Reviews
Reseñas

Luigi De Cristofaro, *Histologia Homerica: studio sulle sezioni dell'Iliade. I gruppi di nove versi (1 + 8, 2 + 7)*, Roma: Arbor Sapientiae Editore, 2016, 406 pp., ISBN 9788897805779.

Esta monografía, muy bien publicitada y divulgada por su autor, parte de una analogía con la histología como base teórica del análisis literario de la técnica compositiva de la *Ilíada*. El autor (en adelante C.) pretende diseccionar de forma sistemática el texto de la *Ilíada* para encontrar en él una estructura compuesta por tejidos, correspondientes a los propios cantos zurcidos entre sí. En su interpretación casi fisiológica de la técnica compositiva de Homero, C. parte de vocablos que transmiten la idea de tejer, zurcir o coser como ῥαψῳδός, ὑφαίνω o ὕμνος. El método 'fisiológico' que C. aplica al texto homérico revela, según el autor, que dicho texto consta de varios macro o microtejidos, que son producto a su vez de las actuaciones improvisadas de aedos y rapsodos, homologables a procesos vitales. Tales tejidos, según C., están compuestos de células, esto es, de versos individuales. Estos a su vez se ensamblan en unidades mayores, y estas por su parte se organizan en secciones mayores autónomas, lo que da lugar al episodio o el canto homérico (pp. 9-10). C. parte de la idea de que en Homero se documentan series numéricas dotadas de significación simbólico-ideológica que no remiten a una voluntad numerológica cabalística o esotérica, sino que son el reflejo de una forma mental anclada en la experiencia. El uso de estas series numéricas no es producto del azar, sino que responde a exigencias rítmicas y narrativas y funcionan como bloques de composición modular, que indican el principio y fin de un episodio, un discurso, una sección descriptiva, una écfrasis, etc. (p. 12-13). En palabras de C., esta disección sistemática de la *Ilíada* pretende desvelar, en el ámbito de las formas mentales y rítmicas, la estructura, la dinámica y la simetría compositiva de las ideas y de la práctica que operan en el funcionamiento del 'zurcido' de los cantos. A través de dicho 'zurcido' se ha formado el *corpus* iliádico en su conjunto, un macrotejido multiforme pero coherente, constituido por un conjunto de microtejidos conformados, a su vez, por varios grupos de células unitarias 'hexamétricas' (p. 31). El autor desvela que esta monografía estudiará los conjuntos de nueve versos agrupados según los esquemas 1+ 8 y 2+7, y que le seguirán otro trabajos sobre agrupaciones distintas de versos (p. 32).

El libro incluye una introducción no muy extensa (pp. 9-27), un análisis de los grupos hexamétricos articulados mediante el esquema 1+8 versos (35 ejemplos) y mediante el esquema 2+7 versos (37 ejemplos), cuatro apéndices (pp. 353-376) y una completa bibliografía. C. proporciona el texto de los

nueve versos completos objeto de estudio, seguido de un análisis literario y lingüístico y un breve comentario que contextualiza dicho pasaje en el marco de las secciones mayores y de los cantos de los que forma parte. C. apunta que el esquema 1+ 8 y 2 + 7 tiene asimismo reflejo en textos religiosos hititas, lo que, considerando la localización geográfica del ciclo troyano (pp. 32-33), no deja de resultar intrigante.

