiths e, soprattutto, i risultati del lavoro di Nigel Wilson, cui si deve la nuova edizione per gli Oxford Classical Texts. Varie novità, risalenti appunto a Wilson, meriteranno di essere dibattute in una recensione a quest'ultima. Qui è solo il caso di ricordare alcune buone discussioni di problemi testuali, in genere condotte con equilibrio (la famigerata *crux* del cap. 28 è molto ben trattata in tutte le sue implicazioni alle pp. 123-6, anche se io continuerei a rammentare la vecchia congettura ἄνευ κακῶν di Emilio Porto; sono meno entusiasta di H., p. 160, rispetto al δυνάμι di Powell in 47.1, e mi chiedo se l'errore non sia in ἀνδρῶν [*num* ἀνάγων?]; in 57.2 è forse effettivamente giusto accogliere la congettura ὀλίγων ed esiterei a introdurre in Erodoto qualcosa come πολλοστῶν; notevole l'idea, che era di Maas, di una lacuna alla fine del libro, pp. 310-1). Spiace che a volte non vi sia totale precisione nel rendere conto dei manoscritti (ad es. in 20.4, dove Μακεδών non è esattamente "the reading of some MSS", p. 115, né si comprende perché, a p. 249, si enfatizzi la presenza di una certa lezione nel Par. gr. 1633 oltre che nella *stirps Romana*); mentre registro con piacere che H. ha tenuto conto dei lavori di Benedetto Bravo, di cui pur non approva l'ipotesi di un "editore falsario" (p. 208): si tratta, in effetti, di una tesi radicale che si stenta ad accogliere, ma che merita di circolare largamente e di essere soggetta ad ampia discussione.

Per quanto riguarda la lingua e l'interpretazione, H. non arretra davanti

alla spiegazione di dati elementari, adatta al pubblico degli studenti: così ad es. quando a p. 276 invita a considerare l'accento di οἰκός = attico εἰκός (evidentemente per scongiurare la confusione con οἶκος) o quando spiega la differenza tra Χίος e Χῖος (p. 278). A ciò si alternano però considerazioni più elevate (ad es. la discussione sul difficile rapporto tra Ἑτίων e ἀετός a p. 255) per cui lo studente non troppo avanzato richiederebbe forse più dettagliate argomentazioni. Quando, a p. 274, si suggerisce che il piuccheperfetto ἐδέδοκτο potrebbe indicare "that this was what the refusal of Artaphrenes' terms amounted to, whether or not the Athenians phrased it exactly in this way", allo studente di un Master of Arts avrei prima più semplicemente spiegato l'uso di δέδοκται = *constitutum est, constat*, come faceva Stein (in genere, comunque, le note di commento linguistico, o quelle in cui si citano paralleli, utilizzano proficuamente i dati raccolti da Stein; si noti, *en passant*, che l'ultima edizione del commento di Stein al libro V è la quinta, risalente al 1894, mentre quanto si legge a p. ix vale per il libro I - e non del tutto preciso è anche quel che si dice del commento di Abicht, che nel 1883 uscì in terza edizione, ma poi ancora in quarta nel 1906).

Uno dei punti di forza del commento è l'attenzione continua agli aspetti di struttura e composizione. Potremmo segnalare moltissime note di grande intelligenza, ad es. le osservazioni sull'*excursus* di Dorieo a p. 148, o i frequentissimi riferimenti agli "story patterns", agli espedienti di focalizzazione e alle strategie narrative, tra cui la posposizione (ved. ad es. pp. 146, 191, 209, 244; io continuerei a rinviare alla fondamentale *Appendix A* nel commento all'*Agamennone* di Eduard Fraenkel [Oxford 1962², 805]). Talora, naturalmente, capita che il livello di sottigliezza sia tale da non risultare totalmente convincente (ad es. a proposito della posposizione dei dettagli sullo Strimone in 32.1, a p. 119), ma comunque si apprezza lo stimolo a una lettura intelligente, quale traspare anche da alcune indicazioni su possibili giochi verbali o concettuali (gli efori in 39.2, a p. 150).

Spesso, poi, le note inducono a riflettere su alcuni aspetti della mentalità erodotea, e anche in questo caso il lettore riceve una serie ininterrotta di intelligenti provocazioni. Più che illustrare i tanti casi in cui si può solo essere d'accordo, a beneficio della discussione segnalo un raro caso di dissenso. A proposito della descrizione della "multi-tasking sister" dei fratelli peoni in 12.3 mi pare che H. non colga un punto che è però rilevante per intendere il modo relativistico in cui Erodoto concepisce le differenze nei *nomoi* tra Greci e barbari. H. trova, infatti, "not quite logical" il commento da Erodoto attribuito a Dario, che si sarebbe stupito per la capacità della donna di svolgere vari lavori insieme perché ciò non era conforme al modo di fare di Persiani, Lidi o altri Asiatici (p. 105). Naturalmente è vero che, come H. osserva, anche un greco troverebbe inusuale il comportamento della donna; ma - sottintende Erodoto - un greco consapevole della variabilità dei costumi da popolo a popolo potrebbe a rigore pensare che esso fosse invece usuale per i Persiani, i

Lidi, o qualche altro popolo dell'Asia, e quindi a Dario familiare (cfr. ad es. la notazione sull'uso persiano di seppellire persone vive in 7.114); così però non è, ed è per questo che anche Dario si stupisce.

Con questo insistere sugli aspetti di costruzione del racconto e di mentalità, non vorrei però dare l'impressione che il commento di H. sia soprattutto narratologico o letterario. Al contrario, H. è attento a notare che spesso non è questione di "story pattern", bensì di pratiche reali, che si danno e si ripetono nella storia e sono attestate da altre fonti (così ad es. a p. 129 a proposito degli esuli che fanno appello alla Persia). In tempi di eccessiva insistenza sulla mera letterarietà, ciò è quanto mai saggio e salutare. Il lettore apprezzerà quindi l'equilibrio, la ricca informazione e l'aggiornamento delle tante note su storia, antiquaria, religione, *Realien*, geografia e topografia (si veda ad es. la nota su Pidasa alle pp. 304-5). Qua e là, intercalate alle ampie trattazioni sugli eventi e i personaggi principali, troverà peraltro illuminanti osservazioni sul ruolo del pettegolezzo in una piccola città antica (p. 152), sulla terminologia del sacrificio (p. 161), sull'esatto valore dello stadio come unità di misura (p. 170), sui colpi di stato compiuti durante le feste (p. 174), sull'esistenza della superstizione presso i Greci (p. 187), e così via. In 65.2, il sospetto che il periodo di cinque giorni "may have some traditional significance which escapes us" (p. 190) non è ingiustificato, ma che si tratti di un termine consueto non sarebbe dovuto sfuggire al commentatore di Tucidide (cfr. infatti Th. 4.105.2 e 7.3.1; per l'età ellenistica si ricordino la *Cronaca di Lindo* e il libro di Giuditta). A p. 239, d'altra parte, sull'associazione di tuono e terremoto, tipica del pensiero antico, si poteva dire di più (ved. D. Asheri, A. Lloyd, A. Corcella, *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV,* Oxford 2007, 602-3).

Specialmente meritevole è poi l'ampio ricorso a rinvii bibliografici in tutte le lingue (aspetto che mi sembra rilevante in uno strumento destinato ad essere ampiamente utilizzato nelle università anglofone, e che si auspica vi funga da stimolo a consultare letteratura in lingue diverse dall'inglese): la lista di "Works cited" occupa 27 pagine (pp. 312-38), cui ne vanno aggiunte altre cinque di "Abbreviations" (pp. ix-xiii). Davvero difficile da spiegare mi appare solo l'assenza di B. Virgilio, *Commento storico al quinto libro delle 'Storie' di Erodoto*, Pisa 1975; mentre, naturalmente, su ogni singola questione qualche integrazione è sempre possibile. Quasi casualmente, segnalo che su Apollo Ietros (pp. 23 e 143) si potevano menzionare le novità emerse dalle colonie milesie del Ponto, specialmente Olbia (una sintesi ad es. in Yu. Ustinova, "Apollo Iatros: A Greek God of Pontic Origin", in K. Stähler - G. Gudrian, *Die Griechen und ihre Nachbarn am Nordrand des Schwarzen Meeres*, Münster 2009, 245-98); mentre sull'anfizionia di Calauria non avrei mancato di citare M. Cicciò, "Il sanctuario di Damia e Auxesia e il conflitto tra Atene et Egina", in M. Sordi (a cura di), *Sanctuari e politica nel mondo antico*, Milano 1983, 95-104 e M. Valdés, "Mercado de esclavos en Atenas arcaica", in M. Garrido (éd.), *Routes et Marchés d'Esclaves*, Besançon 2002, 275-319 (il

recente libro di I. Polinskaya, *A Local History of Greek Polytheism. Gods, People, and the Land of Aigina, 800–400 BCE*, Leiden-Boston 2013 non era evidentemente ancora disponibile).

Ma se per il recensore il gioco delle integrazioni e delle correzioni sarebbe fin troppo facile, più utile è ribadire l'ammirazione per la ricchezza di multiforme dottrina che H. ha profuso in questa sua opera. Qualche elemento idiosincratico o qualche occasionale disordine nulla tolgono all'interesse, anzi al piacere che si ricava nel leggere il commento. L'impressione è quella di una splendida *Wunderkammer*, ricca dei più vari e preziosi oggetti. Sotto la guida di un maestro dei nostri studi, lo studente più motivato, e lo stesso studioso, vi troverà quindi impareggiabili stimoli non solo per comprendere Erodoto, ma per riflettere su diversi aspetti della civiltà greca di età classica; qualche rischio potrà, semmai, darsi per lo studente medio, che vi si potrebbe perdere, ed essere portato a privilegiare altri più elementari strumenti.

Segnalo, infine, che la copia *hardback* in mio possesso contiene non pochi refusi (molto insidioso quello a p. 17, che rovescia il senso di Erodoto 6.43.3, e spiacevole in un testo per gli studenti il ποιευμένα nel testo e nell'apparato a 92 ζ 3, p. 82, per fortuna non ripetuto nel commento, p. 263; a p. 70 è impossibile capire, dalla nota di apparato, che Valckenaer propose Λακεδαιμόνιοι come correzione dell'Ἀθηναῖοι di 63.1). Ma, a quanto ho potuto verificare esaminando l'anteprima disponibile sul sito della Cambridge University Press, almeno alcuni di questi errori sono già stati emendati nelle successive tirature, sicché non vale la pena insistervi.

Aldo Corcella
Università della Basilicata
aldo.corcella@unibas.it

Vayos Liapis, *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides*. Oxford / New York: OUP, 2012. lxxviii + 364 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-959168-8.

When faced with a work that does not appear to meet the highest standards, literary scholars have, broadly speaking, three choices: a) to remain non-judgemental; b) to make a virtue of the deviation from the norm and interpret it as pursuing a different kind of aesthetics; or c) to deplore the poor quality of the work. There have been three recent commentaries on the *Rhesus*, one of each type, by Arne Feickert[1], Almut Fries[2] and Vayos Liapis. Liapis asserts: "I should be loath to pronounce the author of *Rhesus* a wholly incompetent poetaster" (v), but his commentary suggests that the emphasis must be very much on "wholly".

The stated aim of the commentary is to answer the question that has dominated scholarship on the *Rhesus*: whether the play was written by Euripides. That answer could not be more resoundingly negative; Liapis' impressive demonstration of spuriousness will probably stand without serious challenge for a long time. He effectively undoes the work of generations of scholarship defending Euripidean authorship, the pinnacle of which was William Ritchie's *The Authenticity of the Rhesus by Euripides*[3]. This study had undertaken to prove that the play was in fact so full of Euripidean elements on all levels that it had to be by Euripides. Not only is this reasoning flawed (the work is to some extent derivative and the author, while not trying to forge, certainly imitated Euripides), Liapis also shows that the "Euripidean" character of the work is inconsistent.

The lemma commentary is a display of assiduity and learnedness, designed not just lavishly to explain *Realien*, but primarily to provide the data for the argument on spuriousness (the synopsis forms an important part of the introduction): it consists to a large part of the analysis of vocabulary and idiom, making this the most thorough and detailed analysis of its kind. The identification of Euripidean *Lieblingswörter* and *voces Euripideae* abounds – though it does not become clear whether Liapis understands as *vox Euripidea* one that occurs only in Euripides (e.g. 372 δόχμιος: 3x in Euripides, not in Sophocles or Aeschylus) or one that Euripides uses particularly frequently (e.g. 895 ἰάλεμος: 7x in Euripides, 2x in Aeschylus) – in places, the significance of such labels is put in doubt by the low figures. The result of the analysis is that, although Euripidean vocabulary is predominant, the influence of Sophocles and Aeschylus as well as the lyric and, above all, epic tradition is clearly detectable; the fourth-century context of the play has also left its mark on the language. Similar conclusions can be drawn from

[1] *Euripidis Rhesus. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, Frankfurt 2004.
[2] *Pseudo-Euripides,* Rhesus, Berlin 2014.
[3] Cambridge 1964.

the metrical analysis: while mostly consistent with Euripidean practice, the songs recurrently exhibit traits alien to the fifth but unexceptional in the fourth century. The commentary is highly effective in its task of proving stylistic inconsistencies, so much so that after 50 lines at most, the case can be considered settled. The author that emerges is one that is well-versed in the texts of Euripides. He exploits and (more or less successfully) remodels the Euripidean tragedies, with a particular penchant for "purple passages", which he tends to use over and over. However, the playwright's learning and familiarity with literature goes far beyond one author. He is capable of quite nuanced play with the Homeric intertext, refashions Sophoclean scenes and seems to allude to different versions of the Rhesus and Dolon myths.

The explanation of the language is lucid and helped by the translation that precedes the discussion of each chunk of text. The abundance of parallels and the detailedness of the notes make the linguistic interpretation generally reliable (and where one wishes to consider alternatives, we now have Fries to check against).

Another focus of the commentary, both in the lemmas and in the introduction, is on the staging. Liapis tracks in detail the entrances, exits and movements on stage. The departures from the practice of the rest of the tragic corpus are emphasised and attributed primarily to the author's desire for making the play sensational and spectacular. To what extant this is an individual characteristic of the author or typical of his time remains open.

One peculiarity of the commentary consists in the matters that are marginal or absent. Textual questions do not receive much attention. The transmission is dealt with dutifully (the scribe of L is called Nicolaus Triclinius); textual criticism has largely been covered in a separate article in the 2011 issue of this journal. For Liapis' aim of proving the spuriousness of the play this aspect of work on the text may be largely dispensable, but in this way an aspect that is prominent in similar commentaries is missing. Liapis' constitution of the text is not easy to extract: the printed text and apparatus are those of James Diggle's OUP, and a separate list of proposed changes is not offered.

The question of the play's date is also dealt with surprisingly briefly. Liapis does not stop at assigning it to the fourth century but has a rather specific idea: that the play was composed in the middle of that century for a Macedonian audience. This is so far from being run-of-the-mill that one would read rather more than a summary in the introduction and scattered notes pointing to (not entirely compelling) Macedonian influences, in particular in the military terminology. The long version of the argument, though, is prominently published[4] and easily accessible to any interested academic. Liapis argues in more detail the hypothesis – which he calls speculation – that the play is by the Athenian actor Neoptolemus. And the treatment of the mythical background of the Dolon and Rhesus stories is extensive.

Not very prominent, either, are the literary appreciation and remarks on the interpretation of the play. The introduction to some extent addresses the issue by extended characterisations of the *dramatis personae*, stating in

[4] "Rhesus Revisited: The Case for a Fourth-Century Macedonian Context", *JHS* 129, 71-88.

particular an anti-Greek bias. The lemma commentary itself focuses rather on the stage management. The interpretation is thus not developed very far. The reason may lie in the low esteem in which Liapis holds the author. One can gauge from the commentary that Liapis does not regard him as capable of having any intention that goes much deeper than tickling the audience with spectacle and surprise. But even where he does, his negative view of the man behind the play can stand in the way: one interesting idea is that the author undertakes to whitewash the Dolon of the *Iliad* by portraying him as less of a coward. However, this characterisation is inconsistent, so Liapis, because Dolon betrays the watchword to Odysseus and Diomedes (one may add that the moment of Dolon's greatest cowardice, his confrontation with the two Greeks, is not part of the play). But instead of modifying the theory, Liapis takes the frictions in Dolon's character as a sign of the playwright's sad level of skill.

Liapis is probably often right in his critical appraisal of the author and in not attempting to dignify with an elaborate interpretation what does not merit one. On the other hand, he rather annoyingly states the author's incompetence and insipidness at every turn – more benevolent interpretations ought to be refused rather than brushed aside or not even sought. The commentary accomplishes what it wants, and it does so on a very high scholarly level: readers go away with a great amount of information on details and in the all but certain knowledge that they have not been reading a play by Euripides.

Gunther Martin
University of Zürich
gunther.martin@uzh.ch

I. Calero Secall y R. Caballero Sánchez, *Aristóteles*, *Constitución de los Atenienses*, edición crítica, traducción, introducción y notas, Madrid: CSIC, 2012, ISBN 978-84-00-09646-5.

La *Constitución de los Atenienses*, "quizá el más afortunado descubrimiento papirológico de la Filología Clásica" (p. LXIV), constituye, desde su primera edición por Frederic Kenyon en 1891, un texto fundamental para los estudiosos de Aristóteles y la historia de las instituciones de Atenas. En efecto, la obra no solamente permite conocer casi integralmente una de las 158 constituciones redactadas por el filosofo y su escuela, de las que, por lo demás, solo quedan fragmentos de tradición indirecta y la *Epítome* de Heraclides Lembo, sino también ofrece la posibilidad de comparar la información que nos proporciona con aquella contenida en la *Política* y las oraciones y textos literarios.

En este volumen de la Colección Alma Mater, Inés Calero Secall y Raúl Caballero Sánchez, de la Universidad de Málaga, se encargan de ofrecer al lector una rica introducción a la obra, la edición del texto griego con tres aparatos, la traducción al español acompañada por amplías notas explicativas, los fragmentos de tradición indirecta relativos a la primera parte de la obra y la *Epítome* de Heraclides Lembo y, por último, un índice de nombres propios y temas (relacionados sobre todo con las instituciones y el derecho griego).

La amplía introducción (pp. IX-LXXVII), que abre el volumen, se articula en dos partes.

La primera, a cargo de Calero Secall, se centra en la autoría, el contenido, el método y la estructura de la obra, presentando, con bastante detalle, las principales posturas de la crítica sobre cada aspecto. La obra, que Calero Secall atribuye a Aristóteles, ya que, aunque cabe la posibilidad de que el Estagirita no sea el autor, es producto de su escuela y por eso impregnada de espíritu aristotélico (p. XII), se fecha con buena probabilidad entre 329 y 322 a.C., es decir durante la segunda estancia del filósofo en Atenas. Después de un análisis pormenorizado del contenido de cada capítulo y de las fuentes y el método usados por Aristóteles, la autora discute las omisiones que se encuentran en el texto (§ VII, pp. XLVI-LII): en la *Constitución* de los Atenienses, en efecto, no se mencionan ni los *nomothetai* ni la *epicheirotonia ton nomon* ni el *metroion*; además, no se habla de la *phasis* o del *apophasis*, que conocemos gracias a los oradores, y no se hace ninguna referencia a la *Pnyx*, el lugar donde, durante el s. IV a.C., se reunía la asamblea de los ciudadanos. Estas omisiones, que desde el principio han llamado la atención de editores y comentadores, no han encontrado una explicación única y definitiva y

quizás algunas de ellas se puedan justificar, siguiendo la opinión de Bertelli[1], con la hipótesis que Aristóteles no nos quiera presentar una descripción objetiva de la democracia ateniense de su época, sino una reconstrucción de esta conforme a un modelo teórico. La primera parte de la introducción se cierra con una bibliografía básica sobre la *Athenaion Politeia*, dividida en ediciones, traducciones y comentarios; traducciones en español; libros y artículos; y con algunas indicaciones sobre el tipo de traducción ofrecida.

La segunda parte (pp. LXIV-LXXVII), escrita por Raúl Caballero Sánchez, está dedicada a la historia del texto de la *Constitución de los Atenienses* y la exposición de los criterios que el autor ha utilizado para la elaboración del texto griego que se proporciona en las páginas sucesivas del volumen. Caballero Sánchez declara al lector haber trabajado con la segunda edición del facsimil del Papiro de Londres (Papyrus Londinensis British Library n. 131), con las ediciones de Kenyon (1903) y de Chambers (1994) y con los comentarios a la obra de Kaibel, Sandys, Rhodes y Chambers. El resultado de este esfuerzo aparece no solo en el texto sino también en los tres aparatos que lo acompañan: el primero contiene los *loci paralleli*, por orden cronológico; en el segundo, de caracter crítico-paleográfico, están registrados los elementos más importantes de la escritura de los papiros; el tercero, el aparato crítico *strictu sensu*, recoge las restituciones, las correcciones y conjecturas de los filólogos, la colación conjunta de los dos papiros L y B y, por último, el testimonio de la tradición indirecta. Concluye la introducción el *Conspectus siglorum et compendiorum*.