La introducción, dividida en cinco partes bastante inconexas entre sí, describe muy someramente y con excesivo laconismo el método 'fisiológico' apuntado al principio de esta reseña (pp. 9-13), pero peca, pese a su brevedad, de desorganizada, poco coherente y difusa. En no pocas ocasiones no se hace evidente qué relación tiene lo expuesto en ella con la tesis posterior de C. Se echa en falta mayor claridad en la exposición de objetivos y en la propia explicación y disposición de los argumentos con los que el autor pretende sustentar su método, argumentos estos bastante difíciles de seguir a veces. Proliferan las largas citas directas tomadas de referencias secundarias que buscan ilustrar cuestiones menores o periféricas para la demostración del método 'fisiológico' de análisis literario que pretende poner en práctica el autor. Las abundantes citas bibliográficas son igualmente prolijas, largas y en ocasiones no sólo innecesarias sino lesivas para su propósito, por cuanto distraen en asuntos secundarios la atención de lo que debería ser el corazón de la introducción: qué pretende hacer, cómo, por qué y para qué. La información contenida en la introducción tiene partes valiosas, sobre todo en lo tocante al manejo de la bibliografía secundaria, pero no tengo claro que la aportación positiva contrapese suficientemente la sobrecarga de datos innecesarios. Habría sido precisa una poda inmisericorde en la introducción, que dejara únicamente la información relevante para la demostración e interpretación de su método 'fisiológico' y que respondiera de forma clara, sencilla y concisa a las siguientes preguntas: qué pretende hacer, cómo, por qué y para qué.

Con respecto al cuerpo en sí de la monografía, el autor basa su análisis histológico en encontrar y aislar conjuntos de nueve versos (a los califica con la denominación 'ricorrenza'), algunos de los cuales son autónomos mientras que otros forman parte de secciones más amplias. C. ha aislado los siguientes grupos: verso individual, segmento hexamétrico, grupo hexamétrico, secciones menores, secciones mayores, bloques narrativos más amplios, partes principales del canto en su conjunto (p. 29). El análisis literario y lingüístico de dichas secciones resulta interesante y en no pocas ocasiones sugerente, pero una vez más se ve afectado por la poca claridad expositiva y por la falta de recapitulación, resumen o generalización, que en ocasiones pone a prueba la paciencia del lector. No infrecuentemente se tiene la sensación de no saber muy bien para qué sirve o qué aporta en realidad la sección que se está analizando. No hay conclusiones generales ni se resume al final de cada gran sección cuáles han sido los hallazgos y cómo contribuyen al análisis histológico propuesto. Tampoco hay índices, aunque no faltan apéndices con

material que se antoja de interés secundario o incluso superfluo. Al final del libro (pp. 403-404) hay un resumen en italiano e inglés (este último de no fácil comprensión), pero es muy insuficiente y parcial y resulta tan abstruso que no da idea válida del contenido ni del valor de la monografía.

En suma, resulta muy difícil emitir un juicio sobre este libro. En justicia, el método 'fisiológico' en sí es original y sugerente y merece ser difundido (aunque se puede estar de acuerdo con él o no); el trabajo del autor es meritorio, entusiasta y minucioso, por lo que no se debe minusvalorar sus aportaciones al estudio de la técnica compositiva de la poesía épica griega. Al mismo tiempo, resulta dudoso que la originalidad sea un criterio suficientemente válido en sí mismo si la ejecución no está a la altura de los objetivos propuestos. La monografía aporta cosas de valor y acumula un gran caudal de información (tanto de datos y de material como de referencias a la bibliografía secundaria), pero se ve lastrada por una organización poco clara, por un estilo difícil, embrollado y repetitivo, por una disposición del material más bien elefantiásica que debería estar mucho más trabajada y pensada, por una falta de conclusiones y recapitulaciones periódicas que guíen al lector y por un exceso de información irrelevante que hace el volumen difícil de consultar o manejar. Más allá de las breves menciones casi enterradas en lugares dispares e inconexos de la introducción general y de la introducción particular al análisis de los grupos de nueve versos, no se informa al lector del propósito general de lo que está leyendo, o qué relación tiene con lo que sigue o precede, o en qué contribuye exactamente a la tesis central de un libro que tiene una amplitud más que considerable (350 pp. de texto principal, formato A4, cuerpo bastante poco generoso) y está articulado en muchas secciones breves, con lo que surge la sensación de estar ante un trabajo compuesto casi por aluvión y acúmulo. Una monografía de tanta extensión sobre un tema muy técnico y específico debería tener una organización lúcida y meridiana e incluir unas conclusiones tanto parciales como totales que sean claras e informativas, que recapitulen el amplio material tratado y que demuestren cómo se ha aplicado el método presentado en la introducción y qué consecuencias ha tenido. No es esa la impresión que se tiene al terminar la monografía.