A la introducción siguen el texto griego con los tres aparatos y la traducción en español, realizada por los dos autores, con notas ahora básicas, ahora más amplias, donde se ofrecen informaciones sobre los principales personajes y eventos históricos mencionados y se explican las instituciones y normas descritas por Aristóteles, con referencia a la bibliografía crítica sobre el tema.

Cierran el volumen una sección dedicada a los fragmentos de tradición indirecta sobre la parte inicial perdida y el *Epítome* de Heraclides Lembo, con texto griego con doble aparato (*loci paralleli* y aparato crítico) y traducción española, y el índice.

El volumen representa, a nuestro parecer, una importante y útil contribución al conocimiento y la difusión de la *Constitución de los Atenienses* en el mundo hispanohablante. El cuidado con el que se aborda el texto griego y la gran cantidad de información filológica que se encuentra en los aparatos, junto con las notas explicativas, en algunos casos bastante amplias y centradas en particular en los aspectos institucionales y jurídicos, proporcionan al lector, especialista y no, un valioso punto de partida para el estudio de esta importante obra aristotélica.

[1] L. Bertelli, "La costituzione di Atene era una democrazia?". En: L.R. Cresci y L. Piccirilli, *L'*Athenaion Politeia *di Aristotele*, Il Melangolo, Genova 1993, pp. 53-98.

El único aspecto que desde el punto de vista editorial quizás se tendría que controlar más es la uniformidad en las referencias a los autores antiguos (p. ej. p. XLIII, r. 2 *Retórica* 1357 b 11-19, pero n. 106 Arist., *Pol*. 1281b27) y la bibliografía secundaria (p. ej. p. XX, n. 38 Mathieu-Haussoullier, *op. cit.*, p. I, pero p. XXI, n. 45 Mathieu- Haussoulier, *op. cit.*, p. III), que aparecen a menudo.

Federica Pezzoli
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid
fpezzoli@inst.uc3m.es

Antonis K. Petrides, *Menander, New Comedy and the Visual*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014, xii + 322, pp. ISBN 978-1-107-06843-8.

Petrides has given us a thoughtful and potentially useful book, offering less analysis of Menander and New Comedy than musings on how to analyze Menander and New Comedy. He constructs a dialogue with theory, scholarship, and ancient theatrical culture, working towards scripts rather than from them. The study should prove useful in stimulating further inquiry, in part because Petrides does not give sufficient examples to prove his points conclusively. Long passages provide the background and rationale for an interpretive strategy, but often a single example stands as culmination or demonstration for a section. The example may be well chosen as a case study, but such a procedure will leave many skeptical that Petrides' strategies are valid throughout the corpus of New Comedy.

Petrides' approach will be familiar to anyone who has read his chapter "New Performance" in *New Perspectives on Postclassical Comedy*, ed. Petrides and Sophia Papaioannou (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010). Indeed, Chapter Two, "New performance: visuality and intervisuality in Menander," offers a largely verbatim republication of the 2010 chapter with some cosmetic alterations and occasional expansion of a point. Petrides argues that New Comedy derives its peculiar force from intertextuality and "intervisuality." Menander's plays are permeated with tragic tropes, and his audience, being participants in an emergent "new performance culture" of spectators and spectacles, well understood how to integrate both verbal and visual signs. He posits a process of standardisation ("the constitution of a limited and concerted system of signs"), hybridization ("the creation of a hybrid with tragedy" by absorbing elements of plot, diction, spectacle, and masks), and semiotisation ("the transformation of formerly 'iconic' theatrical signs, for instance, the features of the mask, into 'indexes' of disposition by way of Physiognomics") (5). Although the book's title suggests broad consideration of *opsis,* Petrides' attention to visual theatrical signs falls almost exclusively on the mask. Theater buildings and the proscenium stage, for example, receive only a single paragraph (113). The section on theatrical space (117-130) offers good insights, such as the notion that the spectators' familiarity with the proxemics and kinesics (space and movement) of Euripidean tragic theater would lead them to recall *Electra* and *Ion* when Knemon's unescorted daughter encounters a male while drawing water at Pan's grotto. Petrides reasonably claims that spectators of any performance draw upon "theatrical

memory," "cultural awareness," and "civic ideology" (90). Since this study foregrounds theatrical memory, it proposes that a viewer seeing Knemon's daughter would think of Electra rather than the real girl next door.

Chapter 1 argues that a deep intertextuality with tragedy pervades Menander's work. Direct allusions to tragedy or scenarios reminiscent of tragedy are not some sort of garnish but comprise the very matrix of Menander's comedy. The argument is compelling, albeit short on supporting evidence. Petrides may press the claim too far in the following formulation, but the idea repays consideration: "To put it briefly: tragedy seems to operate within New Comedy in ways comparable to the workings of epic myth in tragedy itself: that is, as a precedent series of performed narratives possessing 'sufficient gravity to hold the contemporary world within their orbit, creating a wide spatial field in which mythic and contemporary worlds could coexist' (thus Rush Rehm on myth in tragedy)." (79-80). Perhaps so. But while one can envision New Comedy without a tragic precedent or intertext, specimens of Greek tragedy lacking epic myth as intertext are rare. Amid many pages of theoretical remarks, Petrides offers a few observations on *Aspis* and *Epitrepontes*, comments on *Dyskolos* with *Bacchae* as intertext, and concludes with a good close reading of *Samia* with Oedipus as intertext. While a Euripidean Oedipus may lurk underneath, imagery of sight and the story of an intelligent, headstrong individual who mistakenly believes that he knows (or can deduce) what he does not know calls to mind the Sophoclean Oedipus.

Chapter 2 asserts the importance of standardisation, hybridisation, and semioticisation of the mask, laying the groundwork for the following chapters. Petrides reconstructs the appearance of New Comic masks through cautious application of the evidence of archaeology and Pollux, concluding that distinctions in the physiognomy of masks create expectations of character types that individuals may fulfill or ironically foil. While masks must be understood not in isolation but as part of a system, Petrides proceeds by way of selected examples rather than an overview of the entire system. Sentences such as, "[w]e need to develop a discursive understanding of physiognomical indications as loci of semantic tension, whose significance arises only in the complex web that is the performance" (151), seem more a directive or a prospectus than an assurance that Petrides has already done the work and reached conclusions. Chapter 3 explores the interrelation of mask, character, and action, and Petrides argues forcefully against Joe Park Poe's denial of masks having conventional meaning. Using Aristotle as an interpretive lens, Petrides shows how masks suggest a natural disposition (*ethos*), but individual characters may vary from the type, especially when those characters are youths and old men, whose immature or deteriorating moral fiber often results in *akrasia* and leads them to act inconsistently with the ethos of their masks. The application of Aristotle is basic but sound.

So far, so good. But a significant problem emerges at the end of Chapter 3, in the section entitled: "An example: the 'hypo-proairetic' youth and the second *episeistos* mask," which examines Pistoclerus in Plautus' *Bacchides* and Chaerea in Terence's *Eunuchus* ("a Terentian character, for sure, but with nothing particularly un-Menandrian about him," 194). Whence Plautus and Terence? Petrides tells us eight pages later: "As the reader will have noticed already in the last part of Chapter 3, discussion inevitably leads us beyond Menander and towards Plautus and Terence. The assumption behind this is that Plautus' characters, too, as well as Terence's, play in the masks of the Greek style." "Inevitably"? Petrides has slipped the reader a huge assumption that not all will be willing to accept without some attention to the problems underlying it. But, even granting the assumption about the inherited continuity of masks, I find an almost insurmountable conflict in the hypothesis that: (a) masks in Menander comprise part of a "conventional and culture-specific" (209) system of theatrical signifiers based on Athenian tragedy, fourth-century Greek theater, and Aristotelian philosophy performed before a Greek audience; and (b) we can use the evidence of Plautus, Terence, and second-century Romans to understand and illustrate a Greek spectator's experience of Menander. We cannot backread so simplistically. Petrides dismisses the influence of the *fabula Atellana* on masks in the *palliata*. He may be correct, but the implications of adopting that position require more than a tart denial and mandate to see another of his publications (202). The masks may be the same, but Greek masks signify something different with Roman actors speaking Latin on a temporary stage in the Roman forum.

For some readers, the failure to address the impact of Italian theatrical and cultural traditions on the semiotic system with which the Greek masks interacted on the Roman stage (and in the eyes of the Roman imperialist beholders) will vitiate the analysis of Chapters 4 and 5. Likewise, the almost complete absence of comparanda from other authors of Greek New Comedy will frustrate. An exception suggests how the book could have benefitted from looking at other authors of the *Nea*. While Petrides nowhere invokes the evidence of Diphilus and mentions Philemon only twice, in one section he does put to good use the evidence of Alexis (fr. 121 K.-A.). Petrides speculates on the distinctions between *parasitos* and *kolax*, judging the *parasitos* to be the hapless, almost feminised scrounger (e.g. Ergasilus in Plautus' *Captivi*) and the *kolax* to be the more active and masculine soldier's aide-de-camp, thereby resembling and offering a foil to the *Miles Gloriosus*. But until evidence emerges to confirm the suspicions about which character wore which mask, these suspicions, though intriguing, remain too speculative to serve as a sturdy foundation for further conclusions.

The final chapter gives an extended case study of one mask, the *panchrestos neaniskos*, presumed to be worn by three characters: Charisios (Menander's *Epitrepontes*), Pamphilus (Terence's *Hecyra*), and Pamphilus

(Terence's *Andria*). Petrides contends that the actions of these young men, although somewhat older and presumably more mature than other lads, ironically fall short of the moral accomplishment connoted by their masks. Such a conclusion offers a modest gain in our appreciation of New Comedy.

Petrides' prose sometimes obscures his illuminating observations and makes the book unsuitable for readers below the advanced graduate level. Roughly every four pages in the first chapter, a "***" will mark the end of one section and beginning of another, sometimes with no expressed connection. Topic sentences are often lacking or come at the end of a paragraph, and thus the argument tends to meander from theory and generalization towards a specific application or example without any signposts to guide the reader. Granting that complex ideas often resist simple formulations, many sentences reach an almost Thucydidean length and difficulty that will require rereading to comprehend all the subordinate clauses, qualifying parentheses, colons, em dashes, scare quotes, phrases in other languages, and pronouns without clear antecedents. Adding to the difficulty, the attempt to convey nuance results in a superabundance of adjectives, adverbs, and a reliance on longer words with a whiff of pretension (e.g., "physiognomise," "metaphorise," and the reliance on "utilise" rather than the simpler and clearer "use"). Petrides often turns a vivid phrase; more often his metaphors become mixed (e.g., 24: "it invests it with cutting introspective resonance"). A few passages offer riddling wordplay worthy of Heraclitus: "In some cases the *con*nections can be of the most *gen*eric kind: not exactly 'allusions' so much as mnemonic *con*currences, virtually automatised *con*nections *gen*erated by the 'hybridity' of New Comedy as a *gen*re, the fact that it *con*flates, evolutionally speaking, both the comic and tragic traditions." (52, italicized prefixes mine). Such sentences typify what the acknowledgements term a "quirky English style" (viii). Often I think that I agree with Petrides but have the unsettling notion that I have misunderstood him or have been hoodwinked by the exuberant style, accepting ideas in a murky apodosis because of a sparkling protasis.

The book is well produced, except for an odd tendency to vacillate between Greek script and italicized Roman script (e.g. "*pappoi*" in successive sentences atop 157; *pathos* in 164 n.9), and free of typographical errors (but read "C.S. Peirce" for "C.S. Pierce," 5). The *index locorum* is serviceable, and the twenty-six-page bibliography ample, but the six-page general index is feeble. The scant five entries under "B" can serve as an emblem of Petrides' freewheeling approach: "Bakhtin, *Batrachomyomachia*, blocking, book culture, Byzantium."

George Fredric Franko
Hollins University, Roanoke, Virginia
gfranko@hollins.edu

Alan H. Sommerstein , *Menander: Samia (The Woman from Samos)*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge: CUP, 2013. xii + 367 pp. ISBN 978-05-2173-542-1.

Samia stands as an important work within the extant corpus of Menander, displaying as it does the playwright's ability to interweave the theme of love, traditional within the genre, with a series of impediments that go well beyond the obstacles that normally beset the route to a happy ending. Despite this the play has not attracted the attention of English-speaking editors and commentators as much as have other plays. In part this might be due to fact that, unlike *Dyskolos* or *Aspis*, its composition, as we have it today, has been the result of a process covering more than half a century. Sommerstein's volume, therefore, in the prestigious Cambridge series, marks an important addition to scholarly exploration of Menander's skill as a playwright, one that fully justifies his claim to have produced the first full-scale edition suitable for upper-level students. It is a pity, however, that he signally fails to mention David Bain's 1983 edition in the Aris and Phillips series that Sommerstein himself used to such effect for the plays of Aristophanes.

The volume begins, as one might expect, with a highly useful introduction covering a wide variety of topics, including Menander's life and career, New Comedy as a genre, the plot of *Samia*, the characters and their relationships (even including here even the role of the baby), the themes of love, marriage and rape, reminiscences of tragedy (not least Euripides' *Hippolytus*), the contrast of rich and poor, the play's date, and those pictorial representations of scenes recorded in extant mosaics. There is much that is stimulating and revealing, though inevitably there were issues on which I had my doubts. One, both here and sporadically through the commentary, were parallels drawn with *Hippolytus*, which Sommerstein regards as indicative of the audience's close familiarity with the play, something to my mind only valid if one posits a recent revival of it, for which there is no evidence.

The text itself is exemplary in its clarity of presentation, with the apparatus thankfully of moderate proportions, deliberately designed to indicate only those places where readings are conjectural or uncertain. Similarly, restoration of the Greek is judicious and not given to excessive flights of fancy, though I did get the impression that at times Sommerstein was consciously(?) eschewing Sandbach's suggestions in the OCT edition.

Like *Aspis*, the remains of *Samia* are concentrated in three of the original five Acts. In the case of *Aspis* these deliver the play's opening and the complications that flow from the situation presented, though the combi-

nation of genre-expectations and what remains of Acts IV and V allow a ready over-arching restoration of developments. With *Samia* the reverse is the case, with Acts III-V largely intact, together with sections of Act I, including the bulk of Moschion's opening monologue, which provides illuminating insights into the mind-set of both Demeas, the father, and his adopted son. Nevertheless there is much in Acts I and II that remains uncertain and requires scrutiny within the commentary. In his approach to this Sommerstein displays all the attention to detail and rigour that one has come to expect from someone who has devoted his career to the close study of comedy, providing a wealth of textual discussion and interpretation. Inevitably, however, when it comes to the commentary on these early sections, while there is often useful discussion of likely developments within lacunae, there is also a heavy reliance upon textual interpretation that can appear difficult to digest. In this, though, I speak not to detract from Sommerstein's achievement, but as someone whose main interest lies in dramatic developments rather than textual analysis. Clearly Sommerstein is here building upon the work of earlier scholars, many of whose interpretations he is able to elaborate upon or correct, doubtless bringing to bear the vast advantages available to him through today's search-capabilities of the internet. Of course, this brings with it its own problems, not least discussion of earlier emendations that are best left to fade into obscurity, or the temptation to scour the spoil-heap of antiquity for parallel instances, the semantic nuances of which may have shifted with time. As Corinna advised, it is better to sow with the hand rather than the whole sack. A similar temptation is to bestow significance on the fact that a phrase is found occurring nowhere else in Menander, or even in comedy, or of not being found repeated for some considerable time. The fact that ultimately we have so little remaining from the vast literary output of antiquity suggests caution here.

In contrast to his treatment of the fragmentary remains of Acts I and II, Sommerstein's approach to the analysis of subsequent Acts becomes, certainly to this reviewer, more balanced, with much illuminating insight into dramatic developments, not only by way of introductory comment at the beginning of each Act, but also within them. Inevitably there are places where I would take issue with him or where his approach downplays the audience's superior knowledge compared to that of the stage characters, or where he sees discrepancies, often visible to the scholar with a printed text and ample time but passed over by the audience, carried along as it is by the action and ready to accept the situation presented, even if this does contain contradictions. This is indeed a feature of all drama, both ancient and modern - see, for instance, Dawe's telling analysis of inconsistency in Aeschylus (*PCPhS* 189, 1963, 21-62).

To illustrate a few areas of contention: at 306, Demeas' threat to flog Parmeno at the very beginning of his interrogation finds no discussion from

Sommerstein, though it seems to me that the whole ensuing scene is built upon it, prompting the slave to maintain the 'official' version revealed in Act I and to divulge as little information as possible. At 161-2 Sommerstein rightly argues that Moschion leaves the scene because he does not wish to come face to face with Niceratos. Equally, on a technical level his departure allows very effective concentration upon the two old men and their plans for marriage between their families. In Act III, 383ff., Sommerstein discusses the detail of the cook's intervention in Demeas' expulsion of Chrysis from his house, but is less forthcoming as to the reason Menander has included it at all rather than have the character depart at 368. I see here an element of the playwright's technique frequently found elsewhere in the plays, and in some respects typical of him – that of using an intervention in order to divide significant information or developments into more manageable sections for the audience. On a small scale we see this at the beginning of *Aspis*, where Daos' lengthy description of the campaign his master was involved in and the enemy attack in which he was ostensibly killed is punctuated by interventions from Smikrines serving to bring into greater focus the various stages involved. A similar technique can be seen at *Dyskolos* 94ff., where Pyrrhias' description of Knemon's violent reaction to the slave's approach is likewise divided by the interventions of Chaireas into a series of separate events. In the case of *Samia*, the cook's interventions at 375 and then 383ff. mark pauses in the process by which Chrysis is driven out. Till 375 the emphasis is upon Demeas' largely unspecified charges against his mistress. Following the cook's one-line comment the emphasis shifts to Chrysis' supposed lack of gratitude for the favours bestowed upon her. Following the intervention at 383ff. comes the dark and biting description of her impending life on the streets – from past to future. No less important, though, is the status of the cook as a stock comic character, serving to lighten what could otherwise have been a dialogue of unrelieved viciousness and virtual tragedy. The intervention of a no-less comic feature such as Niceratos' comments on the sheep he has obtained for sacrifice, like the grumbles of the cook and waiter at the end of *Aspis* Act I, achieve a similar effect, as Sommerstein notes.

Inevitably, given the task of surveying a book like this, a reviewer will find his conclusions coloured to a large extent by his concentrated reading of it, and he will often note factors that appear to him surplus to requirement, anodyne, or improbable within the context of that reading. The student or scholar, on the other hand, seeking clarification of an individual point within the play, or approaching the play over an extended period, will have a completely different reaction. Instead he will find in Sommerstein's edition a model of erudition, providing a treasure-house of elucidation, combined with incisive analysis, especially of Menander's language. The result is a volume that fully merits its inclusion within the Cambridge series and con-

stitutes a valuable addition to study of the play that will well pass the test of time.

Dr. Stanley Ireland
University of Warwick.
S.Ireland@warwick.ac.uk

Mariella Bonvicini, *Il 'novus libellus' di Catullo. Trasmissione del testo, problematicità della grafia e dell'interpunzione*, Quaderni di «Paideia» 15, Cesena: Stilgraf Editrice, 2012, 183 pp. ISBN 978-88-9624-015-1.

Gilberto Biondi has turned the University of Parma into a lively centre of Catullan studies. This book, signed off there in 2011 and sent to this journal in 2014 for review, consists of four chapters, twelve numbered illustrations at the end (of book-production from ancient Rome to 1501) and five unnumbered ones in the text (of Catullus 62.30-48 in TOGR and the Aldine of 1502), a bibliography, and indexes of topics, passages, and scholars. The outer chapters provide a general sketch of transmission and presentation but say little about Catullus; the inner discuss spelling and how editors of Catullus since 1900 have handled it. Bonvicini disclaims originality at the outset, and readers who want to know what Catullus put in his *novus* or *nouos libellus* must go elsewhere.

The fourth chapter, 'Problemi di interpunzione nel *libellus*', best shows the limitations of the book. No problem in Catullus is discussed, even though a decision on punctuation is required by the very first sentence of the collection: does the question end with *expolitum* or with *Corneli* ? Editors have sometimes rejected an interpretation or a conjecture because the absence of punctuation in ancient copies would have made it hard for a reader to grasp, but B. does not mention such arguments, let alone give examples. Incidentally, someone as interested in punctuation as B. should take more care over her own. Her treatment of relative clauses is poor, and many sentences are separated only by a comma, as in a passage further marred by poor coordination (p. 102): 'Nel papiro del nuovo Gallo … ogni verso si inizia con una *littera notabilior*, occupa una sola riga e i pentametri appaiono rientranti rispetto agli esametri, le parole sono separate da un punto medio'.

In the first chapter B. naturally talks about different scripts and the graphic mistakes that could arise in copying, and she twice mentions that editors have disagreed about the script of V, the lost Veronensis (pp. 24, 35); but she cites only one piece of evidence that has been invoked and expresses no opinion.

It was perhaps in the second chapter, 'Problemi di grafia nel *libellus*', that B. had the best chance of reaching conclusions helpful to editors, but she comes out favouring the view of Mynors amongst others that several things make it impossible to restore Catullus's spelling even if he himself was consistent and never varied it for contextual reasons: a shortage of contemporary evidence, conflicts in such evidence as we have, the unreliability of

late-antique grammarians as guides to Republican practice, the inconsistency of the authoritative manuscripts both among themselves and internally.

The discursive part of the third chapter had already appeared in *Paideia* 65, 2010, 649-63, but here B. adds 15 pages of tables. In view of divergent practice, she says, the survey 'sarà utile'. To whom or for what ?

In short, this is not really a book about Catullus. That said, however, the outer chapters and elements of the second offer an up-to-date account of how Latin literature was transmitted and presented from the late Republic to the present day. Since it appeared, *Scribes & scholars* has gone into a fourth edition (Oxford 2013), but the Italian translation, *Copisti e filologi* (1969), made from the first, was last revised in 1987 before the third (1991), and B.'s 19 pages of bibliography consist largely of works published since.

I comment on some details.

Pp. 13-14: B. implausibly follows Verdière in regarding *parcus* at 39.11 as a graphic corruption of *pinguis*.

P. 18 n. 38: B.'s most recent example of damage to libraries concerns the fire of 1904 at Turin. Add the flood in 1966 at the Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence; the flood in 2002 at two libraries in Prague, on which see Emily Ray, 'The Prague library floods of 2002: crisis and experimentation', *Libraries & the cultural record* 41, 2006, 381-91; the fire in 2004 at Weimar; the collapse in 2009 of the Stadtarchiv, Cologne; and perhaps wanton destruction in 2013 at Timbuktu (reports varied).

P. 26: B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)* III, Wiesbaden 2014, 138 no. 4524, was inclined to put T in the third quarter of the ninth century. On its emergence, well before 'gli ultimi anni del 1500', I have a note forthcoming in *Hermes*.

P. 33 n. 89: Enea Silvio Piccolomini was echoing the passage of Quintilian that B. quotes at p. 19 n. 41.

P. 36: A manuscript M appears in B.'s stemma but nowhere in her discussion.

P. 43 n. 125: On incunables of classical texts see also O. Mazal's four volumes, *Die Überlieferung der antiken Literatur im Buchdruck des 15. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 2003; he discusses Catullus in vol. 2, pp. 416-30.

P. 49 n. 15: This repeats the end of p. 48 n. 8.

P. 74 n. 4: Against Flores-Tomasco on Nicolaus Heinsius and the *apparatus criticus* see my remarks in *Aevum* 80, 2006, 179-80.

Pp. 74-75: Lachmann is mentioned here but not in the index of scholars. His choice of manuscripts for his edition of 1829 has come under heavy fire, but not even Fiesoli in a long chapter on the edition (pp. 61-105) can spare a word for his use of *testimonia*, for instance at 1.2 (Fiesoli reproduces the page in plate IV). Together with his *libri*, they rightly led him to accept *arido*, but B. in her epigraph prefers *arida*.

P. 108 n. 26: Moreau-Maréchal misstates two shelfmarks. She also men-

tions the oldest manuscripts of the Leiden corpus, ABV, but without giving details of their layout.

P. 113: B. puts Alcuin 'alla fine del IX secolo'.

P. 116 n. 48: Barzizza died in 1430; see R. G. G. Mercer, *The teaching of Gasparino Barzizza*, London 1979, 135-36.

P. 117: The printer has omitted the upper part of the *punctus elevatus*.

Pp. 117-18: 'Tutti i codici di Catullo appartengono all'età umanistica, più precisamente alla seconda metà del 1300.' OGR yes, but surely B. knows perfectly well, even if she never quite says it either on pp. 37-40 or elsewhere, that apart from T no other among the hundred-odd was written before 1400.

P. 118: B. says that Salutati commissioned G and may have punctuated it. For G read R, on which see now T. De Robertis and G. Fiesoli in T. De Robertis, G. Tanturli, S. Zamponi (ed.), *Coluccio Salutati e l'invenzione dell'umanesimo*, Florence 2008, 238-43 no. 63.

P. 123: Neither Aldus's *Institutiones* of 1493 nor his *Rudimenta* of 1501 includes anything on punctuation, a topic introduced in the *Institutiones* of 1508; B. does well to mention it, especially since it is not mentioned by K. Jensen, 'The Latin Grammar of Aldus Manutius and its Fortuna', in D. S. Zeidberg & Fiorilla Gioffredi Superbi (ed.), *Aldus Manutius and Renaissance culture: Essays in memory of Franklin D. Murphy*, Florence 1998, 247-85.

Slips or misprints (few): p. 22 n. 48 *magisteri*, p. 43 *tum* omitted after *additos*, p. 107 n. 22 'un «rivers of letters»', p. 113 n. 41 *quoque* for *quosque*, p. 123 *Istitutiones* and *quam potuimus* for *quae potuimus*.

I was left feeling that B. is a hard-working scholar capable of digesting a wide range of material and summarizing it clearly and concisely. These virtues appear to best advantage, however, in the parts of the book that have least to do with Catullus.

Michael D. Reeve
Pembroke College, Cambridge
mdr1000@cam.ac.uk

Alessandro Garcea, *Caesar's De Analogia*. Edition, Translation, and Commentary, Oxford: OUP, 2012, xiv + 304 pp. ISBN 978-01-9960-397-8.

We have perhaps fewer than 150 of the *ipsissima verba* of Caesar's *de Analogia*. Only four of the fragments contain at least one full sentence, and more than a third of the total concern the inflectional morphology of particular words, mostly third-declension nouns. It is striking, then, that G(arcea) has been able to write a 300-page book on the subject, and even more striking that it is a good and interesting one.

The opening pages (3-124) offer six substantial chapters, which provide general historical and intellectual background to *de Analogia* (part I) and a more focused discussion of the nature of *elegantia* and its role in Late Republican debates over the role(s) of public speech (part II). The former part includes G.'s commentary on the five *testimonia* and the latter that on three clearly programmatic fragments of the work (his F1A, 1B, 2). The long part III then gives texts with apparatus, English translations, and extensive commentary on the remaining 33 fragments. The work concludes with bibliography, general index, and a compendium of the numerous primary sources (including individual manuscripts) cited.

G. demonstrates a number of important points in his introductory chapters. Caesar's work is pitched at the level of and in dialogue with the likes of Cicero's *de Oratore* and (after the fact) his *Brutus* and Varro's *de Lingua Latina*, not the dogmatic and pedagogical grammar texts which preserve so many of our Caesarian fragments. Caesar's linguistic intervention (as well as that of the other texts just cited) is ultimately a political act. In that context it should not be surprising that there are parallels between Caesar's linguistic and political programs; both employ inclusive leveling and rationalization. More specifically, Caesar adopts one of the several minimalizing approaches to language and oratory available at the time (which, G. rightly insists, are not to be conflated as is often done). The theoretical position advanced in *de Analogia* is one that, by and large, Caesar seems also to adopt in practice. On most of these points, G. is staking out positions (correctly) within existing debates. His more distinctive contribution is thus in the commentary in which he seeks to resolve what he reasonably describes as an "inconsistency between a general attentiveness to the 'external' function of *De analogia* and an unsatisfactory knowledge of its 'internal' content (vii)."

For any text preserved in the fashion of this one, there will always be questions about the accuracy of later paraphrase. Additionally, a number of the fragments, especially the more extensive ones, treat Caesar along with

other sources, and it is not always straight-forward to tell what information is to be attributed to Caesar himself. A commentator's natural urge is perhaps to identify as much as possible as belonging to his chosen subject. G. several times shows the integrity to reject the possible Caesarian provenance of bits of information when the evidence so requires (e.g. 94-5, 179, 205).

This interweaving of sources and the simple exiguity of the Caesarian fragments mean that there is rarely any point in attempting to interpret Caesar's text purely on its own. Rather, G. reconstructs whole strands of linguistic debate from Hellenistic times to Caesar and his contemporaries to Pliny the Elder and sometimes on to the scholastic grammatical tradition. It is often only within this elaborate context that we can even tell what kinds of claims Caesar is making. Then, as Caesar's basic meaning is being established, we also automatically get some sense of his relative position-taking. So, for instance, at a very general level, Caesar's style of analogy serves to sort out already-existing forms of expression, while Varro's allows logical principle to create entirely new ones (chapter 3c). This is very much in line with Caesar's apparent general view that linguistic correctness is not only pragmatically but logically subordinate to clarity (chapter 6). To pick a single other, more technical, example at random, G. can show that Caesar's distinction between *Albani* and *Albenses* (F8) is probably not meant to illustrate a general semantic naturalism, but is merely a contingent fact about that particular doublet.

The interpretation of the text in the broadest sense involves intersection with other, contested areas of Roman studies such as the nature of *popularis* politics (50) or the mechanisms of Romanization (4; explicit attention to the "Romanization" debates might have been helpful here), so no one will ever be in agreement with all of G.'s premises (or those of any commentator). This leaves some room for disagreement—as there will likely always be—for instance, about who precisely stood to benefit from defining proper Latin in the way Caesar does. In the long run it would presumably include the soon-to-be Romans of what was still not yet Italy (so G.), but the more immediate beneficiaries would be, I would think, peninsular Italians who were already juridically Roman, and in fact differed from the peripheral Roman elite only in subtle ways like accent. That is, we should perhaps think more at this point about Cicero's less talented brethren, rather than Valerius Troucillus. However this may be, G.'s positions are always reasonable, the issues he identifies are the important ones, and his presentation of the evidence is both detailed and scrupulous.

The text is written in dense, but ultimately understandable style; its translation into English does not seem to have resulted in any particular difficulties. In addition to dealing with the complexities of the ancient grammatical tradition, G. also deploys a certain amount of modern linguistic terminology, including the frequent use of IPA transcription when a

phonetic point needs to be made. As a whole this is not only a learned but also a thoughtful contribution to our understanding of this text, and will be an invaluable contribution for those who wish to place *de Analogia* in its proper contexts, both of the long grammatical tradition and the politics of its day.

Andrew M. Riggsby
University of Texas at Austin
ariggsby@mail.utexas.edu

Elaine Fantham, *Cicero's Pro L. Murena Oratio*. Oxford: OUP, 2013, 224 pp. ISBN 978-01-9997-453-5.

Pro Murena is one of Cicero's most rhetorically appealing forensic speeches, and offers a provocative glimpse into Roman political and social priorities at a particularly exciting juncture in history. However, it is seldom taught to Latin undergraduates (in North America, at least) due to the pedagogical challenges of steering students through Ciceronian periods with one hand, and the diversity of historical events and prejudices invoked in Murena's defence with the other. The book under review is a teaching commentary by the well-known Latinist and scholar of ancient literary culture, Elaine Fantham (hereafter F.). It is the first English-language commentary on *Pro Murena* to be published since C. Macdonald's Macmillan school edition of 1969 (which will be familiar to many from its subsequent reprinting by the Bristol Classical Press), and is part of the American Philological Association's Texts and Commentaries series.

Like the other Texts and Commentaries, this book is primarily intended for use in intermediate and advanced undergraduate Latin reading courses. In her introduction, F. says that she wishes specifically to target fourth-year (i.e. final-year) students who were Latinless when they entered university but are now on the cusp of attaining facility with the language. Her desire to help these aspiring classicists and literary scholars to "make a linguistic breakthrough... and to be released from the straitjacket of syntactical comments" (p. 3) underpins the entire book, which has been sensitively compiled to support its target audience. It consists, in the main, of a brief introduction to *Pro Murena*, a reproduction of A.C. Clark's 1905 Oxford Classical Text of the speech, a commentary with an excursus offering practical guidance for translating the text, and a sourcebook-like appendix of "related texts" which provide additional context for the events and people connected with Murena's trial. A map of Asia Minor, index of persons and places, and bibliography are also supplied.

The introduction chiefly concerns the historical background to Murena's trial and the main literary features of Cicero's speech; textual matters are reserved for a single page (a single paragraph plus two sentences) at the end, where F. outlines the transmission of *Pro Murena* concisely in non-technical language and explains her preference for Clark's text. The historical narrative rightly emphasizes the link between electoral malpractice – the charge against Murena – and political instability at Rome in this period, as ambition and greed inflamed already intense competition for the consulship.

The discussion is helpfully divided into two phases dealing with the broader context of Murena's trial (beginning with the troubled consular elections of 66BC, which had to be re-run after both successful candidates were convicted of electoral malpractice), and the elections in 63BC which he was accused of manipulating. The section on rhetoric and eloquence is less effective: an outline of the speech is badly needed, and F.'s choice of focal points seems arbitrary (esp. "figures", which is made to encompass both figures of speech and historical persons mentioned by Cicero). However, the analysis of the role of psychological manipulation in the speech illustrates the high political stakes of this defence well.

F.'s expertise on rhetoric comes to the fore in the commentary, where many notes draw from her work on Cicero's *De Oratore*[1]. The commentary is generally well-balanced between grammatical notes and those providing background information. All strictly grammatical notes are conveniently (if ambitiously) cross-referenced with the relevant chapters of J.H. Allen and J.B. Greenough's *New Latin Grammar* and E.C. Woodcock's *A New Latin Syntax*, thus providing a valuable resource to students and instructors alike. In addition to the excursus on translation, several longer notes offer summaries of major and/or complex themes in Cicero's narrative (e.g. the Mithridatic War, pp. 130-34; Catiline's threat to Rome, pp. 153-55; Stoic philosophy, p. 168). These are valuable but often obstruct the flow of the commentary: because only the first note to each section of the speech is numbered, and line numbers are not used, it is very easy to lose one's place (as sequencing errors with notes on pp. 84, 107, 138, and 162 illustrate).

The appendix is comprised of three groups of texts: a series of excerpts from *Commentariolum Petitionis* about the experience of canvassing for the consulship; a handful of passages from *Brutus* and *Paradoxa Stoicorum* describing the skills and personalities of Murena's other advocates M. Licinius Crassus and Q. Hortensius Hortalus; and a fictional letter, from Sallust's *Histories*, purporting to be from Mithridates to Arsaces of Parthia seeking an alliance against Rome. At 21 pages in length – including English translations which seem to be F.'s own – the appendix is rather long considering the indirect relationship between these texts and *Pro Murena*. But it does make a handy self-study unit for ambitious students, and could be mined for examination material. The map and index of persons and places are self-explanatory, but it should be noted that the index is for the speech only and is thus tantamount to an onomasticon (RE numbers and highest offices held are recorded for most of the persons listed).

I applaud F.'s aim for this book, and am grateful that she has applied her

[1] See E. Fantham, *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore*, Oxford 2004; J. Wisse, M. Winterbottom, and E. Fantham (edd.), *M. Tullius Cicero De Oratore Book III. Volume 5: A Commentary on Book III, 96–230*, Heidelberg 2008.

considerable gifts to the exegesis of this important speech. She is a personable guide, and her observations on Cicero's use of language – from metaphor and idiom to the sounds of particular words – are a salutary reminder about the orality of oratory, and that speeches were intended to be heard, not read. This point cannot be overemphasized to students, especially when their primary objective (quite reasonably) is simply to prepare a passable translation of the text.

That said, the efficacy of this book is impaired by a number of factors. One serious issue is an apparent lack of awareness about existing commentaries and editions. It is not the case – contrary to the publisher's blurb – that this is the first English-language commentary on *Pro Murena*. In addition to Macdonald's school edition (mentioned above), teaching commentaries in English were also published by W.E. Heitland (Cambridge 1874, 1914) and J.H. Freese (London 1894). Although F. stops short of claiming to be breaking new ground, none of these commentaries is acknowledged in her discussion or bibliography; Macdonald's Loeb translation (1977), which has excellent notes, is also absent. Similarly, F.'s assertion that "there has been no new edition since Clark's Oxford Classical Text of 1905" (p. 31) is also mistaken, and disregards editions by H. Kasten (Leipzig 1932, 1961, 1972), A. Boulanger (Paris 1943), M. Marín y Peña (Madrid 1950), and, most recently, J. Adamietz (Darmstadt 1989). Bizarrely, F. praises Adamietz in the same sentence as "the most learned editor of our generation." Whether or not Adamietz's text should supersede Clark's is a live question and beyond the scope of this review. Nevertheless, F.'s rejection of Adamietz's contribution ("only very modest choices or suggestions in doubtful passages", p. 31) will surprise even undergraduates who are accustomed to being steered towards the most recent sources for their research. Most of Adamietz's conjectures are mentioned in the notes, but a separate list would be helpful – and consistent with practice in J.T. Ramsey's commentary on Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* for this series (2nd ed. 2007). The fact that Macdonald's edition is still in print, comparably priced, and also based on Clark's text invites comparison. Ultimately, the books are set apart by the educational environments for which they were written. Macdonald's commentary emphasizes the historical and legal context of the speech, and is better suited for students with some previous experience of reading Latin authors, whereas F.'s commentary focuses on language/literary features and is tailored to her target audience of fledgling Latinists.

It is an unfortunate consequence of F.'s efforts to reassure these students that her informal writing style often detracts from the importance of the information she is trying to convey. Open-ended questions are routinely used to signpost historical material in the introduction: "Who was Murena? Who were his accusers? What were the charges against him and the political circumstances of this trial?" (p. 3); "What do we know about Cicero's client,

and his political and military career?" (p. 6); "But why resort to prosecuting Murena? Maybe Murena was so flagrantly guilty of malpractice that prosecution was inevitable?" (p. 9); "And when all had been said and done, what was the point of being consul?" (p. 22). The notes are peppered with personal reflections (e.g. "I would translate...", p. 124; "I offer a close paraphrase..." p. 131"; "we have come to the part of the *peroratio*...", p. 191), and attempts to modernize the narrative of Murena's trial are jarring and require familiarity with (North) American politics and culture (e.g. candidate attrition in the American presidential primary elections, p. 19; the acquittals of Canadian abortionist Henry Morgenthaler and American ex-footballer O.J. Simpson despite compelling evidence of their guilt, p. 104; the ritual name "Gaia" as a placeholder equivalent to "Jane Doe", p. 122; the importance of political pedigree in the careers of Justin Trudeau, George W. Bush, and certain Japanese parliamentarians, p. 161). The tone of the notes also varies widely. At one end of the spectrum, very basic grammatical constructions are repeatedly identified for the reader, and "glosses" frequently amount to the paraphrasing of entire passages (especially towards the end of the commentary). At the other extreme, a significant minority of notes assumes familiarity with technical literary terms and textual criticism. The addition of a glossary, and more attention to the manuscript tradition in the introduction would go some way towards levelling out the reader's experience.

Lastly, a large number of misprints gives a poor impression. The titles of ancient works are variously written out in full and abbreviated (sometimes in more than one form), sometimes capitalized and other times not, and even placed in quotation marks (e.g. "Catilinarian" speeches, p. 86). Other errors include: "MRR 2: 80-81" for "MRR 2: 580-581" (p. 6), "Plb. 6.56 4 and 15" for "Plb. 6.56.2 and 14" (p. 13), "Sex. Caesar" for "L. Caesar" (p. 18), "*norma*" for "*normam*" (p. 88), "Sall. *Cat.* 13" for "Sall. *Cat.* 11" (p. 101), dating Q. Metellus Macedonicus' praetorship to 146BC instead of 148BC (p. 128), "Nisbet 1962" for "Nisbet 1961" (p. 147), "our ancestors" for "the ancestors" (p. 164, but *maiores* here clearly refers to aged people rather than ancestors in the traditional sense), "*fixum atque statutum*" for "*fixum et statutum*" (p. 170), and assigning the consulship of L. Licinius Lucullus to 73BC instead of 74BC (p. 224). On p. 174 a note explaining a variant reading in Adamietz's edition is attached to the wrong *conducti* (further showing the need for notes to have both section and line numbers attached), and words and punctuation have been changed in a quotation from a modern author. In a related vein, the map of Asia Minor on p. 2 is not correct for the time of the Mithridatic Wars and *Pro Murena*. Among other anachronisms, this results in Cabira-Diospolis, a city mentioned in one of the extracts in the appendix (Sall. *Hist.* 4.15), appearing with its Imperial name Neocaesarea (Byzantium is similarly labelled Constantinople).

In sum, this is a teaching commentary with a prescribed audience and scope that is further limited by errors and omissions. Although it contains

much that will be of use and interest to advanced students and scholars, this material gets lost in the crowd of elementary notes. The text is neither new nor improved, and excellent alternative commentaries and annotated translations are readily available. Nevertheless, F.'s efforts to facilitate a problematic transition for many Latin students are praiseworthy. *Pro Murena* is an inspired choice of gateway speech: if this book stimulates the production of the first English-language non-pedagogical commentary on the speech, or further discussion about pedagogy, it will have done a great service.

Katherine A. Liong
Fredericton, Canada
k.a.liong@hotmail.com

Craig Kallendorf, *The Protean Virgil. Material Form and the Reception of the Classics*, Oxford: OUP, 2015, 207 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-872780-4.

Fra i molteplici fili che formano l'intreccio della cultura occidentale, Virgilio è forse quello più lungo ed ininterrotto, per la fortuna di cui questo autore ha goduto negli ultimi duemila anni. Con questo volume Craig Kallendorf (d'ora in poi: K.) offre al lettore un'efficace panoramica di questa vicenda, per la quale si avvale di una visuale poco praticata, ma strategica: quella dei supporti materiali che hanno mediato la sopravvivenza dell'opera virgiliana.