C. anuncia en esta obra que está trabajando ya en sucesivos volúmenes que apliquen el mismo método 'histológico' a distintas agrupaciones de versos. Me atrevería a pedir al autor que reflexione sobre si la plasmada en la presente monografía es la organización y presentación del material que más justicia hace a su tesis.

Míriam Librán Moreno
Universidad de Extremadura
mlibmor@unex.es

Andrew Faulkner, Athanassios Vergados and Andreas Schwab (edd.), *Reception of the Homeric Hymns*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2016, xiv+409 pp., $150.00, ISBN 978-0-19-872878-8.

Andrew Faulkner has acquired great merits for the contemporary study of the Homeric Hymns. After his rich commentary on 'Aphrodite' (2008) and an edited collection on the interpretation of the Hymns (2011, both OUP), he now offers a volume of newly commissioned essays on the reception of the Hymns. The themes and topics suggest an attractive variety of points of view: chronologically they range from the Roman Imperial period to the early XIX century, with the exception of Jenny Clay's important discussion of the Hymns in connection with Greek vase painting. In cooperation with Athanassios Vergados and Andreas Schwab, the three of them operating in Heidelberg between 2012 and 2014, Faulkner has once again promoted interest in those texts, individually and as corpus, by inviting contributions primarily but not exclusively on the literary aspect. Reasonably enough, some of the questions foregrounded in the 2011 collection of interpretive essays – issues of genre, poetics, relationship to other kinds of hymns and cult practice, performance, transition from aural culture to textual collection – are not central to this new project: the previous volume had stated the aim of covering the period from the genesis of the oldest hymns to, roughly, the III century BCE in Hellenic tradition. In addition, a new Faulkner project (with O. Hodkinson, Brill 2015) has quite recently staked another approach to the Hymns, based on narratology and genre, and extending from early Greek culture to Neoplatonic and Orphic texts, not excluding epigraphically attested songs.

The three editors do a good job in contextualizing the papers, and their Introduction is unusually rich and detailed: it includes a reassessment of the presence of the Hymns in Hellenistic poetry, with reference to recent discussions. Clay's paper has interesting links with her important work on the Hesiodic corpus and its representation of the life and power of the Olympic gods. This is followed by a compact and interrelated panel of close readings dedicated to major Augustan poets: Clauss on the Homeric Hymn to Hermes in Virgil and others (not a frequently studied topic up to now), in a discussion that rightly draws attention to the concomitant influence of Apollonius and Callimachus; Stephen Harrison on Horace; John Miller and Jason Nethercut on the Hymns in Ovidian epic; Alison Keith on the importance of the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite in Augustan texts, in an era when the new and sole ruler of Rome is represented as a descendant of Aeneas and Venus.

A cluster of papers on Greek texts produced in Imperial and Late Antique culture follows, with a number of unusual and rarely explored aspects: the Hymns emerge as important presences in Lucian's divine dialogues (P. Strolonga), more occasional in Aelius Aristides (A. Vergados), and in the allegorical and mythographical tradition (J.B. Torres); the Hymn to Ares is compared to the Hymns of Proclus in the context of Neoplatonic reevaluation of Homer (R. van den Berg); some traces can be recuperated in Christian and pagan poetry of Late Antiquity (G. Agosti), in a study that refreshingly includes both canonical authors like Nonnos and also outliers such as the painted epigram from the Dakhleh oasis edited in 2008 by Raffaella Cribiore and others, or the tantalizing 'Strasbourg Cosmogony', linking the origins of Hermopolis Magna to the origins of the universe.

The brief section IV offers two papers on the Byzantine tradition, with soundings both on the history of the text and scholarship (Ch. Simelidis) and on XII century praise poetry (A. Faulkner). The modern section spans some very exciting moments of rediscovery and re-appropriation: Humanistic literature and scholarship of the XV century (O. Thomas), the amazing intertextualist Poliziano (M. Elisabeth Schwab), English poets between late XVIII and early XIX century (N. Richardson, the doyen of Homeric Hymns reappraisal). The book ends with one of the most surprising convergences (A. Schwab, 'The Homeric Hymn to Demeter in Romantic Heidelberg'): the work of J.H. Voss on the Homeric Hymn to Demeter. After the discovery of the manuscript in Moscow in 1777 (Codex Mosquensis), the Demeter Hymn with its Eleusinian apercus enters European culture and in particular German research and participates to a heated debate on the scope and methodology of the nascent science of antiquity, with a growing component of 'history of religions and symbols'. At stake is no less than a question on whether early Greek culture is indebted to Oriental mysticism (India, Egypt), and on the possibility of a pre-Homeric stratum of mystery religion; all this while the question on whether there was ever a single unified 'one god' religion still makes its influence felt. The debate involves the likes of Creuzer, Heyne, and Hermann, and Voss is a timely (if defensive and Hellenocentric) participant, producing a Latin translation, a German translation, and a first German commentary on the new Hymn.

This last chapter encourages us to revisit the book as an invitation to research what different communities do with the Hymns. Even if a number of encounters analyzed or chronicled here are just 'pointillisme' or vestigial presences, or happen at a very formal level, and even if this type of collection will unavoidably over-stress the cultural importance of every single encounter or epiphany, the interplay of those essays urges us to formulate questions that will be food for thought in the future: the relationship of divine images and narrative myth, the interplay of narrative and ritual, the interaction of early Greek texts with postclassical belief systems, the relationship between

praise for the gods and praise for political power, the use of the Hymns as sources for new approaches to the study of religion and to the definition of mythology as a field.

Alessandro Barchiesi
NYU
ab6167@nyu.edu

Tom Phillips, *Pindar's Library. Performance Poetry and Material Texts* (Oxford Classical Monographs), Oxford: OUP, 2016, x+330 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-874573-0

Dass die archaische und klassische Literatur eine starke Faszination auf die hellenistischen Dichter ausgeübt hat, ist längst eine allgemein bekannte Tatsache. Die Forschung hat dieser Erkenntnis Tiefe und Breite zu geben versucht, indem sie Spezialuntersuchungen zur Rezeption einzelner klassischer Autoren vorlegte.[1] Dem vorliegenden Buch ist daran gelegen, das Nachleben Pindars durch synoptische Untersuchungen (S. 1–117) und exemplarische Fallstudien (S. 121–281) zu beleuchten. Nachleben erfährt allerdings in diesem Buch eine etwas ungewöhnliche Sinngebung, die auch Methode und Interessen bestimmt. Entsprechend geht es nicht so sehr um die Nachwirkung pindarischer Oden auf hellenistische Dichtung, als vielmehr um die Interaktion pindarischer Oden mit exegetischen Texten (vor allem den Scholien), den materiellen Gegebenheiten des Buchformats (Papyrusrollen und später Kodices) und wechselnden Rezeptionsmodi (vornehmlich der Leserhaltung) sowie deren interpretatorische Folgen auf den Pindartext.