Il volume ha alle sue spalle oltre un ventennio di studi nei quali K. ha esplorato ambedue i versanti su cui si muove il saggio: la ricezione culturale di Virgilio, in particolare in età rinascimentale (basti ricordare i volumi *In Praise of Aeneas* del 1989 e *The Other Virgil* del 2007), e la tradizione a stampa delle opere virgiliane, tema su cui K. ha pubblicato l'affascinante *Virgil and the Myth of Venice* (1999) e svariati altri volumi, fra i quali è da ricordare almeno il recente *A Bibliography of the Early Printed Editions of Virgil, 1469-1850* (2012), uno strumento che costituiva da tempo un *desideratum* degli studiosi di Virgilio. Queste molteplici ricerche alimentano nel presente volume una lucida visione d'insieme del ruolo di Virgilio nella cultura occidentale.

L'approccio che caratterizza il lavoro di K. è esposto nel cap. 1, "Material Instabilities" (pp. 1-41). L'"instabilità" che rende Virgilio "Protean", come recita il titolo del volume, è in primo luogo materiale, in quanto il testo virgiliano è stato trasmesso da supporti deperibili, il papiro e la pergamena, in secondo luogo quella culturale, filtrata dalle diverse ricezioni a cui Virgilio è stato sottoposto nelle diverse epoche. K. fa riferimento, nella sua ricostruzione, a quella che Martindale ha definito la versione "forte" della teoria della ricezione, per la quale l'interpretazione è il prodotto di una catena di ricezioni da cui siamo dipendenti, che preclude la possibilità di ricostruire il significato originario di un testo. Nel paragrafo conclusivo del volume (pp. 167-72) K. torna su questo concetto, aggiornandolo alla luce dei capitoli precedenti, e mettendo a fuoco in particolare i rapporti di continuità / estraneità che il lettore odierno stabilisce con le diverse ricezioni del passato.

L'instabilità riguarda sia il testo che la sua interpretazione. Il testo virgiliano è rimasto instabile anche nell'epoca della stampa, dalla quale ci saremmo aspettati una sua progressiva stabilizzazione, favorita dalla ricerca filologica, se non direttamente dal metodo di Lachmann. Questo non si è verificato,

come K. dimostra ripercorrendo la storia delle edizioni virgiliane, dall'*editio princeps* di Bussi alle edizioni più recenti, la Teubneriana di Conte (2009) e l'edizione nazionale spagnola del 2009-2011. Oltre che testuale, l'instabilità è anche esegetica: alla tradizionale interpretazione "augustea" dell'*Eneide*, prevalente già a partire da Servio, si è affiancata l'interpretazione pessimistica, di cui lo stesso K. ha ricostruito le radici rinascimentali nel citato *The Other Virgil*. Duemila anni non sono bastati, come scrive K. nella conclusione del primo capitolo, a stabilizzare il testo e l'interpretazione di Virgilio, il cui messaggio resta elusivo.

Nei capitoli successivi il volume prosegue con un ordine grosso modo cronologico, centrato sui diversi sistemi di trasmissione che hanno caratterizzato la storia della cultura: i manoscritti (cap. 2), la stampa (cap. 3), le illustrazioni (cap. 4), ed il computer (cap. 5).

Nel cap. 2 (pp. 42-79), nel delineare le conseguenze del passaggio dal rotolo al codice, K. mette opportunamente in evidenzia la ricezione cristiana dell'opera virgiliana. Il caso eclatante è quello dell'interpretazione "profetica" della quarta egloga, che da Lattanzio si prolunga nei secoli successivi, fino a Pope ed oltre. Ma è l'intera trasmissione medievale di Virgilio ad essere permeata da elementi cristiani, come sottolinea K., grazie all'uso scolastico della sua opera, che portava maestri ed allievi ad annotare il testo poetico. K. segnala alcuni casi di questo tipo di ricezione, dal manoscritto di Oxford All Souls College 82, analizzato da Baswell, alle note di Coluccio Salutati nel codice di Basilea F II 23, studiate dallo stesso K. in un contributo del 1987 pubblicato in collaborazione con Virginia Brown. Altri sentieri della ricezione cristiana di Virgilio sono segnati dalle interpretazioni allegoriche dell'*Eneide*, da Fulgenzio a Bernardo Silvestre, e dai centoni: quello di Proba, in particolare, costituisce per K. il tentativo più forte di stabilizzare l'interpretazione cristiana dell'opera virgiliana. Un capitolo meno conosciuto della storia dei centoni è quello rinascimentale, a cui K. accenna nel cap. 3: ancora nel sec. XVI i versi virgiliani sono utilizzati per comporre opere autonome, in quest'epoca di interesse non solo religioso ma anche encomiastico, come evidenziano per es. i poemi di Giulio Capilupi dedicati a Paolo IV e ai principi della casa d'Austria.

Il capitolo 3 (pp. 80-120) si apre con una valutazione aggiornata del numero di edizioni virgiliane stampate nel corso dei secoli, alla luce della *Bibliography* pubblicata da K. nel 2012. Un numero notevole, che dà la misura del rilievo avuto da Virgilio nella cultura occidentale. Per il presente volume K. si è avvalso anche dell'esame di un'anonima collezione privata contenente un cospicuo numero di edizioni virgiliane. Di notevole interesse sono le informazioni che K. fornisce sui formati e le caratteristiche librarie delle edizioni virgiliane, a partire da quelle aldine, un indizio rilevante per l'identificazione dei lettori e degli utenti di Virgilio. Altre risposte vengono da un lavoro che meriterebbe un maggiore impegno da parte degli studiosi,

l'analisi delle note manoscritte che si leggono in numerose edizioni conservate. Questo uso, come nota K., era ben noto anche agli stampatori, che pubblicano spesso edizioni in cui il testo virgiliano è stampato con margini molto ampi, quelli destinati appunto alle note dei lettori. Questa pratica è rilevabile nelle edizioni pubblicate nel XVI e XVII secolo, mentre declina decisamente nel XVIII. Che cosa cercavano questi lettori in Virgilio? Sulla base di qualche esempio (fra i quali le note a Virgilio di Filippo Melantone, il *praeceptor Germaniae*), K. individua due tipi di interesse prevalenti, la ricerca di insegnamenti morali, e la raccolta di esempi di stile (metafore, similitudini e altre figure retoriche). Un interesse rilevabile, oltre che negli esemplari glossati, anche nella tradizione del *Commonplace Book*. Questo materiale delinea una storia della fortuna moderna di Virgilio che non coincide con quella dei principali commenti, sui quali si è accentrata spesso l'attenzione degli studiosi. K. fa riferimento, in particolare, all'interpretazione neoplatonica di Virgilio del commento di Cristoforo Landino, e a quella aristotelica di Sebastiano Regoli.

Le edizioni virgiliane includono spesso illustrazioni, che hanno sul lettore un impatto a volte anche maggiore di quello del testo, in latino o in traduzione. Il cap. 4 (pp. 121-51) delinea un quadro della storia delle illustrazioni virgiliane, per il quale K. ha utilizzato la collezione di edizioni conservata a Princeton (alcune illustrazioni sono riprodotte nel volume). Gli artisti riflettono ovviamente il contesto culturale della loro epoca e i relativi linguaggi figurativi (K. utilizza la periodizzazione corrente neoclassico / barocco / romantico). Ma un peso notevole hanno anche gli orientamenti politici. Quest'ultimo aspetto è ben esemplificato dall'esame di due edizioni francesi di Virgilio, quella di Perrin del 1664 e quella di V.-A.-C. Leplat del 1808. La prima, sia nella traduzione francese che nelle illustrazioni che la accompagnano, evidenzia la proiezione dell'ideologia augustea nell'assolutismo francese dell'epoca. La seconda, anch'essa corredata di illustrazioni, interpreta l'*Eneide* alla luce della rivoluzione francese: per es. la caduta di Troia, nel libro II, è reinterpretata sulla base della caduta della monarchia francese. Altre celebri edizioni di cui K. riesamina il programma figurativo sono quella pubblicata da Sebastian Brant (1502) e quella tradotta da John Dryden, illustrata da Franz Cleyn (1716). La panoramica include anche edizioni più recenti, quali la versione parodica dell'*Eneide* di Aloys Blumauer, illustrata da Franz von Seitz (1841), che testimonia, come osserva K, la marginalizzazione di Virgilio nell'età contemporanea.

L'ultimo capitolo (pp. 152-72) esplora le trasformazioni che investono Virgilio nell'era del computer e di internet. Esse comportano l'eclissi di quella scrittura lineare, tipica del libro, che McLuhan individuò che centrale nella tradizione occidentale. Una linearità tendenzialmente autoritaria, come osserva K., sostituita ora da una tecnologia centrifuga e potenzialmente sovversiva, nella misura in cui offre al "lettore" la possibilità di muoversi liberamente per associazioni e links, senza essere più condizionato dalla lineare

successione delle pagine del libro stampato. Questa svolta, osserva K., è stata in qualche modo anticipata dalla temperie culturale degli anni '70 (Foucault, Barthes, Deridda), e nel caso degli studi virgiliani dalla citata interpretazione pessimistica dell'*Eneide* e dai fattori di "instabilità" segnalati nel primo capitolo. L'approccio al poema virgiliano praticato ad es. da Putnam, basato sulla ricerca di consonanze lessicali e stilistiche nascoste, appare funzionale all'uso dagli strumenti digitali, che nel caso di Virgilio offrono oggi una gamma di opportunità piuttosto ampia (K. ne propone nel capitolo una sintetica rassegna).

Si tratta, in definitiva, di un libro importante, che interesserà lettori e studiosi di varie discipline, e che costituirà una lettura salutare anche per gli studiosi, abituati ad un rapporto diretto con l'opera virgiliana, che tradizionalmente considerano il Fortleben e la ricezione quali campi di studio accessori. Nell'interpretare Virgilio non è inutile la consapevolezza di essere l'ultimo anello di una lunga catena.

Fabio Stok
Università di Roma Tor Vergata
fabio.stok@uniroma2.it

Pierluigi Leone Gatti, *Ovid in Antike und Mittelalter – Geschichte der philologischen Rezeption* (Hermes – Einzelschriften 106), Stuttgart : Franz Steiner Verlag, 2014, 260 pp. + 15 ill., ISBN 978-3-515-10375-6.

Histoire philologique de la réception d'Ovide dans l'Antiquité et au Moyen Âge, tel est le titre, quelque peu ambitieux, de la version remaniée d'une thèse de doctorat soutenue en 2011 par Pierluigi Leone Gatti à l'Université Humboldt de Berlin. Mais qu'est-ce qu'un tel titre implique précisément ? L'introduction jette quelque lumière sur le choix du titre : l'auteur souhaite écrire une histoire de la réception philologique des textes d'Ovide ; avec d'un côté, une reconstruction de la place d'Ovide dans les écoles, de l'Antiquité au Moyen Âge, et de l'autre, une analyse des matériaux exégétiques comme scolies, gloses, etc. En effet, le but de cet ouvrage est de remettre en cause la *communis opinio* selon laquelle Ovide serait tombé, après son existence d'exilé, dans l'oubli ne ressuscitant l'intérêt des maîtres et des écolâtres qu'à l'essor de la soi-disant *aetas Ovidiana* (à partir, environ, de l'an 1100).

Dans le premier chapitre, Gatti définit d'abord les termes clefs de commentaire, scolies et gloses, et retrace ensuite le développement historique des relations entre les ouvrages commentés et les commentaires. Selon la reconstruction de Gatti, ce développement se découpe en trois phases : jusqu'au III^e^ siècle apr. J.-C. les commentaires furent transmis indépendamment des ouvrages commentés, ainsi le commentaire était rédigé sur un rouleau séparé, pourvu des lemmes renvoyant au texte commenté ; pendant la phase du III^e^ au VI^e^ siècle, les commentaires étaient toujours transmis indépendamment des ouvrages commentés mais un changement de matériau se mit en place : le codex de parchemin remplaça le rouleau de papyrus. Les *scholia Bobiensia* constituent un bon exemple de ce stade. En principe, ceux-ci ne se différenciaient pas des ὑπομνήματα sur papyrus. Enfin, à partir du VI^e^ siècle les commentaires commencèrent à apparaître avec le texte commenté dans le même codex (cfr. Cassiod. *Inst.* 1.11.3). Gatti, en s'appuyant, il faut le souligner, sur les travaux de Louis Holtz, mentionne les premiers témoins dès les années 850 : des extraits d'une homélie de Grégoire le Grand sur le livre d'Ézéchiel (contenu dans le MS Zurich, Staatsarchiv, AG 19 N° 12, *CLA* 7.1008), ainsi que, pour le texte de Virgile, les MMS Bern, Burgerbibliothek 165 et 172 + Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 7929.

Passés ces préliminaires, Gatti s'attache, dans le deuxième chapitre, à examiner deux aspects de la critique philologique : les commentaires aux ouvrages ovidiens et la présence d'Ovide dans les écoles, de l'Antiquité au Moyen Âge. Avant de considérer les ouvrages exégétiques proprement dits, il

constate qu'il y a une disproportion frappante entre la réception des ouvrages d'Ovide et le manque d'informations sur sa vie. Ce n'était pas le cas, dit-il, dans l'Antiquité à en juger par l'index du *De poetis* de Suétone qui contient l'entrée *P. Ovidius Naso*. D'après cet index (c'est-à-dire, la table des noms des poètes qu'on a pu reconstruire grâce à la compilation de Jérôme) Gatti parvient à la conclusion que Suétone s'intéressait aux poètes mentionnés en tant que matière d'enseignement (*Schulautoren*). Peut-être. Toujours est-il qu'aucune vie d'Ovide écrite dans l'Antiquité n'a été conservée. On s'étonne d'autant plus du silence de Gatti sur les biographies médiévales encore existantes et largement commentées par Fausto Ghisalberti.[1]

Gatti se concentre plutôt sur l'histoire des recherches sur les deux ouvrages exégétiques conservés et datant de l'Antiquité : les *Narrationes fabularum Ovidianarum* du Pseudo-Lactance Placide et les scolies de l'*Ibis* (ce dernier sujet est annoncé au début du chapitre, mais le lecteur est renvoyé au quatrième chapitre). En elles-mêmes, les *Narrationes* ne ressemblent guère à un commentaire. Il s'agit en fait d'une collection des titres (*tituli*) et des résumés en prose (*narrationes* ou *argumenta*) de chaque récit de transformation (*fabula*) contenu dans les *Métamorphoses*. Leur intérêt réside, en premier lieu, dans le fait que la majeure partie des chercheurs les regardent comme étant la trace d'un commentaire datant de la fin de l'Antiquité. Pour des raisons d'espace, je ne puis entrer dans l'explication de tous les arguments de ce long débat, mais disons, pour simplifier, que Gatti se positionne favorablement par rapport à l'hypothèse, supposant une édition annotée perdue, avancée par Brooks Otis[2] et développée par Franz Bretzigheimer[3] et Richard Tarrant.[4] Ainsi réfute-t-il fermement les plus récentes positions d'Alan Cameron[5] qui, lui, n'envisage aucun commentaire mais plutôt un ouvrage indépendant datant d'avant le III^e^ siècle. Avant d'aborder la place qu'Ovide aurait occupée dans les écoles, Gatti se penche sur ce qu'il considère comme les restes d'un commentaire antique des *Métamorphoses* : les glossaires contenus dans les codices *Parisinus Latinus* 7530 (composé au Mont-Cassin à l'époque de Paul Diacre) et *Vaticanus Latinus* 1471 (du IX^e^ siècle) dont les feuillets 302v-303v et 157r-157v contiennent des gloses aux 133 premiers vers des *Métamorphoses*. Selon Gatti (qui donne une édition critique et une transcription diplomatique des gloses en appendice = *Anhang*

[1] F. Ghisalberti, "Medieval Biographies of Ovid", *JWI* 9, 1946, 10-59.

[2] B. Otis, "The Argumenta of the so-called Lactantius", *HSPh* 47, 1936, 131-63.

[3] F. Breitzigheimer, *Studien zu Lactantius Placidus und dem Verfasser der Narrationes fabularum Ovidianarum*, Würzburg 1937.

[4] R. Tarrant, "The Narrationes of 'Lactantius' and the Transmission of Ovid's Metamorphoses" dans O. Pecere et M. D. Reeve (éds.), *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, Spoleto 1995, 83-115.

[5] A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*, Oxford 2004; ou, pour faire vite, le compte-rendu de J. J. Clauss, *CPh* 101, 2006, 295-99.

1 et 2), la collation et l'analyse paléographique des deux manuscrit nous permettent de supposer un commentaire de l'Antiquité tardive, provenant peut-être d'Italie du Sud.

Le second volet du chapitre vise donc à déterminer la place d'Ovide dans les écoles. Plus précisément, Gatti étudie la présence d'Ovide dans la tradition grammaticale romaine ainsi que les traces de textes didactiques où Ovide est utilisé comme modèle littéraire. Premier constat : il n'y a que 156 citations d'Ovide dans les *Grammatici Latini* contre plus de 5000 de Virgile. De ces 156, Priscien est responsable de plus de la moitié (84), 93 sont des citations des *Métamorphoses* et 100 datent du VI^e^ siècle. (Gatti dresse la liste des citations avec celle des entrés d'Ovide dans les *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* en annexe = *Anhang* 3 et 4). Par contre, la présence et la réception d'Ovide dans les graffiti et dans les peintures murales de Pompéi ainsi que des passages significatifs d'auteurs comme Sénèque l'Ancien (*Controversiae* 3.7) et Velleius Paterculus (*Historiae* 2.36) indiquent que le poète de Sulmone faisait partie du canon scolaire pendant les premières décennies du Haut-Empire, jusqu'à ce que se mette en place, vers la fin du I^er^ siècle, un changement de style littéraire qui selon l'analyse de Gatti, amena l'exclusion d'Ovide du canon. D'après cet examen, il ressort que la période la plus défavorable, par rapport à la place d'Ovide dans le canon, s'étend en gros de l'an 100 à l'an 500. Gatti admet que les citations de Priscien ne veulent pas forcément dire qu'Ovide était lu dans les écoles, mais en revanche d'autres témoins comme Fulgence (*Mythologiae* 1.21) et Hilderic, l'auteur de l'*Ars grammatica* contenue dans le *Casinensis* 299, sont des indices incontestables de la présence d'Ovide dans les écoles pour l'Afrique du VI^e^ siècle et pour le Mont-Cassin du IX^e^ siècle. Encore une fois, on s'étonne, étant donné le titre de l'ouvrage, que Gatti n'ait rien à dire sur les siècles suivants.[6] Pour corroborer sa thèse sur la présence d'Ovide dans les écoles, il examine plutôt des textes de nature différente : d'une part les centons et de l'autre les fragments du *De orthographia* de Caecilius Minutianus Apuleius conservés en partie dans le *Vallicellianus* R 26, où ils sont copiés sur les feuillets 201r-209r par l'humaniste portugais Achilles Statius (1524-1581), et en partie dans les *Lectionum antiquarum commentarii* (Venice 1516) de l'humaniste italien Caelius Rhodiginus (1469-1525). Comme l'a d'ailleurs déjà remarqué Adrian Swayne Hollis,[7] certains des fragments du *De orthographia* sont particulièrement intéressants en raison, entre autres, des références à ce qui semblerait être un commentaire antique

[6] Il ne donne qu'une poignée de références (à Ernst Robert Curtius, Élisabeth Pellegrin, Günter Glauche, Jose Luis Canet Vallés et Frank Coulson) dans la note 164 de la page 69. Étant donné que la recherche a fait beaucoup de progrès ces dernières années, on pourrait au moins ajouter les noms de Ralph Hexter et de Birger Munk Olsen.

[7] A. S. Hollis, "'Apuleius' De orthographia, Callimachus fr. [815] Pf. and Euphorion 166 Meineke", *ZPE* 92, 1992, 109-14 et "Traces of ancient commentaries on Ovid's Metamorphoses", *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 9, 1996, 159-74.

aux *Métamorphoses*. Le problème c'est que l'authenticité de Minutianus Apuleius, autrement inconnu, a été contestée, depuis Johan Nicolai Madvig, par une série de savants (de Rudolf Merkel à Sebastiano Timpanaro) qui considèrent le *De orthographia* comme un faux forgé par Caelius Rhodiginus. La contribution de Gatti consiste à faire deux remarques ; premièrement : Rhodiginus n'a pas pu falsifier les fragments en raison du fait qu'un autre humaniste italien, Giovanni Pontano (1426 ou 1429-1503) les avait déjà utilisés, et donc cités, pour son ouvrage *De aspiratione* (Naples 1481), ce qui ajoute aux arguments déjà avancés par Hollis.[8] De plus, et cela constitue sa seconde remarque, le fragment 18 dit à propos de la chute de Vulcain que, d'après la *Médée* d'Ovide, Vulcain fut précipité du ciel par Junon (et non par Jupiter), ce qui fournit un nouvel argument en faveur de la supposition selon laquelle l'auteur du *De orthographia* aurait utilisé un commentaire antique des *Métamorphoses* (en l'occurrence, Gatti envisage un commentaire aux vers 13.313-14 : *nec Poeantiaden quod habet Vulcania Lemnos / esse reus merui…*).

En fin de chapitre, Gatti consacre deux pages aux centons, c'est-à-dire aux pastiches (plus ou moins) ovidiens.[9] Il définit d'abord les centons comme un genre scolaire (*Schulgattung*) en constatant que nous n'avons pas conservé de centons ovidiens de l'Antiquité, il mentionne ensuite les centons virgiliens de l'*Anthologie Latine* en faisant ressortir que trois de ceux-ci (Riese 9, 13 et 14) traitent de sujets mythologiques pris des *Métamorphoses*, après quoi, pour finir, il observe qu'un centon ovidien nous a été transmis par le Moyen Âge : celui des *Tristes* d'Albertino Mussato (1261-1329) dont il cite[10] les premiers 24 vers et il remarque que ce centon peut nous donner une idée de ce qu'était le centon ovidien de l'Antiquité. Bref, on le voit, pas de véritable discussion. Il est toutefois dommage que Gatti consacre si peu de lignes aux centons, car l'exposition sommaire ne peut que laisser le lecteur avec plus de questions que de réponses. Pour commencer, la définition même est contestable : un centon n'implique pas nécessairement un produit d'école. En ce qui concerne les centons virgiliens par exemple, rien n'indique qu'il s'agisse de poèmes scolaires.[11] En fait, cette forme de réécriture va bien au-

[8] Comment les humanistes ont-ils pu inventer les renseignements sur Callimaque et Euphorion mentionnés dans les fragments du *De orthographia* ? Cfr. Hollis 1992, *op. cit.*, 112.

[9] Avant de passer aux centons, Gatti s'interroge brièvement sur les *argumenta* des *Héroïdes*, en suggérant que ces résumés en vers devraient être considérés comme des témoins de l'éducation de l'Antiquité (discussion que je passe sous silence pour ne pas trop allonger ce compte rendu déjà assez étendu).

[10] D'après l'édition (1889) de Friedrich Ehwald et sans signaler d'ailleurs que le poème entier compte 193 distiques. La nouvelle édition (2010) de Jean-Frédéric Chevalier ne figure pas dans la bibliographie.

[11] Cfr. S. McGill, *Virgil Recomposed. The Mythological and Secular Centos in Antiquity*, Oxford 2005, xx-xxi : « …for there is no evidence that any of them [i.e. the mythological and secular Virgilian centonists] was a child-centonist. »

delà d'une simple imitation scolaire.[12] Ce qui caractérise surtout les centons, c'est l'élément ludique : ce sont des jeux littéraires.[13] Et cela nous amène au centon de Mussato : non seulement ce centon est un jeu érudit,[14] mais c'est aussi le poème d'un vieux monsieur.[15] En tout cas, on est bien loin des écoles ! Mais pourquoi mettre en valeur tout particulièrement Albertino Mussato ? Son centon n'est pas le seul centon ovidien du Moyen Âge, contrairement à l'impression que donne cette mention isolée.[16] Par ailleurs, il serait tout à fait intéressant, après avoir mentionné Mussato, de mettre son jeu littéraire en relation avec la *musa iocosa*[17] de Baudri de Bourgueil et, par extension, avec les autres imitations ovidiennes et les pseudo- ou para-ovidiana.[18]

Avant d'entamer la véritable discussion sur les scolies de l'*Ibis*, Gatti, dans le troisième chapitre, apporte en préambule diverses précisions sur ce poème lui-même, ce qui, en fin de compte, constitue une évaluation de l'état de la recherche. Pour résumer, cette présentation du *status quaestionis* concerne la datation (entre l'an 10 et 13 apr. J.-C.), le problème de l'identification d'Ibis (Marcus Valerius Messalla Corvinus ? Auguste ? Hygine ? Marcus Manilius ? personne/une fiction ? Cornélius Fidus, le gendre d'Ovide ? Ateius Capiton ?),[19] le genre littéraire (poésie de malédiction dans la tradition des ἀραί des poètes

[12] *Ibidem*, xxi : « Of course, cento composition is a very different pursuit from creating Virgilian school texts and from writing versified Virgilian *ethopoeiae*, *themata*, and summaries. »

[13] *Ibidem*, *passim* : « each cento can be read as a discrete literary game » (71) ; « poetry that is fundamentally about the manner of its own composition, or how the author handles his particular ludic technique (…) seven ancient Virgilian centos whose authors turn to myth in playing at their literary game » (74) ; « the centos serve as examples of ludic poetry » (115) etc.

[14] J.-F. Chevalier, "Albertino Mussato o la figura del poeta esiliato: edizione di un centone autobiografico dai Tristia di Ovidio", *Studi umanistici Piceni* 30, 2010, 111-31, *passim* : « un poeta che propone un gioco erudito » (p. 111); « La prima lettura del poema mostra che si tratta di un *lusus* erudito » (113) ; « insomma un gioco letterario » (117) etc.

[15] Mussato écrivit le poème en 1318, à l'âge de 57 ans. Cfr. Chevalier, *op. cit.*, 111. Curieusement, Prudence, lui aussi à l'âge de 57 ans, écrit ceci : *…inrepsit subito canities seni…* (*Prooem.* 23).

[16] Je pense surtout au *De tribus puellis*. Voir ma discussion "The Elegiac Love Poems *Versus Eporedienses* and *De Tribus Puellis* and the Ovidian Backdrop", *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 23, 2013, 271-89.

[17] G. A. Bond, "'Iocus amoris' : The Poetry of Baudri of Bourgeuil and the Formation of the Ovidian Subculture", *Traditio* 42, 1986, 143-93, et J.-Y. Tilliette, "Savants et poètes du Moyen Âge face à Ovide : les débuts de l'aetas Ovidiana (v. 1050 - v. 1200)" dans M. Picone et B. Zimmermann (éds.), *Ovidius redivivus : Von Ovid zu Dante*, Stuttgart, 1994, 63-104, ici 82 ss.

[18] Pour un premier aperçu, voir R. J. Hexter, "Shades of Ovid. Pseudo- (and para-) Ovidiana in the Middle Ages" dans J. G. Clark, F. T. Coulson, K. L. McKinley (éds.), *Ovid in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge 2011, 284-309 ; M. T. Kretschmer, "The Love Elegy in Medieval Latin Literature (Pseudo-Ovidiana and Ovidian Imitations)" dans T. S. Thorsen (éd.), *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*, Cambridge 2013, 271-89.

[19] Dans un essai récent, Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak présente une liste alternative de 13 candidats et opte pour Titus Labienus. Cfr. K. T. Witczak, "Ovidio e il suo biasimato persecutore", dans M. G. Iodice et M. Zagórski (éds.), *Carminis personae : Character in Roman Poetry*, Frankfurt am Main 2014, 123-31.

alexandrins), la structure et le contenu, les sources (notamment la question des modalités de son éventuelle utilisation de Callimaque) et la survie littéraire (mention des allusions, plus ou moins probables, et des emprunts ou des citations faites par Sénèque, Silius Italicus, Martial, Ausone, Pacatus, Prudence, Rutilius Namatianus, Orens d'Auch, Théodulf d'Orléans, Micon de Saint-Riquier, Albert de Stade[20], Vincent de Beauvais et Conrad de Mure).

Le quatrième et dernier chapitre, sur les scolies de l'*Ibis*, se divise en cinq parties, dont la première dresse le contexte des *accessus* médiévaux en général et plus particulièrement des *accessus* à l'*Ibis* et aux autres ouvrages d'Ovide (avec en appendice la liste des explications médiévales des causes de l'exile = Anhang 5). Dans la deuxième partie, Gatti se penche sur la genèse des scolies qui sont conservées (pour la plupart sous forme de *marginalia* ou gloses interlinéaires) dans une trentaine[21] de manuscrits datant du XI^e^ au XVII^e^ siècle. Les deux manuscrits les plus importants sont P, le *Berolinensis Latinus* 210 (anciennement le *Phillippicus* 1796), manuscrit isolé qui forme la branche de la première famille, et B, le *Bernensis Bongarsianus* 711, le plus ancien de la seconde famille (et le plus proche donc de l'hyparchétype α de la seconde branche du stemma bifide.) Ce dernier (B) est le seul à contenir le texte sous forme de commentaire continu. Avant de proposer sa propre reconstruction, Gatti examine et critique les principales hypothèses avancées par les savants depuis le XIX^e^ siècle, selon lesquels les scolies seraient soit le produit d'un clerc du VII^e^ ou du VIII^e^ siècle (Ehwald 1872), soit la traduction des scolies de l' Ἶβις, le prétendu modèle d'Ovide (Rostagni 1920), soit le commentaire écrit par ou sous la direction d'Ovide lui-même (Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924) ; enfin, les scolies remonteraient à des *notulae* de l'Antiquité (La Penna 1959). Ensuite, Gatti livre sa propre hypothèse : à l'origine des scolies conservées il faudrait supposer un *commentarius perpetuus* rédigé, au I^er^ siècle, sur un rouleau séparé (et non sous forme de *notulae* comme le croyait La Penna) ; conclusion à laquelle il arrive par le raisonnement suivant : les scolies constituent des segments de texte trop longs par rapport à l'« entrecolonnement » (*Interkolumniengröße*) d'un rouleau ; parmi les rouleaux conservés, on ne connaît aucun exemple de commentaire continu écrit dans les marges ou entre les colonnes, et dans les très rares cas où on trouve des gloses entre les colonnes il s'agit toujours de notes privées, c'est-à-dire des traces du lecteur (comme il en existe dans le papyrus PSI 1390 = LDAB 877 contenant le Θρᾷξ d'Euphorion de Chalcis) ; la présence de lemmes dans les deux manuscrits P et B ne peut pas être fortuite : les lemmes des deux familles doivent remonter à l'original ; enfin, le dernier argument

[20] Au lieu de la plus récente édition de Thomas Gärtner (2007) c'est l'ancienne édition de Merzdorf (1875) qui figure dans la bibliographie.

[21] D'après le *conspectus codicum* de l'édition de La Penna (1959). Pour l'établissement du texte La Penna se concentre sur une dizaine de manuscrits (les *codices potiores*). Cfr. *Scholia in P. Ovidi Nasonis Ibin* (Biblioteca di studi superiori 35), Firenze 1959, lxi.

est d'ordre littéraire : le plaisir des poèmes savants de tradition hellénistique consiste, en grande partie, dans le dénouement d'énigmes de mythes obscurs ; par conséquent, une lecture accompagnée d'une explication continue ne produirait pas l'effet désiré.[22] Quant à la datation, Gatti, s'appuyant sur les arguments de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff en faveur d'une datation postérieure de peu à la composition du poème, ajoute que bien d'autres circonstances plaident pour l'hypothèse du savant allemand : l'utilisation de matériaux exégétiques sur Callimaque, la mention de Nicandre, le succès d'Ovide et le regain d'intérêt pour la poésie hellénistique et pour les poèmes énigmatiques sous la dynastie julio-claudienne.

La troisième partie est un essai de réévaluation des scolies, généralement considérées comme peu fiables. Par une analyse de scolies choisies[23] et par leur comparaison avec d'autres sources, Gatti montre que celles-ci, loin d'être sans valeur, fournissent au contraire des renseignements valables, et que leur auteur doit avoir eu à sa disposition des sources de première qualité.

La quatrième partie se veut une explication des transformations textuelles que la collection des scolies a subies à chaque étape de la tradition manuscrite. Partant de la prémisse selon laquelle les savants médiévaux ne considéraient pas des commentaires comme une *auctoritas*,[24] Gatti revient sur les phases[25] de la tradition en indiquant comment les modifications apportées lors des phases critiques reflètent les intentions et les inclinations des copistes. Les manuscrits diffèrent considérablement les uns des autres. En effet, il s'agit, pour les scolies, des rédactions remaniées : l'on ne peut qu'approuver le jugement de Gatti sur l'édition de La Penna qui a très bien réussi à restituer les scolies dans leur mouvance.

[22] Argument déjà avancé d'ailleurs par Antonio La Penna contre la thèse de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Cfr. *op. cit.*, xxiii.

[23] En l'occurrence (suivant l'ordre de l'analyse) : *Scholia in Ibin* 178 (sur l'oracle révélant à Danaüs l'intention de ses cousins) ; 467 (sur le rite apotropaïque d'Abdère) ; 457 (sur le rendez-vous d'Atalante et d'Hippomène) ; 601 (sur la prophétie des Parques au jour de la naissance de Méléagre) et 459 (sur le supplice de Limoné).

[24] On regrette que la discussion ne s'appuie que sur quelques pages de E. R. Curtius (Gatti, note 132). Certes, depuis Curtius (1948) la recherche a fait des progrès. À titre d'exemple, je cite A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, Philadelphia 1988 (2e éd.) ; M. Zimmermann (dir.), *Auctor et Auctoritas. Invention et conformisme dans l'écriture médiévale*, Paris 2001 ; M. Zink, "Auteur et autorité au Moyen Âge", dans A. Compagnon (dir.), *De l'autorité : colloque annuel 2007*, Paris 2008, 143-58 ; et dernièrement E. D'Angelo et J. Ziolkowski (éds.), *Auctor et Auctoritas in Latinis Medii Aevi Litteris. Proceedings of the Sixth Congress of the International Medieval Latin Committee*, Firenze 2014.

[25] D'après l'*Abbildung* 8 de Gatti, les trois phases sont 1) Ier siècle : le commentaire fut rédigé indépendamment du poème, c'est-à-dire sur un rouleau séparé peu après la composition de l'*Ibis* ; 2) entre les IIIe et Ve siècles : le commentaire fut copié indépendamment sur parchemin, c'est-à-dire sur un codex séparé ; 3) entre les VIe et VIIIe siècles : le texte du poème fut pourvu des scolies dans le même codex.

La cinquième et dernière partie porte sur une particularité de la seconde branche de la tradition manuscrite, à savoir : 35 poèmes courts (de deux à neuf vers), faussement attribués dans les manuscrits à des auteurs connus ou inconnus (*ut dicit Ennius, unde ait Batus*, etc.), cités ici et là pour confirmer les explications données aux vers de l'*Ibis*. Antonio La Penna était parvenu à la conclusion que ces vers furent inventés par un seul auteur, celui de la rédaction de α (en tête de la seconde branche), que le savant italien place au IX[e] siècle,[26] et Gatti a le mérite de corroborer cette hypothèse, car, après une recherche dans les répertoires de Walther et de Schaller-Könsgen-Klein ainsi que dans les ressources électroniques de BTL 4, dMGH, CLCLT, In Principio et Google, il peut constater qu'aucun de ces vers n'y figure. En plus, son analyse métrique montre que les vers sont marqués par des caractéristiques prosodiques. En joignant tout cela à la discussion précédente, Gatti complète en conclusion de l'ouvrage la définition des étapes de la tradition manuscrite.[27] Enfin, il ne lui reste qu'à déterminer la provenance de l'inventeur des poèmes. Comme l'analyse des vers le montre, le versificateur emprunta des fragments de vers aux autres ouvrages d'Ovide (notamment à l'élégie érotique) pour les insérer dans ses propres inventions poétiques. De plus, ce stade de la tradition (a) dénote l'influence de Fulgence le mythographe et peut-être, aussi, de l'*Anthologie Latine*.[28] Sachant que des manuscrits soit de Fulgence, soit de

[26] Cfr. *Scholia in P. Ovidi Nasonis Ibin*, p. xxx.

[27] Schématisé dans l'*Abbildung* 9 (qui reprend la troisième phase de l'*Abbildung* 8) de cette manière : entre les VIII[e] et IX[e] siècles : introduction d'explications improvisées (*Autoschediasmen*) dans l'archétype (Ω) ; entre les IX[e] et XI[e] (datation du *Bernensis* 711, le témoin le plus ancien de la seconde famille) siècles : introduction de « faux vers » dans l'hyparchétype (α).

[28] La scolie 79 de la rédaction E cite des *Mythologiae* 1.7 et, une dizaine de noms des auteurs, auxquels sont attribués les poèmes courts, sont également cités dans l'*Expositio sermonum antiquorum* (Gatti néglige de préciser de quel ouvrage de Fulgence il s'agit mais il suffit de consulter les pages en question dans l'édition de Helm). En ce qui concerne l'*Anthologie Latine*, Gatti considère la scolie 273 comme un possible écho de l'*AL* (Riese 414), mais ce seul exemple ne suffit point pour nous persuader qu'il s'agisse d'un emprunt. À plus forte raison, on ne saurait conclure que : « Wenn der Anklang an die *anthologia Latina* richtig und kein Zufall ist, haben wir vielleicht ein kleines Indiz, um eine Gegend für diesen Dichter zu finden, da die Codices vom Werk des Fulgentius und der *anthologia Latina* dort gleichzeitig vorhanden waren: Frankreich. » (163). D'ailleurs, la description est trop succincte pour qu'on puisse suivre le raisonnement de Gatti sur ce point. Je cite le passage en question afin que le lecteur puisse en juger lui-même : « Eine Reminiszenz der Epigramme des Ps.-Seneca ist vielleicht zu finden in: ***schol. in Ib.* 273 V.7** (*credere vix ausim esse deos*) **— *anth.* 414 Riese** (*marmoreo Licinus tumulo iacet, at Cato nullo, / Pompeius parvo. credimus esse Deos?*) » (158). À mon sens, il faudrait informer les lecteurs les moins versés que bien des poèmes du groupe 396-463 de l'*AL* (= SB 392-461) sont attribués à Sénèque, mais pas forcément tous (pour citer l'*apparatus* de Shackleton Bailey 1982 : « cc. 392-461 vel omnia vel pleraque a compluribus Senecae philosopho adtributa sunt »). En tout cas, l'attribution à Sénèque à laquelle Gatti fait allusion ne figure nulle part, ni dans l'édition de Riese ni dans celle de Shackleton Bailey (Riese 414 = SB 411). En l'occurrence, le poème en question était attribué à Varron de l'Aude (Terentius Varro Atacinus) dans le *Bellovacensis* (aujourd'hui perdu) et sans attribution dans le *Vossianus* Q. 86. Au lecteur qui voudrait se renseigner sur les détails, nous recommandons L. Zurli, "La tradizione

l'*Anthologie Latine*, se trouvaient en France à la même époque (on aimerait quand même quelques précisions), Gatti suggère une provenance française. Dans la remarque finale (p. 165), Gatti conclut que dans l'Antiquité et le Haut Moyen Âge, les commentateurs s'intéressaient plutôt à la mythologie ovidienne (les *Métamorphoses*, les *Héroïdes*, les *Fastes* et l'*Ibis*) et non pas au *praeceptor amoris* ; précision temporelle qu' à mon avis il faudrait faire au début du volume. En fait, le titre *Ovid in Antike und Mittelalter* est quelque peu trompeur (*Ovid in Antike und Frühmittelalter* serait plus exact) car Gatti ne s'intéresse pas spécialement aux siècles qu'on a coutume d'appeler *aetas ovidiana* (les XII^e^ et XIII^e^ siècles).[29] Il serait plus opportun de rappeler que les maîtres Orléanais glosaient aussi les élégies érotiques.[30]

Marek Thue Kretschmer
NTNU. Department of Historical Studies
marek.kretschmer@ntnu.no

ms. delle *anthologiae Salmasiana e Vossiana* (e il loro stemma)", *AL. Rivista di Studi di Anthologia Latina* 1, 2010, 205-91, ici 266-67. Enfin, répétons-le, des précisions seraient les bienvenues. En ce qui concerne l'*Anthologia Vossiana* (qui contient le poème 414), on estime que le *Vossianus* Q. 86 fut écrit au IX^e^ siècle, peut-être à Fleury.

[29] Je renvoie le lecteur à mes notes 1, 6, et 16-18.

[30] Et n'oublions pas le versificateur (IX^e^ siècle ?) de la seconde branche. Gatti ne dit-il pas lui-même que le versificateur avait une prédilection pour les élégies érotiques ? Cfr. 163 : « Er war selbstverständlich ein Leser von Ovid, mit einer Vorliebe für die erotischen Werke… ». Quant à la mythologie ovidienne, les *Héroïdes* au moins racontent autant d'amour que de mythes.

Markus Stachon, *Tractavi monumentum aere perennius: Untersuchungen zu vergilischen und ovidischen Pseudepigraphen*. BAC – Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, Bd. 97. Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2014. 375 pp. ISBN 978-38-6821-519-9.