Dies ist ein denkbar anspruchsvolles Vorhaben. Es liegt aber gerade an dem äußerst komplexen Charakter der Fragestellung, dass die Untersuchung nicht allen von sich selbst gestellten Erfordernissen genügen kann. Wenn es um die Erfassung der historischen Daten bezüglich der Scholien, des Annotationssystems der Papyri, der Lesegewohnheiten geht, gelangt der Autor kaum über das bisher Gewusste hinaus. Wenn er aber auf den Dialog des diese materiellen und interpretatorischen Spuren produzierenden oder an ihnen sich orientierenden Rezipienten mit dem Pindartext zu sprechen kommt, muss er sich mit äußerst Hypothetischem begnügen, auch wenn versucht wird, diesen Mangel entweder mit einem elegant anmutenden Bescheidenheitstopos oder einem Wiederholungen nicht scheuenden Wortschwall zu überdecken. Das unbeweisbar Hypothetische rührt aber daher, dass – um Aussagen über die Interaktion des Pindartextes mit den veränderten Rezeptionsbedingungen treffen zu können – die Leseerfahrung des jeweiligen Rezipienten vorausgesetzt werden muss, die allerdings vollauf im subjektiven Bereich liegt. Um nur ein einziges Beispiel zu nennen: Ob

[1] Aus jüngster Zeit seien erwähnt: B. Acosta-Hughes, *Arion's Lyre. Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*, Princeton – Oxford 2010; J. Priestley, *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories*, Oxford 2014; Richard Hunter, *Hesiodic Voices: Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod's Works and Days*, Cambridge – New York 2014.

dem Leser die Zeichen zur Strophengliederung und zum Gedichtende über ihre technische Funktion hinaus etwas bedeuten, d. h. ob sie in ein Widerspiel zum Inhalt des pindarischen Textes treten (S. 110–117), muss dahingestellt bleiben, wenn nicht die subjektiven Eindrücke des Lesers für objektive Fakten ausgegeben werden sollen.

Es bleibt zu fragen, ob dabei etwas Neues für die Interpretation der Gedichte selbst abfällt. Der Autor kultiviert nämlich eine 'rückläufige' Rezeptionsauffassung, und meint, dass einige Züge der Rezeption auf die Gedichte selbst zu extrapolieren seien, weil sie im Keim schon im Pindartext verborgen liegen. So könnte man aus dem erhöhten Bewusstsein der mehrschichtigen Medialität der rezipierten Siegesoden darauf schließen, dass die Texte selbst darauf hinarbeiten, ihre abgewandelte Wiederverwendung (Aufführung oder Lektüre) zu ermöglichen. Dies ist plausibel und erklärt sich daraus, dass Texte nur eine Wirkung auslösen können, die ihnen – in auch noch so sehr keimhafter Form – tatsächlich innewohnt. Aufgrund der rezeptionsgeschichtlichen Annäherungsweise bleiben allerdings die Pindar-Interpretationen in diesem Buch etwas matt und verschwommen: entweder es hat damit sein Bewenden, was der Text suggerieren könnte, aber kaum zu beweisen ist, oder man begnügt sich mit Plattitüden, die nur profiliert werden, um einen angemessenen Hintergrund für den Aufbau der rezeptionsästhetischen Tektonik abzugeben.

Das ergiebigste Kapitel scheint mir das über *Olympie* 14 zu sein (S. 211–235), in dem die Parallelisierung des zum Tempel der Chariten ziehenden Chors mit dem bis zum schwarzmäurigen Saal (V. 20: μελαντειχέα … δόμον) der Persephone dringenden Echo (S. 215–217) erhellend wirkt und die Interpretation des Gedichts als eines Prosodions zum Tempel der Grazien bestätigt. Auch die Erwägungen (S. 217–223) zum *reperformance*-Szenario, das der Personifikation Echos κατὰ δύναμιν innewohnt und durch jeden Rezeptionsakt (Neuaufführung oder Lektüre) aktualisiert wird, leuchten ein.

An einigen Stellen scheint mir der Autor nicht ganz das Richtige getroffen zu haben. In der Pointe des Sophokles-Epigramms des Simias (AP 7. 21) erwähnt er die Interpretation des Prädikats δέρκεται (V. 6: auf die Unsterblichkeit des Sophokles bezogen) als 'shines forth', entscheidet sich aber (S. 88) für 'beholds' (d. i. die Nachwelt den auf der Papyrusrolle [σελίσιν] festgehaltenen Sophokles). Am besten scheint mir aber δέρκεται hier als Synonym von βλέπει im Sinne von 'leben' zu fassen (d. h. Sophokles lebt auf den unsterblichen Blättern seiner Werke weiter). Der περισσὸς αἰών bezieht sich also nicht auf die Nachwelt, sondern das Nachleben des Dichters.

Andernorts (S. 97 f.) analysiert der Autor Pindars 'Dichterweihe', wie diese in den Scholien (Σ I 1 Dr) erzählt wird, mit Blick auf die Konstruktion einer Biographie des Dichters aus fiktiv-literarischen Elementen: Pindar sei von der Jagd ermüdet eingeschlafen, wobei ihm die Bienen seinen Mund mit Honig benetzt haben. Dies Geschehnis sei von einigen als Pindars Traum ausgelegt

worden. Der Autor stellt aber beide Erzählungen in einen ursächlichen Zusammenhang, indem er sagt: *the vision experienced by the poet … an expansion of the real-world event of the bee settling on his mouth* (S. 98), obwohl es audrücklich heißt, dass die Traumerzählung eine andere Variante ist, die von anderen kolportiert wird (οἱ δέ φασιν). Die Verlegung des realen Geschehens in Traum ist offensichtlich durch den Einfluss der ebenfalls im Traum vollzogenen Dichterweihe des Kallimachos bewirkt worden.

Überzogen scheint mir die Interpretation von Theocr. 16. 109: ἀεὶ Χαρίτεσσιν ἅμ' εἴην zu sein als *realizing the image of the poet who is bound up absolutely with his compositions* (S. 161). Die Chariten sind hier göttliche Personifikationen, die zwar mittelbar mit den dichterischen Werken verbunden sind, aber ein breiteres semantisches Spektrum haben. Pate gestanden hat bei diesem Gebet außer Pind. *O.* 14. insbesondere auch *P.* 9. 89a f. Dies alles wird deutlich, wenn man die Aussage mit dem vorausgehenden Vers zusammenliest (V. 108 f.: τί γὰρ Χαρίτων ἀγαπητόν / ἀνθρώποις ἀπάνευθεν;). Hier sind die Chariten als Göttinnen der Anmut den Menschen allgemein zugeordnet. Der Dichter schließt sich diesen allgemein menschlichen, nicht nur dichterischen, Chariten an und ordnet seine dichterische Tätigkeit den allseitigen Prinzipien der Anmutigkeit und Dankbarkeit unter, indem die negative rhetorische Frage (ἀπάνευθεν) in einen positiven Wunsch (ἅμ' εἴην) verwandelt wird.

An anderen Stellen hat sich der Autor eine wichtige Interpretationsmöglichkeit entgehen lassen, die seiner These dienlich gewesen wäre. S. 86 f. behandelt er ein Epigramm des Poseidippos (*fr.* 122 AB), in dem der durch die redenden Papyrusblätter (V. 6: φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες) fixierten sapphischen Kunst lobend gedacht wird. Eine willkommene Ergänzung wäre ein Hinweis auf *fr.* 37. 1 f. AB gewesen, wo Arsinoe als Empfängerin der Leier des mythischen Sängers Arion dargestellt wird. Womöglich handelt es sich hierbei um ein Weiheepigramm anlässlich der Aufstellung einer Leier im Heiligtum, dieses Moment hat aber auch eine symbolische Dimension: Arsinoe wird zur Schirmherrin der neuen musischen Kunst in Alexandrien. Dieser Sachverhalt wird durch die Herausstellung der Worte Ἀρσινόη und Ἀριόνιο[ς (sc. Delphin) am Anfang und Ende des Distichons signalisiert. Dabei erscheint Arsinoe als Anagramm von Arion (in attributiver Form), was symbolischerweise die Einverleibung der oralen Sängerkunst in die neue leserorientierte Literatur der alexandrinischen Kultur ausdrückt. Bezeichnenderweise wird diese Umwandlung durch Neuordnung als ein Tausch der Buchstaben, des neuen Mediums der Literatur, *augen*fällig gemacht.