Deutsche Dissertationen beginnen oft entweder mit einem nicht enden wollenden Forschungsbericht oder mit der langatmigen Paraphrase einer in der Arbeit anzuwendenden Literaturtheorie. Eine solche ist für S., wie er einmal beiläufig bemerkt, ein "Fleischwolf" (180 Anm. 6), Doxographie dagegen (die bei seinem Thema eher entbehrlich ist) bietet er zwar nicht in der Einleitung, aber immer wieder im Laufe seiner Ausführungen, besonders extensiv zu *Consolatio ad Liviam* (240-248) und *Nux* (273-277). Er eröffnet seine Einleitung ganz einfach mit einer Unterscheidung zwischen "primärer" Pseudepigraphie, bei der "die Fehlzuschreibung auf den Autor selbst zurückgeht", und "sekundärer", worunter er literarische Werke versteht, "die aufgrund eines Irrtums zur falschen Betitelung gekommen sind" (13f.). Das klingt ebenso verheißungsvoll wie seine Überlegungen zum Verhältnis eines Anonymus, der die Maske eines Klassikers wie Vergil trägt, zu seinen zeitgenössischen Lesern: Er kann bei ihnen ein breites "kulturelles Gedächtnis" voraussetzen, das sich außer an die reale Vita des Klassikers – über sie war in der Regel wenig bekannt – an mehrere nur anekdotenhaft tradierte "Begebenheiten" in dessen Leben erinnert, Fakten und Fiktion unbekümmert vermengt und deshalb bereit ist, ein bisher nicht publiziertes Opus als Teil einer solchen "Vita" zu betrachten. Auf der Basis seiner Kategorisierung und seines rezeptionsästhetischen Ansatzes befasst S. sich dann allein mit Typ 1 näher, Ps.-Vergils *Culex*, *Catalepton* und *Dirae* sowie Ps.-Ovids *Consolatio ad Liviam*, *Nux*, *Halieutica* und *Epistula Sapphus*, aber die Hoffnung auf überzeugende Interpretationen, die er mit seiner Einleitung weckt, erfüllt er leider nicht.

Es war auch ein guter Gedanke S.s, den Vergil- und Ovid-Abschnitt jeweils mit einem Kapitel anzufangen, in dem er alles uns Überlieferte zusammenstellt, was man im 1./2. Jahrhundert n.Chr. über die beiden Dichter wusste bzw. zu wissen glaubte. Aber schon hier zeigt sich, dass S. nicht nur den "Fleischwolf" ablehnt und folglich die in den anglophonen Ländern und Italien entwickelten Methoden moderner latinistischer Textanalyse weitgehend ignoriert, sondern überdies an die vor allem in Deutschland bis in neuere Zeit (und z.T. noch heute) bevorzugte historistische Philologie anknüpft. Denn S. differenziert in den zwei von ihm erarbeiteten Viten nicht etwa zwischen biographischen Fakten, die von der strengsten Kritik als solche

anerkannt werden können, und dem, was als frei erfundene Zutat verdächtig ist, sondern behandelt beides als gleichwertig. Er hätte da aber sorgfältig trennen müssen, um schon jetzt mit Blick auf die einzelnen Pseudepigraphen zu fragen, inwieweit fiktionale Elemente der "Vita" zur Übernahme der Rolle eines *Vergilius impersonatus* oder eines *Ovidius impersonatus* anregen konnte. Stattdessen präsentiert S. uns romanhafte Lebensbilder in der Manier des 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhunderts, was auch an seiner Diktion erkennbar ist: Über die *Bucolica* Vergils z.B. sagt er: "Ein neuer Stern am Dichterhimmel war aufgegangen" (58), und zu dem jüngeren Dichter, dessen Vita er wie in einer TV-Doku mit "Wir schreiben das Jahr 30 v.Chr." beginnt (201) und der für ihn "der große Volksdichter" ist (218), formuliert er z.B. "Nun haben wir Ovid bis etwa ins Jahr 8 v.Chr. begleitet" (210). Das konnten "wir", weil S. alles, was dieser Autor über sich sagt, für authentisch hält, ohne Selbststilisierung und poetisches Ich auch nur in Erwägung zu ziehen (vgl. dagegen Rez., "Playing with his Life: Ovid's 'Autobiographical' References", in P. Knox. ed. *Oxford Readings in Ovid*. Oxford, 2006, 51 ff.). Deswegen setzt er z.B. aufgrund von *Am*. epigr. bedenkenlos voraus, dass uns mit den *Amores* eine 2. Auflage vorliege, und findet es nicht seltsam, dass am Ende der Sammlung, die für ihn frühestens um Christi Geburt publiziert worden sein kann, der Dichter das Verfassen der *Medea* ankündigt, die laut S. circa 15 Jahre zuvor "erschien" (207).

S.s methodisch problematischer Umgang mit den "Viten" Vergils und Ovids versperrt ihm den Weg zu seinen Pseudepigraphen, den er sich mit seiner unbedingt zu begrüßenden Theorie eines Autor/Leser-"Vertrages" bereitet hat, und das auch deswegen, weil er eine wichtige Prämisse für diese Konstellation fast gar nicht berücksichtigt: Die antiken Rezipienten dürften zwar, gestützt auf ihr "biographisches" Wissen, akzeptiert haben, dass ihnen z.B. mit dem *Culex* zusätzlich zu *pascua rura duces* ein Frühwerk Vergils vorgelegt und damit erstmals Einblick in dessen Jugendzeit bzw. die seiner Persona gewährt wurde, aber ihr "kulturelles Gedächtnis" verriet ihnen ebenso, dass dieses Frühwerk u.a. auf die *Metamorphosen* Ovids anspielt und folglich keines sein kann. Doch Intertextualität und implizite Poetik, die mit einer solchen Art von "Zitieren" verbunden sind, interessieren S. offenkundig nicht. Er analysiert die von ihm gewählten Pseudepigraphen lediglich unter zwei Aspekten: 1. fragt er, welche Ergänzung diese Dichtungen zu der von ihm jeweils erstellten "Vita" Vergils und Ovids liefern – etwa das Motiv "Maro und die Liebe" (150ff.) in dem Gedichtbuch *Catalepton*, das S. nicht, wie heute üblich, linear liest, sondern in der Art der älteren Philologie in ein kompliziertes, für diejenigen, die eine Papyrusrolle aufwickeln, nicht nachvollziehbares Strukturschema zwängt (175) –, 2. versucht er zu zeigen, welche Botschaft die Anonymi an ihr Publikum des 1./2. Jahrhunderts n.Chr. richteten; dabei bedenkt er eines nicht: Wenn der Autor/Leser-Kontrakt funktionieren soll, müsste der eine Maske tragende Autor, was seinen Zeitbezug betrifft, doch eigentlich hinter

der Maske verschwinden, sich also mindestens mit seinen aktuellen Bezügen auf die Lebensjahre seiner Persona beschränken.

Das kann man zwar für die von S. betrachteten Texte nicht ohne weiteres annehmen – jeder Literat schreibt irgendwie für seine Epoche –, aber was S. hier (überwiegend spekulativ) herausliest, halte ich bei Pseudepigraphen denn doch für unwahrscheinlich. Der *Culex*-Dichter "persifliert das amateurhafte dichterische Treiben" der Tiberius-Ära (132); im *Catalepton* "kratzen" … Vergils "allzu menschliche Charakterzüge … am Bild des unantastbaren, ja göttlichen Dichters" (176); die *Dirae* kritisieren die "Schmeichelei gegenüber den Herrschenden" in der neronischen Bukolik (199f.); in der *Consolatio ad Liviam* verspotte der Autor ähnlich wie eine von "two voices" Ovids in der Exildichtung zwischen den Zeilen Augustus, Livia und Tiberius (270); in der *Nux* lasse sich "an mehreren Stellen Kritik an Neros Willkürherrschaft und seinem Stolz als Künstler erkennen" (292); auf Ov. *Ars* 1,45-50 stützt S. den Satz: "So könnten die *Halieutica* als Apologie der *Ars* konzipiert worden sein, in der Naso seine erotische Verspieltheit zugunsten eines … 'trockenen' Stoffs aufgibt" (301); der Sappho-Brief (den S. ohne zwingende Begründung für unecht hält) treibe (bes. in V. 133f.) ein Spiel "mit der tatsächlichen Schlüpfrigkeit Ovids und der möglichen" (307), d.h. der Anonymus überschreite eine Grenze, die Ovid sich selbst gezogen habe (was S. einfach behauptet, ohne zu bedenken, dass Frauen in der Antike als höchst lasziv galten und speziell Sappho von diesem Vorurteil betroffen war). Sein ganzes Hypothesengebäude errichtet S. auf einem sehr schwachen Fundament. Denn die Datierung der einzelnen Pseudepigraphen ist mehr als unsicher, und wenn S. z.B. Kritik an Nero entdeckt, verlässt er sich mit seinem dafür vorauszusetzenden Negativbild des Kaisers auf die mehrheitlich subjektiven Nero-Porträts antiker Historiker und Biographen. Was die Texte seiner Meinung nach implizit aussagen, dürften die Zeitgenossen darin gerade dann nicht gesucht haben, wenn sie ihr "detektivisches Augenmerk" auf den *lusus* mit Dichtung und Wahrheit im Rahmen der Vita eines Literaten lenkten.

Gewiss: S.s Buch enthält immer wieder Beobachtungen zu den von ihm behandelten Texten, die zur Weiterarbeit anregen. Aber wirklich nützlich ist nur ein Kapitel: der umfassende Überblick über die Geschichte der *Appendix Vergiliana* (80-112). S. zeichnet hier sehr sorgfältig nach, wie nicht lange nach Vergils Tod zunächst "primäre" Pseudepigraphen (*Culex, Catalepton, Dirae*), dann noch in der Antike "sekundäre" (*Aetna, Ciris*, *Copa*) und irgendwann später alle übrigen hinzukommen, die mit den älteren im Murbacher Katalog zusammengestellt sind, darunter das *Moretum*. Eine Tabelle, die diese Entwicklung synoptisch verdeutlicht (109), ist vielleicht das Beste, was sich in S.s Buch findet.

Niklas Holzberg
München/Bamberg
nc.holzberg@gmail.com

A.J. Boyle, *Seneca Oedipus*, Oxford: OUP, 2011, cxxvi + 437 pp. ISBN 978-01-9954-771-5.

A. J. Boyle has for the past twenty plus years made something of an industry in publishing commentaries on Seneca's tragedies. The volume under review, an edition, translation and commentary on *Oedipus*, follows his earlier *Phaedra* (Leeds 1992²), *Seneca's Troades* (Leeds 1994), *Octavia* (Oxford 2008), and as the reviewer was writing this review, one on *Medea* appeared as well. The appearance of this book is welcome since it fills a great need in Senecan studies. It is the first full-scale commentary on the play in English, and will no doubt serve as a complement and counterweight to Töchterle's philological 1997 German *Habilitationsschrift*, to which Boyle is indebted. The book is consistently of high quality; scholars of Seneca and of drama will want the book at hand, and it is a must for all research libraries.

Boyle's goals for the book are ambitious. As stated in the preface, his primary aims are "to elucidate the text both dramatically as well as philologically, and to locate the play firmly in its contemporary historical and theatrical tradition." As such, Boyle's professed audience consists of drama students, Latin students of every level, and professional scholars of classics, drama, and literature. Yet, an edition and commentary that attempts to be everything to everyone often disappoints, failing to satisfy fully any of the groups it wishes to reach. The book under review, however, does an admirable job of blending together commentary that does justice to both the philological and the dramatic issues that the play presents. Scholars of Seneca will indeed find much of importance in the volume, and students of drama will benefit from Boyle's acute and judicious exegesis of the theatrical elements of the play and its place in the history of theater—though the latter will often have to wade though a forest of philological exegesis to find what they are looking for. Students of Latin, on the other hand, especially those meeting Seneca for the first time, will find the edition somewhat less useful than the editor believes.

The introduction, occupying over a hundred pages, offers a wealth of information, a function of the author's long engagement with Seneca's plays and Roman Theater in general. It offers full discussion of: Seneca's life and his works; the Republican and Imperial theater; the performance issue (short; see below); Seneca's style and language; the myth before Seneca (noting how rarely the myth was treated in Rome); a full 30-page analysis of the play itself; an exhaustive survey of the reception of Seneca's play from antiquity to the present; and finally a short survey of meter and colometry.

As might be expected, Boyle reuses a great deal of material from his earlier works, especially the *Octavia* (2008), *Tragic Seneca* (1997), and *Roman Tragedy* (2006), though he rewrites it to fit the context and to take in recent scholarship. For instance, the section on *The Roman Theater* (xxvi–xliii) is taken nearly word for word from that in *Octavia* (xxv–xlii, itself a rewriting of the introduction of *Tragic Seneca*), though he more fully considers the possibility that pantomime could have influenced the tragedies (see p. xli, n. 56), taking into account the recent work by Zimmerman (2008). Likewise, the section of the Introduction entitled "The Declamatory Style" is a hybrid of the chapters by the same name in *Tragic Seneca* and *Roman Tragedy*, but recast for the present book.

As he has articulated in his other work on Seneca tragedy, Boyle stands firmly in favor that Seneca's tragedies were written with performance in mind. While I wholeheartedly agree, *Oedipus* contains the scene—the extispicy conducted by Manto (303–86)—that is the most difficult to stage. Yet, it is found nowhere in the introduction and remains relegated to the commentary, where it is treated thoroughly. Given its importance to the question, it would have been preferable to alert the reader early on that there is a significant issue in staging the extispicy. It is a troublesome passage; to solve it, Boyle adopts the solution of Ahl, *Two Faces of Oedipus: Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannus and Seneca's Oedipus* (2008), who suggests that the animals are represented by props, while Manto and the attendants act symbolically with gestures. Hence Boyle's stage directions, "Enter Tiresias and Manto with Attendants from stage left. The Attendants carry sculpted heads of a bull and a heifer, each with gilded horns."

Boyle provides a new Latin text and a facing English translation. He differs from Zweirlein's *OCT* in 36 places (conveniently listed on pp. 91–92), and proves to be a more conservative textual critic than Zwierlein, preferring manuscript readings over conjectures, even where the text is in doubt. He adopts the surely correct emendation of Fitch at 1052–53. At 560, however, he rejects Heinsius' emendation (*claustra Lethaei lacus*) for the mss. *claustra letalis lacus* as "unnecessary" (*ad loc.*), although comparison of phrases involving *claustra* and a genitive in the Senecan corpus reveals that it is always paired with a proper noun (*Oed.* 160, 401, *Tro.* 430, *HO* 1311). Also, at 822–24, Boyle defends the mss. reading *penes quos* instead of Zweirlein's emendation *penes quem*; the mss. reading is, *pace* Boyle, not supported by his interpretation of line 837, which does not indicate more than one herdsman.

To keep the text as clean as possible, Boyle provides the (selective) critical apparatus in a separate section that follows the text (pp. 80–90).

Boyle's translation is "meant to convey to the Latinless reader as much as it is possible to convey in English and without violation of English idiom about the form and meaning of the play (cxxiv)." The translation is vigorous

and readable, and aptly represents the Latin in idiomatic English. In an attempt to help Latin students, Boyle frequently offers the literal translation of the Latin in the commentary; presumably he recognizes that students will use the translation as a guide to the Latin. At times, the translation drifts a bit far from the original: line 26: "You think the impossible and dread it," does not really represent *quod posse fieri non putes metuas tamen*. At line 70: the translation "Help itself becomes diseased" lacks the point of *morbus auxilium trahit*, which reiterates the "falling" healers (*cadunt medentes*) of the first part of the line by emphasizing how the disease "drags down" help. At line 138: in the description of the plague, *taurus…labitur segnis* does not mean "the bull…slowly sank," but that the "the bull collapsed in lethargy" In line 162: *sua motam ripa* is omitted, which emphasizes the inversion of normalcy (a point Boyle emphasizes at every point). At line 232 (*emicat vasto fragore maior humano sonus*), the translation "A loud crack lights the air, a sound beyond human" does not really capture the effect of a booming, other-worldly *voice* emanating and thundering from the chasm; "lights" seems too literal for *emicat* since it is the suddenness that is being described. At line 289, Tiresias arrives, *Tiresia tremulo tardus accelerat genu*; in an attempt, presumably, to keep the alliteration, Boyle translates "Here…/ Rushes tardy Tiresias—his knees tremble," but surely "tardy" will be taken to mean something different than Boyle intends, "late in coming" rather than "slowed by age" (as Boyle suggests in the commentary). For another place where alliteration affects the translation see line 106 *ille, ille dirus callidi monstri cinis* (the Sphinx), where *dirus…cinis* is rendered "that dire dust."

The outstanding commentary consists of a combination of philological, analytic, and interpretative notes, along with occasional remarks about the grammar to help the student of Latin (with references to Woodcock's *New Latin Syntax*). The notes are keyed to both the Latin text and the English translation when the exegesis is helpful to both scholars and those who do not control Latin. Yet, Boyle is not always consistent. To take a few random examples: at 80–81, the lemma is "*iamdudum*/It's late, but:" even though the note is only understandable to Latin readers. At 240–41 the lemma is "*functi*/ dead," but the note will not be understandable to English-only readers: "for *functus* = *defunctus*, see also 579 below, *Med*. 999, Thy. 14." All Latin in the book is duly translated, but other modern languages, especially the number of French quotations, remain untranslated.

The exegetical notes cover a wide range of subjects, including technical points such as metrical features and lexical parallels, matters of dramaturgy, reception of Seneca's works (esp. by Corneille, Voltaire, Dryden, and Lee), parallels in other Senecan plays, and exploration of possible intertexts with Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, and Ovid. In some cases the intertexts are obvious from verbal parallels, such as *ad* 166–70 (part of the plague scene) where the

reference to Charon is indebted to Vergil (p. 154; more below), but others are more suggestive. One wonders, for example, if the geographical echoes of Catullus 11 actually would bring to mind in "some members of his audience" the "personal devastation wrought by sex" (p. 145 *ad* 110–23) found in the latter part of Catullus' poem. Other texts to which Seneca is supposed to have alluded are improbable—especially in the absence of lexical connections. For instance, at 160–65 (the plague scene), Boyle states that "Seneca takes his cue from Virgil's plague, esp. *Geo.* 3.551–3," but there is no reason to suspect that Seneca had Vergil in mind here: in the latter, Tisiphone (named specifically) is sent forth from the shadows into the light, whereas in Seneca it is the "throng of sisters" that have "burst forth" from hell; again, in Vergil Tisiphone drives Diseases and Fear before her as she emerges, but in Seneca black Death itself "opens its maw and unfurls its wings." At other times, the desire to offer an intertext comes at the expense of analyzing the differences. In the scene describing Charon mentioned above, Boyle notes the lexical similarities, but omits describing how Seneca has made Charon, an old but vigorous god in Vergil, into an exhausted and worn-out figure.

After over twenty-five years of producing commentaries, Boyle intimately knows Seneca's tragedies, and the commentary really shines in its explication of how *Oedipus* relates to the other plays in the Senecan corpus. He is equally good at providing philological parallels and at explicating how *Oedipus*' dramaturgy fits in with or diverges from practices in the other plays. See, e.g., his comments on asides in Seneca ad 103–5, p. 139. Only by chance did I catch a place where a crucial parallel in another play was unexplored: at *Oed.* 142–44 (*dominum…prodidit* p. 150), Boyle notes that the use of *dominum* (here "master of the horse," "rider") is interesting because of "Oedipus' status as *dominus*," but he does not provide parallels from *Phaedra* where *dominus* means "rider" (lines 1089, 1100, 1102). Thus, his claim that the phrase *dominum…prodidit* foreshadows "another Theban *dominus* betrayed by his own animals, Actaeon (751–63)" seems particularly far-fetched. Here it just means "rider."

There is, to my mind, an oversized emphasis on Stoicism, despite the overall claim (lxxx) "this is no Stoic world, but one irremediably diseased." In some cases, explanation of a Stoic concept seems warranted (e.g. *fatum ad* 18–19, p. 115), but frequently there is a discussion of Stoicism even though it cannot possibly be relevant to understanding the text at hand. Perhaps the most egregious example of this is *ad* 187–88 (*sacer ignis pascitur artus*, the plague scene again). *Sacer ignis* is clearly *erysipelas*, as Boyle informs us, but for some reason there is appended at the end of this note the following: "'Fire', *ignis*, had a particular charge for the Stoics, who saw fire either as nature itself (so Zeno: Cic. *ND* 2.57) or as its prime element, which persisted forever and into which all else is dissolved (Von Arnim, 1903–24: II.413; Sen. *NQ* 3.13.1)." There is nothing objectionable to the content, but it lures the

reader into trying to figure out how Stoic fire is to be mapped onto what is simply a medical condition. Is it not time for us to stop seeking Stoic influences in every nook and cranny in the Senecan tragedies?

Despite the minor points raised here, Boyle is to be commended for lending his deft touch to Seneca's *Oedipus*. I use the word "touch" (*ars*) purposefully, because what Boyle brings to this and other plays is an artist's sensibility, one that does not take away from his considerable philological acumen. It is in this respect that his book differs from Töchterle's deeply philological, almost scientific, work, and this is what makes Boyle's book so valuable and timely.

R. Scott Smith
University of New Hampshire
Scott.Smith@unh.edu

Alain Lernould. *Plutarque. Le visage qui apparaît dans le disque de la lune / De facie quae in orbe lunae apparet*. Texte grec, traduction, notes et trois études de synthèse. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 2013, 148 pp. ISBN 978-27-5740-579-6.