Bezüglich von Σ *P.* 4. 14 (II 98 Dr) wird die den pindarischen Ausdruck ἀργινόεντι μαστῷ umrankende philologische Diskussion analysiert und auf Aristarchs Bestrebung hingewiesen, ein hellenistisches Charakteristikum (die Verwendung ungewöhnlicher Umschreibungen statt der konventionellen

epischen Formel – hier οὖθαρ ἀρούρης) auf Pindar zurückzuprojizieren (S. 173 f.). Durch einseitige Konzentration auf Pindar wird allerdings ein prominentes Rezeptionsbeispiel des Scholions bei Apollonios Rhodios, in der Pindars vierter *Pythie* nachempfundenen Euphemos-Episode (4. 1734 f.: δαιμονίη βῶλαξ ἐπιμάστιος ᾧ ἐν ἀγοστῷ / ἄρδεσθαι λευκῇσιν ὑπαὶ λιβάδεσσι γάλακτος), vernachlässigt, wo sich der Dichter eindeutig an die aristarchische Verbindung des Wortes ἀργινόεντι μαστῷ mit γάλα (über die Semantik von Weißheit und Fruchtbarkeit) anlehnt. Diese Ansicht wird in den Scholien Aristarch zugeschrieben, könnte aber älter gewesen sein, um auf Apollonios wirken zu können.

Ebenfalls wäre ein Hinweis anlässlich der ansonsten sehr erfreulichen Behandlung (S. 191–193) von Σ *N.* 1. 85a (III 24 f. Dr.) auf die Theiodamas-Episode (*fr.* 24) im ersten Aitienbuch des Kallimachos nützlich gewesen, wo gemischte Gefühle von Herakles Besitz ergreifen, als sein Sohn Hyllos sich krampfhaft an seinen Brustzotteln festklammert (V. 3: τὶν δ' ὥνα γέλως ἀνεμίσγετο λύπῃ). Kallimachos dürfte sich dabei nicht nur auf den *locus communis* realistischer Psychologie (Hom. Z 484 [Andromache δακρυόεν γελάσασα]) bezogen haben, sondern auch auf das diese Homer-Stelle mit τ 471 bündelnde Pindar-Scholion und die dadurch erklärte Pindar-Stelle. Als Fundgrube der Parallelen zu diesem Topos mag dieses Scholion in einer älteren Redaktionsform dem hellenistischen Dichter vertraut gewesen sein. Die Wahl des Verbs (ἀνεμίσγετο) mag durch den Einfluss der Pindar-Stelle (*N.* 1. 55: μιχθείς) ihre Erklärung finden, obwohl die Ähnlichkeit der Verben auch unabhängig voneinander über den sachlichen Zusammenhang zustande gekommen sein könnte.[2]

Das Buch ist in typographischer Hinsicht nicht ohne Fehl und lässt die *ultima manus* vermissen. Es gibt ein paar Querverweise in den Fußnoten, die nicht aufgelöst worden sind, und ein wiederkehrender Makel ist das fehlende Spatium zwischen sämtlichen Wörtern und nach Kommata.[3] Insgesamt handelt es sich um ein gut geschriebenes Werk, das mitreißen will und streckenweise auch zu begeistern vermag. Es kann aber auch nicht verschwiegen werden, dass das konkrete Ergebnis der Untersuchung etwas bescheiden ausfällt im Vergleich zum großangelegten Bogen des theoretischen Rahmens.

Zsolt Adorjáni
Piliscsaba – Budapest
adorjanizs@gmail.com

[2] Eine andere Formulierung desselben Topos (‚Tränen und Gelächter gemischt') ist fr. Hec. 298.