Este pequeño libro, vol. 30 de la serie Cahiers de Philologie, fundada por Jean Bollack en las Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, asociación editorial de Lille y otras dos Universidades francesas, consta de la traducción con introducción y notas de dicho tratado de *Moralia* seguidas de tres estudios, una lista bastante completa de bibliografía (en la que, no obstante, se echa de menos la mención de la traducción en español), un breve índice de nombres propios más los "Agradecimientos". En realidad el libro, más que pequeño, es económico de espacio, habida cuenta que la traducción va acompañada del texto griego a doble columna en cada página (y el griego sin "justificar"), su tamaño de letra y su espaciado interlineal son casi tamaño nota y entre el texto, la traducción y las notas ocupan más de la mitad del libro; lo cual, huelga decirlo, no es precisamente el aspecto más atractivo y práctico del *cahier*. Por lo demás, la traducción, según indica el 'director' de la presente edición, A. Lernould, en una nota previa (p. 9, en la cual informa también de su labor de revisión del libro, corrección de la traducción y las notas y actualización de sus referencias bibliográficas) y luego reitera al final de la introducción (p.16), ha sido hecha a partir del texto griego de H. Cherniss en la Loeb C. L. (1957), pero, por razones fácilmente imaginables, el texto aquí proporcionado ha sido reconstruido a partir del texto, más antiguo, de Pohlenz en la Ed. Teubner (1955, 1960^2), que es el que está en el TLG, por descontado sin aparato crítico y prometiendo indicar en nota las divergencias con respecto al texto de Cherniss (algunas de las cuales consisten en la recuperación de lecturas de los mss. Parisinus E (Gr. 1672) y Parisinus B (Gr. 1675)).

Según expone el director de la publicación en el apartado de 'Agradecimientos' (p. 147 s.), esta es el fruto colectivo de un seminario franco-belga sobre el problema de la articulación entre mito, religión y filosofía en el medio-platonismo y más especialmente en Plutarco, en el cual participaron especialistas y doctorandos de equipos de investigación de tres universidades (Leuven, Bruselas y Lille 3), reunidos respectivamente en torno a los Prof. L. Van der Stockt, L. Couloubaritsis y J. Boulogne, prestigiosos plutarquistas el primero y el tercero y especialista en filosofía antigua el segundo. Tras haber dedicado anteriormente sus tareas a una traducción y comentario del diálogo plutarqueo *La E de Delfos* (J. Boulogne et alii, Bruxelles, 2006) y a un comentario de *La creación del alma en el* Timeo *de Platón*, el seminario

ha abordado este tratado de rico contenido científico, filosófico, religioso y mítico, por el cual se interesó el propio Kepler hasta el punto de dedicarle una traducción anotada en latín y del que se hacía necesaria una nueva versión francesa que reemplazara a la llevada a cabo por P. Raingeard hace tres cuartos de siglo y la única disponible tras la decimonónica de V. Bétolaud.

La Introducción, a cargo de J. Boulogne, consta de apenas media docena de pgs. (11-17) en las que se abordan aspectos esenciales del diálogo. Tal es la cuestión de su autenticidad, avalada por las coincidencias con otros escritos de Plutarco que deniegan una supuesta atribución a su hermano Lamprias, aun cuando conceden a este el papel de narrador y conductor, como ocurre en *Defectu oraculorum*, no menos plutarqueo; la datación, cuestión indeterminable con precisión más allá de una fecha posterior al eclipse de sol aludido por uno de los personajes e identificable con el observado el 5 de enero del 75 en Roma, es decir, cuando Plutarco tendría apenas 30 años, sumando luego el intervalo de tiempo que separa la fecha del eclipse de la época de redacción del diálogo, el cual se puede poner en relación con los mitos escatológicos de dos diálogos de madurez, *Retraso de la justicia divina* y *Demon de Sócrates*, por tanto a mediados del reinado de Trajano (105-110); por otro lado el diálogo debe ser posterior a *Defectu oraculorum*, cuyo tema de Crono prisionero bajo la vigilancia de Briareo y ante démones que le asisten, en una isla frente a Gran Bretaña, recibe allí ulterior desarrollo; el problema es que lo más que se puede precisar de la datación del *Defectu oraculorum* es que pertenece al período de madurez de Plutarco. La composición del diálogo, siguiendo el modelo del *Timeo* platónico, comienza recordando lo esencial de una conversación sobre el concepto de ciudad ideal, antes de dar la palabra al astrónomo Timeo para que exponga el 'mito' de la génesis del mundo, y, tras anunciar que el elemento principal del diálogo es también un relato mítico, retrasa este retomando lo dicho anteriormente sobre la naturaleza terrosa de la luna e interponiendo la cuestión de su habitabilidad, en una estructura tripartita de movimiento ascendente de la primera y luego la segunda interrogación hasta la determinación de los verdaderos habitantes de la Luna, los démones.

Los interlocutores implicados en el diálogo son nueve, dos de ellos mudos y de los cuales el primero es el animador de aquella discusión de la que el diálogo es prolongación, siendo así su verdadero aunque fallido padre; la función del otro, Menelao, es aportar el aval de su disciplina, la geometría, asintiendo con su silencio a las propuestas de Leucio y a las conclusiones finales de Lamprias. Otro matemático, Apolónides, es un personaje ficticio, alineado con los peripatéticos, que objeta contra Lamprias, cuya refutación ayuda a progresar sus conclusiones. Hay otros dos personajes ficticios, Aristóteles y Farnaces, el primero portavoz de la ortodoxia peripatética sobre los cuerpos celestes, refutado por Lamprias y luego por Leucio; el nombre de resonancia persa Farnaces confiere a la discusión una dimensión cosmopolita y representa al Pórtico, cuyas concepciones son rechazadas por Lamprias. Frente a estos dos

aliados hostiles a la tesis de la terraneidad de la Luna, Lamprias y Leucio explican las manchas del disco lunar por su naturaleza terrosa, y sus demostraciones asientan sobre una base científica el mito esperado; de ascendencia pitagórica, Leucio es un romano que secunda los esfuerzos de Lamprias por hacer triunfar la posición de la Academia sobre los problemas planteados por la Luna; Lamprias es uno de los hermanos de Plutarco, que aparece en otros diálogos y, como de costumbre, defiende aquí las tesis de la Academia contra el aristotelismo y el estoicismo sobre la naturaleza física de la Luna y contra la mitología tradicional esgrimida por Teón sobre su habitabilidad; él dirige el diálogo y es su narrador, aun cuando la parte principal de este es el mito contado por Sila, el verdadero protagonista. Teón, gramático de origen egipcio que refuerza el carácter cosmopolita del diálogo, es la autoridad literaria de este, pero también es apasionado de la astronomía, de modo que suscita la cuestión de la habitabilidad de la Luna y permite a Lamprias barrer con las últimas objeciones a la terraqueidad lunar y concluir la de sus habitantes, siendo así el deuteragonista tras Sila.

La transcripción de los nombres de los personajes intervinientes en el diálogo, de los que se da una breve relación precediendo al texto de la edición, a diferencia de los nombres de los autores citados en el texto y recogidos en el índice de nombres propios (p. 145, salvo en el caso de Poseidonius (*sic* y no Posidonius)) no es tal, sino transliteración del griego (Pharnakès, Leukios), lo cual, más que exótico como expresamente se pretende, le confiere un aire extraño. Todavía más incómodo resulta que el griego citado en las notas lo sea en transliteración y no en el original, máxime cuando este se halla en el cuerpo de la página.

La traducción es clara y elegante, sin dejar de respetar el estilo de Plutarco, incluidos sus frecuentes períodos largos y complejos así como la amplia riqueza de su vocabulario. Las abundantes notas ilustran suficiente y adecuadamente al lector no especialista, la mayoría sobre los muchos autores citados (aunque en n. 70 los fragmentos de Píndaro son citados todavía por Bergk y Schröder en lugar de por Snell-Maehler) y la localización de las citas, así como sobre las diversas teorías filosóficas sucesivamente manejadas. Son pocos los casos en que la traducción no es del todo satisfactoria; a título de ejemplo, algunos son: 920E *sunechoûs skiâs* "d'une ombre discontinue" en lugar de lo contrario "de una sombra continua"; 921D *homoiopathê krâsin íschein kaì súmpexin* "d'un mélange homogène et d'une coalescence" en lugar de d'un mélange et d'une coalescence homogènes; 923F *all'apologouménois aeì chrêsthai, mè kategorôsin <oîs> àn entugchánosin* "mais s'arrangent toujours pour que leurs interlocuteurs aient à se défendre, et ils éviten ainsi d'être attaqués" omite la traducción de la última oración 'con cualquier argumento que encuentren'; o bien, en 923C, la cita de Esquilo *Pr.* "351-2" (en lugar de 349-50), referida a Atlas, "Se tient debout, colonne du Ciel et de la Terre, / Supportant sur ses épaules un fardeau qui...." en lugar de Se tient debout, *une*

colonne du Ciel et de la Terre / Supportant *il* sur ses épaules, fardeau qui... . En el texto griego también he advertido algún fallo, p. ej. 921D *pê* en lugar de *pêi*.

De los tres *Études* que siguen a la traducción del tratado, el primero (pp. 91-101), "El rostro de las citas en el círculo del diálogo", de nuevo a cargo de J. Boulogne, consiste en una relación de las 103 citas, literales o alusivas, que se pueden distinguir en el texto y de las que 39 proceden de poetas, principalmente Homero, y casi otras tantas de filósofos, más otras de matemáticos y astrónomos, y algunas de historiadores, distribuidas según su cadencia en las intervenciones que respectivamente las utilizan, a saber, las de Sila, Lamprias y Leucio principalmente y Farnaces y Teón en menor medida. A dichas fuentes de citas el autor añade, allí donde procede, a saber, en la intervenciones de los tres primeros interlocutores nombrados, otras menos convencionales -y que en puridad no se pueden considerar tales- que son las creencias de los pueblos, a veces coincidiendo con mitos. Según Boulogne, dicho conglomerado de citas, lejos de servir a la caracterización de los personajes que las pronuncian, refleja la mezcla de saberes propia de su común *paideia* y la gama, al mismo tiempo, de los saberes disponibles a lo largo de la *oikouméne*.

"A propósito del contenido astronómico de las partes dialogadas del *De facie* de Plutarco" (pp. 103-115), a cargo de Joëlle Delattre, tras pasar revista a las referencias astronómicas desarrolladas en la discusión, y muy especialmente a propósito de Teón, intenta reflexionar sobre el uso que Plutarco se permite hacer de sus fuentes. Las referencias explícitas a astrónomos conocidos son pocas: cap. 4 Hiparco, evocado por Lamprias; cap. 6 Aristarco de Samos, cap. 10 tratado de Aristarco *Sobre tamaños y distancias*, cap. 19 resultado de una demostración de Aristarco: referidos por Leucio; cap. 25 Lamprias interpela a Teón echándole en cara su admiración por Aristarco. Una tercera autoridad astronómica, Posidonio, es citado en los cap. 16, 19, posiblemente a través del tratado estoico de Cleomenes. En cuanto al enigmático caso de Teón, la autora cree poder obtener ciertos indicios a partir de cómo Lamprias se dirige al compañero. Aunque corresponsal de Plutarco, este no es fácil de identificar en tanto que protagonista de diversos diálogos con papeles a veces tan incompatibles que se ha pensado en más de un Teón. La autora intenta argumentar en pro de la identificación del Teón de *De facie* con Teón de Esmirna, autor de un largo tratado "El recurso del saber científico para leer a Platón", según la traducción de la propia autora, e identificable por algunos autores con cierto astrónomo citado por Ptolemeo, identificación discutida por otros.

"De la Luna y Hécate en el mito del *De facie* de Plutarco y en el Neoplatonismo tardío" (pp.117-134), ilustrativa aportación del propio "director" de la publicación, se propone confrontar los paralelos entre el mito del *De facie* y el Neoplatonismo tardío (Proclo) a propósito de Hécate, la gran diosa presente ya como tal en Hesíodo, identificada con la Luna por primera vez

por Plutarco, diosa 'caldaica' correspondiente a la órfica Rea en Proclo y cuyo rasgo común es el de una cierta 'soberanía' en todas sus manifestaciones. Proclo atribuye a la Luna, en tanto que cuerpo celeste, la función de mediadora entre las regiones celestes y el mundo sublunar de la generación; como en los cuerpos celestes su esencia es siempre la misma y como los seres sublunares experimenta crecimiento y mengua en la medida en que cambia la luz que recibe de fuera. Hécate es también en Plutarco una diosa a la vez terrestre y celeste: *Defectu oraculorum* (416 E-F) asocia estrechamente los démones a la Luna y esta a Hécate, asociación que es retomada en *De facie* de manera muy original, siendo la función lunar no solo cosmológica sino también escatológica: en tanto que frontera entre el mundo sublunar y el celeste la Luna es lugar de paso que conduce las almas separadas del cuerpo (démones) ya sea, por la reencarnación, a la misma vida aquí abajo, ya sea, por la muerte, a disolverse en su elemento, que es la Luna. Hécate es la diosa de la frontera entre lo mismo y lo diverso, y corresponde en el mundo griego a Jano en el mundo romano, tradición que es conservada por los neoplatónicos tardíos. Proclo ha establecido una correspondencia sistemática entre las teologías tradicional (hesiódica) y platónica por un lado y las teología órfica y caldaica (donde Hécate es una diosa mayor) por otro. La Hécate caldaica es así identificada con Rea, esposa de Crono y madre de Zeus en la teología tradicional y en la órfica. Y a su vez se constata una analogía entre las funciones que Proclo confiere a Hécate-Rea y las que Plutarco confiere a la Luna; en ambos casos se encuentran sobre todo las de intermediaria y fuente de las almas y la vida, haciendo de ella una diosa mayor y soberana, aun cuando hay gran diferencia entre la Hécate-Luna visible en el mito escatológico de Plutarco y la diosa "intelectiva" y madre de los dioses de Proclo, como ya la Hécate titánide de Hesíodo.

Se completa este "estudio" con dos anejos. El primero contiene un análisis resumido del mito del *De facie* distribuido en los siguientes apartados: la tesis principal expuesta en el mito (que entre los dioses visibles hay que honrar especialmente a la Luna, que reina sobre la vida y la muerte puesto que es el límite del Hades); Deméter y Coré (o Perséfone); cuerpo, alma, intelecto y las dos muertes; la *ousía* y las dimensiones de la Luna: su "cara"; papel y suerte de los démones y destino del alma separada del intelecto. El segundo anejo es una tabla de correspondencias, en Proclo, entre las teologías platónica, caldaica y órfica de acuerdo con las tres hipóstasis platónicas: Uno, Intelecto y Alma.

Si bien en el resto del libro las páginas de la edición de *Moralia* de Estéfano son indicadas, como es habitual, con letras mayúsculas siguiendo al nº correspondiente, en el trabajo de Lernould son indicadas con minúsculas (aunque en un caso, p. 118, con ambas: "937 E 19 et 944c4"), y seguidas, también contra la costumbre, del nº de línea.

Erratas he encontrado algunas: p. 14 ès qualités, p. 122 celle(s), 127 . l', 129 est en est, 138 mongraphies, 139 etcommentaire, 140 inorbe Lunae, corporumcaelestium, greek, 141 Kratesvon..., 142 la anthropologia de ...

Resumiendo, los señalados fallos de presentación y demás aparte, en lo fundamental se trata de una edición muy digna y bastante cuidada de esta pieza de *Moralia* tan importante y falta de una versión actualizada en lengua francesa, cuya laguna es colmada por el presente trabajo cumplidamente.

José Antonio Fernández Delgado
Universidad de Salamanca
jafdelgado@usal.es

Fabio Acerbi - Bernard Vitrac, *Héron d'Alexandrie*, *Metrica*, *Introduction, texte critique, traduction française et notes de commentaire*, Mathematica Graeca Antiqua, 4. Pisa / Roma : Fabrizio Serra editore, 2014, 712 pp. ISBN: 978-88-6227-672-6.

Grâce au travail de F. Acerbi et B. Vitrac, on peut lire aujourd'hui la seconde édition critique et la première traduction française des *Metrica* du mathématicien grec Héron d'Alexandrie (deuxième moitié du I^er^ siècle après J.-C. ?). Le traité est constitué de trois livres consacrés respectivement à la mesure des surfaces (Livre I), la mesure des volumes (Livre II) et la division des figures dans un rapport donné (Livre III) ; au total une soixantaine de propositions, essentiellement des problèmes, dont les deux éditeurs mettent en valeur le caractère algorithmique. Cette édition fait l'objet du volume 4 de la nouvelle collection *Mathematica Graeca Antiqua*, dirigée par Fabio Acerbi et Bernard Vitrac et portée par la maison d'édition italienne Fabrizio Serra editore (Pise et Rome). On ne peut que se féliciter de voir ce travail achevé, car les historiens des sciences ne disposaient jusqu'à présent que de l'édition de 1903 du philologue allemand Hermann Schöne, qui figure dans le volume III de l'édition des œuvres de Héron publiées dans la *Bibliotheca Teubneriana* (*Heronis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt omnia*). L'édition de 1903, à la fois *editio princeps* et première édition critique, fut un grand évènement philologique et scientifique, puisqu'elle faisait suite à la découverte en 1896 par le père de Hermann Schöne, Richard Schöne, du texte des *Metrica*, longtemps considéré comme perdu ; l'ouvrage figurait à la fin d'un manuscrit héronien de la Bibliothèque du Sérail à Istanbul, manuscrit de parchemin de la seconde moitié du X^e^ siècle, déjà signalé par E. Miller en 1865 et par F. Blass en 1888, le *Constantinopolitanus Palatii Veteris* (= Istanbul, Sarayi G.I.1). E.M. Bruins fit paraître un fac-similé du manuscrit à Leyde en 1964. Le manuscrit, qui est l'unique témoin des *Metrica*, a été reconnu depuis comme une copie du moine Ephrem (G. Prato, « Due postille paleografico-codicologiche », *Symbolae Berolinenses für Dieter Harlfinger*, 1993). Les auteurs signalent qu'ils n'ont pu avoir accès au manuscrit et qu'ils ont dû travailler sur le fac-similé.

L'édition critique des *Metrica* ne constitue que la première partie du volume publié par F. Acerbi et B. Vitrac. Les auteurs ont en effet intégré à leur livre, sous la forme d'études complémentaires, le résultat d'un certain nombre d'enquêtes sur l'ensemble du corpus métrologique grec, qui font de cet ouvrage une véritable somme.

Pour ce qui concerne l'édition proprement dite des *Metrica*, le lecteur trouvera en guise d'introduction au texte des éléments d'information très utiles, dont voici les principaux : un point sur les données bio-bibliographiques relatives à Héron et un retour, après les récentes études de N. Sidoli dans *Centaurus* 47 (2005) et 53 (2011), sur la fameuse « question héronienne », dossier complété en annexe (p. 103-115) par une nouvelle édition commentée du célèbre chapitre 35, sur lequel a été fondée la datation de Héron ; une description précise des procédures mises en œuvre, qui met en valeur la variété des approches mathématiques chez Héron (en particulier l'articulation constante des procédés de démonstration de la géométrie « classique » et des procédures de calcul) et la diversité des modes d'expression ; une analyse lexicale quantitative issue des travaux du chercheur Ramon Masià (thèse de doctorat, Barcelone, 2012), auquel on doit également la mise au point de la ressource automatique utilisée pour la réalisation de *l'Index graecitatis* ; un relevé précis et un classement des modes de désignation des objets identifiés comme résultats d'opération et des opérations elles-mêmes ; une description codicologique du manuscrit de la Bibliothèque du Sérail, fondée sur les éléments communiqués par le professeur Dieter Harlfinger, complétée par un essai de détermination des caractéristiques codicologiques du modèle utilisé par le copiste à partir des lacunes des folios 67v-69r ; une présentation des critères retenus dans l'édition et la traduction (p. 97-99). La formulation de ces critères fait apparaître un certain nombre de choix dont le lecteur jugera s'ils servent le texte de Héron (ponctuation du texte réduite au minimum, traduction strictement littérale, utilisation pour l'édition des reproductions des figures du manuscrit, avec leurs fautes et leurs « incongruités graphiques », figures obtenues par M. Guy Le Meur à l'aide du programme DRaFT, mis à disposition par le professeur Ken Saito). On aurait souhaité que l'affirmation, p. 97, selon laquelle l'édition de Schöne est une « mauvaise édition » soit justifiée.

La deuxième partie du volume recueille diverses études des auteurs, déjà partiellement parues dans d'autres publications et qui élargissent la perspective. Il faut signaler les pages consacrées au repérage des caractéristiques stylistiques et syntaxiques de la formulation des algorithmes et l'imposant dossier consacré au foisonnant corpus des problèmes transmis par les textes métrologiques héroniens et pseudo-héroniens. Un des grands mérites de cette dernière étude est l'éclairage apporté au rassemblement de ces textes par les éditeurs du XIX^{e} siècle, en particulier Heiberg dans les volumes IV et V de l'édition des œuvres complètes de Héron dans la Collection Teubner. Cette enquête permet de mieux s'affranchir d'un certain nombre de constructions relativement artificielles auxquelles ont procédé ces éditeurs, constructions qui, malgré l'énorme travail que ce rassemblement a représenté, peuvent faire obstacle à la recherche des véritables sources des problèmes transmis et à la détermination des liens qui les unissent. Un autre mérite des analyses qui sont conduites

est la mise au point de critères discriminants pour opérer des comparaisons pertinentes entre toutes ces collections (témoignage des manuscrits, analyse du contenu mathématique, du lexique, des modes d'expression, etc.) ; c'est la meilleure voie pour éviter de faux rapprochements et mettre au jour différentes couches textuelles, susceptibles de suggérer une chronologie qui ne soit pas trop spéculative pour la constitution de ces ensembles. Au terme de cette étude, de nouvelles connexions sont apparues et un certain nombre d'arguments suggérant une filiation textuelle et intellectuelle forte entre les corpus transmis sous le nom de Héron et les *Metrica* invalidés. Les derniers chapitres de cette étude sont consacrés à la postérité du corpus héronien dans la tradition arabe et hébraïque. Grâce à l'aide des chercheurs Marc Moyon et Tony Levy et à la faveur de la parution récente de nombreux textes jusqu'ici inédits, le dossier de la connaissance arabe du corpus métrologique grec est repris. Il faut signaler le chapitre consacré à la transmission de la fameuse méthode de mesure des triangles associée au nom de Héron (p. 539-549) et le dossier consacré au témoignage d'une figure du milieu judéo-byzantin du XV^e^ siècle, Mordekhai Comtino (1402-1482). Il faut signaler également parmi les annexes qui figurent en fin de volume les pages consacrées au témoignage des papyri dits scolaires à caractère géodésique (p. 557-569).

Le volume consacré par Fabio Acerbi et Bernard Vitrac aux *Metrica* de Héron et au corpus héronien, qui a été composé dans le cadre du projet ANR ALGO et a bénéficié d'un certain nombre de collaborations scientifiques, est donc un ouvrage incontournable pour l'étude de la tradition métrologique grecque dans son ensemble.

Micheline Decorps-Foulquier
Université Blaise Pascal
micheline.decorps5@orange.fr

S. J. V. Malloch, *The Annals of Tacitus, Book 11* (ed., comm.). Cambridge classical texts and commentaries, 51. Cambridge / New York: CUP, 2013. xxi + 538 pp. ISBN 978-1-107-01110-6.

Malloch's excellent commentary on book 11 of Tacitus' *Annals* comes at an opportune moment. Recent years have seen a wealth of scholarly interest in Tacitus, with the publication of two companions and several monographs,[1] yet several books of the *Annals* still lack modern scholarly commentaries in English. The mantle of Goodyear, who intended a multi-volume commentary on the Tiberian hexad but was only able to complete his work on *Annals* 1 and 2, has been duly taken up by Woodman and Martin with their volumes on *Annals* 3, 4, and 5-6.[2] It is extremely heartening that the Claudian and Neronian books are now beginning to receive similar treatment.[3] Malloch's volume fills a noticeable gap in Tacitean scholarship: no scholarly commentary on *Annals* 11 has been written in English since that of Furneaux in 1891.[4] Benario's commentary on *Annals* 11-12,[5] aimed at students, does not provide the depth of historical and literary detail necessary for readers at the postgraduate level and beyond; and Koestermann's commentary on *Annals* 11-13[6] was published in 1967, before the widespread use of modern computer-assisted word searches that allow for detailed observations about word usage and verbal parallels.

The need for this volume was real, and Malloch's work does not disappoint. The book contains the elements one would expect of a commentary in this series. The book opens with an introduction discussing literary and textual matters (pp. 1-21). Malloch then provides a newly-edited Latin text of *Annals* 11 with *apparatus criticus*, collated from a facsimile and a digitized copy of the Second Medicean manuscript (henceforth M), the single MS

[1] D. Sailor, *Writing and Empire in Tacitus*, Cambridge, 2008; A.J. Woodman, *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus,* Cambridge, 2009; V.E. Pagán, *A Companion to Tacitus*, Malden, MA, 2012; R. Ash, *Oxford Readings in Tacitus*, Oxford, 2012.

[2] F.R.D. Goodyear, *The Annals of Tacitus, volume 1* (*Annals* 1.1-54), Cambridge, 1972), and *volume 2* (*Annals* 1.55-82 *and Annals* 2), Cambridge, 1981; A.J. Woodman and R.H. Martin, *The Annals of Tacitus, Book 3*, Cambridge, 1996, and *Tacitus Annals Book IV*, Cambridge, 1989; R.H. Martin, *Tacitus, Annals V & VI*, Warminster, 2001. Woodman is currently completing a commentary on *Annals* 5-6 in the 'Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries' series.

[3] R. Ash is currently completing a commentary on *Annals* 15, and S. Bartera on *Annals* 16.

[4] H. Furneaux, *The Annals of Tacitus, vol. II: Books XI*-XVI, Oxford, 1891. A second edition appeared in 1907.

[5] H.W. Benario, *Tacitus Annals 11 and 12*, Lanham, MD, 1983.

[6] E. Koestermann, *Cornelius Tacitus Annalen. Band III: Buch 11-13*, Heidelberg, 1967.

on which the text of *Annals* 11-16 and *Histories* depends (pp. 25-48). The majority of the volume is devoted to a lengthy and detailed commentary (pp. 51-468) incorporating notes on points of literary and historical interpretation, Tacitus' language and style, and textual issues. Next follow an extensive bibliography (pp. 472-513) and useful indices (pp. 514-538, divided into a general index [pp. 514-521], ancient names [pp. 521-528], Latin words [pp. 521-538], and passages discussed [p. 538]). Malloch also usefully includes an appendix containing a Latin text with *apparatus criticus* of *ILS* 212, the speech delivered by Claudius on the admission of Gauls to the Senate, of which Tacitus gives a version in *Annals* 11.24 (pp. 469-471).

Beginning from the introduction (two-thirds of which [pp. 9-21] is dedicated to a discussion of manuscripts), it is clear that a particular strength of Malloch's commentary is his clear and learned discussion of manuscript and textual issues. He delivers a history of M, and clearly and engagingly discusses the probable time and place of its composition (before AD 1050, likely in Germany and perhaps in Fulda), its 'liberation' from the Abbey of Monte Cassino in the 1350s, and its ultimate arrival in the Laurentian Library. Malloch also chronicles the gradual acceptance of M as the most authoritative MS for Tacitus, supported by quotations from the letters and editions of scholars who produced texts of Tacitus between the *editio princeps* of 1472/3 and the 19th Century (pp. 16-20).[7] The *apparatus criticus* makes use of M, various *recentiores*, and the conjectures of previous scholars; textual problems and emendations are discussed more extensively in the commentary. In addition, many notes draw the reader's attention to the peculiarities of M: in justifying emendations, the commentary contains frequent references to quirks such as M's omission of syllables (p. 206) or letters (p. 373), its 'susceptibility... to phonetic confusion' (p. 258), and transpositions (p. 137, 216). Malloch does not propose his own conjectures, but excels at evaluating the conjectures of previous scholars, and his notes present the reader with measured justifications for the readings he ultimately adopts. The volume does not include a list of all the variant readings Malloch accepts, but he has since published one online as an addendum to the printed book.[8]

Malloch's commentary is excellent in its thoroughness, wide-ranging in the types of information it provides, and superb in its contextualization of *Annals* 11 within Roman history and Latin literature. Amongst this potentially overwhelming wealth of information, Malloch takes care to orient the reader as s/he moves through the commentary. His introduction succinctly sets up the narrative structure of *Annals* 11 and its place within the

[7] Malloch's forthcoming article 'Acidalius on Tacitus,' in R. Hunter and S. Oakley (edd.), *Latin Literature and Its Transmission*, Cambridge, 2016, indicates early modern editions of Tacitus as a particular area of his expertise.

[8] See https://www.academia.edu/7458946/Supplement_to_The_Annals_of_Tacitus_book_11, accessed 1 September 2015.

larger arc of the *Annals*, including a 'table of contents' of *Annals* 11 broken down by episode and year (pp. 2-3), and also includes a short essay ('Tacitus and Claudius', pp. 3-9)[9] highlighting salient aspects of Tacitus' portrayal of Claudius that will recur in Malloch's observations in the notes. The commentary itself is subdivided into sections corresponding roughly with the episodes listed on pp. 2-3,[10] each of which opens with a short introductory essay before the *lemmata* of the commentary proper, highlighting historical and literary issues that will be particularly relevant for that episode. Individual *lemmata* often tie back in with these introductory essays. Given that M does not contain the beginning of *Annals* 11, Malloch's introductory material (pp. 51-55) on the first section of his commentary ('The destruction of Valerius Asiaticus, Poppaea Sabina, and the brothers Petra') is particularly important: Malloch fills in the gap in Tacitus' text by drawing on Dio's parallel account of the episode both in the introductory matter and in the notes that follow, while also bringing out what is unique about Tacitus' presentation of the same events. Also worthy of mention is Malloch's extensive introductory material (pp. 114–131) on the section on Armenian and Parthian affairs at *Annals* 11.8-10, in which a struggle between Vardanes and Gotarzes II for the Parthian throne provides the Romans with the opportunity to restore Mithridates I to the throne of Armenia. Malloch combines a brief summary of the events Tacitus describes (helpful for the reader, given Tacitus' switching back and forth between Armenian affairs and the Parthian civil war within 11.8-10) with an extremely detailed discussion of Rome's involvement in Armenian and Parthian affairs from the Third Mithridatic War to the Neronian period, which helps to contextualize *Annals* 11.8-10 within the larger story of Rome and Parthia as told elsewhere in the *Annals* and in other sources. Malloch even includes a section on Gotarzes II and his relationship with Artabanus II that draws upon Parthian coins, reliefs, and inscriptions (11.8-10n., pp. 126-131), material that probably will not be familiar to many classicists.

Throughout, Malloch is very clear in his opinion that *Annals* 11 is 'T.'s version of the hostile portrait of Claudius that so dominates the historical

[9] This section is based on Malloch's chapter '*Hamlet* without the Prince? The Claudian *Annals*,' in Woodman's *Cambridge Companion* (see n. 1), pp. 116-26.

[10] *Ann.* 11.1-4 'The destruction of Valerius Asiaticus, Poppaea Sabina, and the brothers Petra' (pp. 51-90); *Ann.* 11.5-7 'The *Lex Cincia*' (pp. 90-114); *Ann.* 11.8-10 'Affairs in the East: Armenia and Parthia' (pp. 114-174); *Ann.* 11.11 'The *Ludi Saeculares*; Nero at the *Lusus Troiae*' (pp. 175-196); *Ann.* 11.12 'The affair of Messalina and Silius' (pp. 197-206); *Ann.* 11.13-14 'Claudius' *munia censoria*' (pp. 206-231); *Ann.* 11.15 'The *haruspices*' (pp. 231-239); *Ann.* 11.16-17 'Italicus and the Cherusci' (pp. 239-261); *Ann.* 11.18-20 'Domitius Corbulo and Curtius Rufus in Germany' (pp. 261-301); *Ann.* 11.21 'Curtius Rufus: A character sketch' (pp. 301-316); *Ann.* 11.22 'An assassination attempt and the quaestorship' (pp. 316-338); *Ann.* 11.23-25.1 'The admission of the *primores Galliae* to the Roman senate' (pp. 338-380); *Ann.* 11.25.2-5 'The end of Claudius' censorship' (pp. 380-392); *Ann.* 11.26-38 'The fall of Messalina' (pp. 392-468, also subdivided into individual episodes).

tradition' (p. 7), even if Tacitus does allow Claudius to appear as successful and effective at certain moments. Malloch argues most clearly for Tacitus' negative characterisation of Claudius in his remarks on the fall of Messalina. He maintains that Tacitus downplays political motivations for Silius and Messalina's illicit marriage in favour of an interpretation of the episode that centres on the character of the individuals involved: 'Conspiracy is subsumed within broader interests that inform T.'s presentation of the episode...: Messalina's sexuality, which defines and destroys her; Claudius' weaknesses of character, which ease Messalina's destruction; the power of the freedmen, which allows Narcissus to exploit Claudius and bring down Messalina... Claudius' weaknesses of character are ever-present' (11.26-38n., p. 397). Elsewhere, Malloch allows glimpses of a more effective Claudius; this comes through, for example, in his material on the admission of the *primores Galliae* to the Senate, and especially in the relationship between Claudius' speech as preserved in the inscription from Lyon and Tacitus' version of the same oration. Malloch argues that Tacitus was familiar with Claudius' speech, but that he reworked the oration to 'give... the literary Claudius a strong performance' (pp. 340-341). Individual notes in the commentary that follow draw attention to similarities and differences between Claudius' speech and Tacitus' version (e.g. 11.24.1-3n., p. 358). Malloch also points out allusions to Canuleius' speech in Livy 4.3-5 (e.g. 11.24.1n., p. 359), drawing out a layer of intertextual richness that emphasizes Claudius' status as a historian in his own right and his affinity for Livy in particular, which Malloch sees as 'another hint that T. approved his promotion of the *primores Galliae*' (11.23-25.1n., p. 342). The episode is thus one of the moments when Tacitus shows the emperor in a positive light, yet even here Malloch brings us back to Claudius' failings: the canny argumentation Tacitus inserts into Claudius' speech, Malloch claims, 'demonstrates an awareness which, with regard to his domestic affairs, is either denied to him or parodied through juxtaposition with his ignorance' (11.24.2n., p. 360).

Malloch's well-conceived and clearly presented arguments about the way Tacitus depicts Claudius' character are a contribution to our understanding of the ancient historical tradition's hostility to this emperor, and will undoubtedly serve as a springboard for future discussions of this topic. In particular, Malloch is sure to spark lively debate from any readers who may take issue with his negative view of Claudius, or at least are open to the idea that Tacitus' presentation may sometimes be more nuanced than he allows. For example, Tacitus' presentation of Claudius' celebration of the Secular Games (*Ann.* 11.11) could be viewed as more neutral than Malloch would have us think. Claudius' Games are problematic because of the complex calculations that determined when they could be celebrated (which Malloch unpacks for the reader in detail in an excellent note [11.11.1n., pp. 181-185]): Claudius' *ratio* was evidently incorrect vis-à-vis both the date of Augustus' Secular Games

in 17 BC and that of Domitian's subsequent celebration in AD 88. Claudius' celebration of the Games is characteristic of his general interest in religious and antiquarian matters, interests which (as Malloch rightly notes elsewhere) seem to be shared by Tacitus himself, and indeed to be central to his persona as an historian and a quindecimvir.[11] As Malloch persuasively argues, Tacitus' authoritative position as a quindecimvir is part of what prevents him from explicitly criticizing Claudius' Secular Games.[12] Tacitus' wish to avoid compromising this quindecimviral authority seems a sufficient explanation for his lack of comment, but Malloch sees Tacitus' refusal to rehearse Claudius' calculations as a form of criticism: 'T.'s silence has the effect of suggesting the illegitimacy of Claudius' celebration' (11.11.1n., p. 180). Yet the opposite could equally be true: it could be a desire not to deprive Claudius of a rare moment of effectiveness in producing something so major as the Secular Games that inspires Tacitus' silence on the incorrectness of the date. So if, as Malloch rightly notes, 'crucially, T. does not explicitly praise Claudius' conduct in these [positive] moments' (p. 7), it is also worth remembering that he does not always explicitly criticize Claudius, either.

Still, this should in no way detract from the many thought-provoking observations Malloch contributes to the study of Claudius and Tacitus' presentation of him; it is characteristic of a major contribution to the field to provoke thought and debate, which this volume certainly will. Malloch's commentary is a useful and learned contribution to Tacitean studies, destined to become a standard reference for anyone studying Claudius or *Annals* 11. The book is nicely produced, and I noted few typographical errors.[13] This is a volume I shall return to repeatedly, as, no doubt, will other readers. Malloch has announced that he intends to produce an edition and commentary on *Annals* 12 for the same series; students of Tacitus will await this contribution eagerly.

Dr. K.E. Shannon
University of Alabama
keshannon@ua.edu

[11] See 11.14n. (p. 217), on the digression on the history of the alphabet: Tacitus 'is generally regarded as sharing Claudius' antiquarian interests. If he expected readers to interpret this digression as critical of Claudius, he risked mocking himself in the process and undermining faith in his credibility as an historian.' Cf. 11.15n. (p. 231), on Claudius' revival of the *haruspices*: Claudius' 'hostility towards foreign religious and quasi-religious practices that had not been sanctioned at Rome... presumably appealed to T. as one of the *quindecimviri*, the supervisors of adopted religious practices'; cf. p. 232 n. 137: 'Their [the quindecimvirs'] probable supervision of the *haruspices* at Rome... may have given T. an added interest in the subject.'

[12] If he had criticized Claudius, 'T. would have risked undermining the authority he claimed as a *quindecimvir*' (11.11.1n., p. 180).

[13] p. 105 n. 19: replace 'su' with 'zu'; p. 223: 'Plut.' should be italicized (twice); p. 235: replace 'Dyke' with 'Dyck'; p. 256 and 280: replace 'Varan' with 'Varian'; p. 421, in 11.29.1n. *flagrantissimaque... gratia*, replace 'Narcissus' with 'Pallas.'

CAROLYN J.-B. HAMMOND, *Augustine Confessions*. Vol. I: Books 1-8., (ed., trans.). Loeb Classical Library, 26. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press, 2014. Lxv + 413 pp. ISBN 978-0-674-99685-4.

The old Loeb of Augustine, its body picked clean by vultures over many decades, has now been given a decent burial. It comprised a 19th century text with a 17th century translation, assembled by W.H.D. Rouse. In a time when translations of ecclesiastical prose as recent as Ryan's of 1960 are almost impossible to teach to a contemporary student audience, this is a welcome book.

The translator is very kind in her remarks about my own text of 1992, on which she has drawn for her own eclectic text and which she asserts she used as the basis for her translation. The front matter has been lightly edited and presents certain perplexities. A 26-page introduction focuses almost entirely on the text and its literary and doctrinal qualities, little otherwise. So Augustine's early life and background is treated in four pages, while eight are given to "Theories of Meaning" (in which discussion of Neoplatonism slips in for just over a page). The reader coming to this text fresh will do well to supplement the introduction from other secondary literature. This volume offers limited help in that regard, offering four separate bibliographies: a list of editions (xxix-xlv), a somewhat overlapping list of abbreviations employed (xl-xlvii), a list of "References" (xlix-liii) that I infer to be a catalog of works cited in the introduction or notes (and thus some of no further interest to readers of Augustine), and a "General Bibliography" (lv-lix). Peter Brown's biography appears in "References," Serge Lancel's in "General Bibliography," my own in neither. Translations by Pine-Coffin, Chadwick, and Boulding are mentioned, with the odd omission of the current Penguin by Garry Wills. Jason BeDuhn's pathbreaking work on Augustine and Manicheism is entirely missing, a great loss for any serious reader today. A "Timeline" with *en face* listing of notable events in Augustine's life (verso) and in the "wider church and empire" (recto) offers various entries to puzzle the uninitiated. "Involved in Catholic-Donatist conference (*collatio*) at Carthage" is the verso entry for 411, while "A. intercedes for lives of Donatists convicted of murder" is the recto entry, neither separately or together giving a very useful sense of the great Africa-transforming event of that year.

The annotation is selective and similarly somewhat idiosyncratic. The annotation and the translation together raise the familiar question of the imputed audience for Loeb library volumes, perhaps with a special twist be-

cause of the distinctive audience for a classic of early Christian literature. The needs of a reader of the verso Latin are very different from the needs of a reader of the recto English. So the textual and substantive notes for this volume are clearly designed to speak to the needs of the user making sense of the Latin. The translation does not noticeably aspire to capture itself the literary excellences of the Latin but rather to make explicit and unambiguous as much of what the Latin says and implies as possible. That is common practice for Loeb and among translators of all but a thin slice of "high literary" ancient prose and verse these days. The great virtue of this style is that it has escaped the crib-like literality of the very old Bohn's Library and many of the original Loebs. It manages to tell the reader that the text is a work of literary art without emulating that artistry. The translator's helpfulness obtrudes most on philosophical points, while the translation as a whole slips now into clunkiness ("He closed his eyes as a point of access, and forbade his mind to step forth into such evils" – surely not the words of a native speaker of English today), now occasionally into wit ("the suspense was killing me" for "suspendio magis necabar").

A representative passage:

> hinc enim et mali substantiam quandam credebam esse talem et habere suam molem taetram et deformem et crassam, quam terram dicebant, sive tenuem atque subtilem, sicuti est aeris corpus, quam malignam mentem per illam terram repentem imaginantur. (5.10.20)

> Because of this I used to believe that evil too was a material substance, and had physical magnitude: foul, misshapen, and dense, which they called "earth," or thin and insubstantial, such as the body of air, which they picture as a malevolent mind stealing throughout that earth.

Nothing particular clear or helpful there, where "physical magnitude" goes rather beyond the Latin and "stealing" misses the Genesis-serpently resonance of *repentem*. There's nothing distinctly wrong there, but the reader clinging mainly to the recto English will not find the way noticeably smoothed.

It is almost pointless to evaluate Loebs, for they will all be Loebs, and this will indeed be the Loeb for the next generation and it will do the job very serviceably, better if the second volume follows the first expeditiously. This volume appears, of course, in the digital Loeb classical library. Using the latter to look up things from this volume reminded me of the infelicities of that interface that others have noted.

James J. O'Donnell
Arizona State University
jod@asu.edu