[3] Erfreulicherweise ist das Griechische fast untadelig (mir ist nur der Akzentfehler ὑπομνήμα [59 Anm. 38] ins Auge gesprungen). Das deutsche Zitat auf Seite 92. Anm. 18 liegt im Argen (hervorrfen, geradzu, aristokratiken).

David Mulroy, *Agamemnon, Aeschylus (a verse translation with introduction and notes)*, Wisconsin Studies in Classics. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2016, xliv+81 pp., ISBN 978-0-299-30634-2.

David Mulroy (d'ora in poi M.), *professor emeritus of classics* della University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, arricchisce con questo volume il suo percorso di traduttore di classici, che annovera fra l'altro le traduzioni dei drammi tebani di Sofocle (*Edipo re* [2011], *Antigone* [2013], *Edipo a Colono* [2015]). Non si fatica certo a condividere l'ammirazione che l'autore nutre per l'*Agamennone*, una tragedia che con la sua ineguagliabile ricchezza linguistica e concettuale, e con le difficoltà talora esasperanti che oppone all'interprete, rappresenta una sfida entusiasmante per chi si proponga di far rivivere almeno in parte la potenza espressiva della dizione eschilea all'orecchio del lettore e dello spettatore moderno: un compito che M. ha assolto egregiamente.

La traduzione del testo è preceduta da una breve prefazione (pp. ix-xii) e da un'introduzione (pp. xiii-xxxiv) che fornisce le informazioni biografiche essenziali e traccia un quadro generale dell'arte drammatica di Eschilo così come si manifesta nell'*Agamennone*. Completano la sezione introduttiva un'appendice che riassume il *background* mitologico cui fa riferimento la trilogia (pp. xxxv-xxxviii) e un'utile guida alla non semplice pronuncia inglese dei nomi propri greci[1].

M. è chiaro ed essenziale nel presentare i pochi dati biografici noti, e mette opportunamente in guardia il lettore riguardo alle indicazioni contenute nella *Vita di Eschilo* tramandata assieme al testo nei manoscritti medievali, che sono spesso invenzioni aneddotiche destinate ad arricchire un ristretto nucleo di notizie storicamente fondate. Per quanto riguarda la valutazione della drammaturgia eschilea, M. esprime un giudizio restrittivo circa il valore delle opere anteriori all'*Orestea*: «Today it is difficult to argue that *Persians, Seven against Thebes*, or *Suppliants* is a great drama. Approximately half of the text is devoted to repetitious choral songs and chants that add little to our understanding of the situation. The plot lacks reversal and complications. There are no memorable characters» (p. xviii). Solo con l'*Orestea* Eschilo compie il passo decisivo, conseguendo risultati estetici e drammatici notevolmente superiori alle altre opere; le parti di quest'opera sono infatti «as compelling in content as they are elegant in form» (p. xxi). Si potrebbe discutere su alcuni aspetti di questa valutazione (non credo ad esempio

[1] La qualità della stampa del volume è molto buona: ho notato solo un refuso a p. xi n. 1, dove si deve leggere 1649-1673 e non 1649-1671.

che si possa negare la potenza drammatica del personaggio di Eteocle), ma non è questo il punto essenziale. Ciò che conta è che M. vuole sottolineare come l'interesse del pubblico antico per quelle opere, che a noi possono apparire distanti e poco 'drammatiche', si radicasse nel loro legame con la tradizione lirica corale e fosse rivolto pertanto soprattutto al loro aspetto musicale e coreutico, che a noi sfugge in larga parte a causa delle modalità di trasmissione dei testi. Pressoché nulla di queste componenti essenziali della rappresentazione antica è infatti sopravvissuto; non di meno, siamo ancora in grado di riconoscere il complesso formalismo che caratterizzava le parti corali responsive. Tale complessità formale si estendeva anche ad ampie zone delle parti dialogate, ad esempio nella rigida struttura delle sticomitie o nelle forme complesse del dialogo lirico-epirrematico.

Proprio in questo aspetto M. individua un carattere decisivo della poetica tragica, giacché a suo giudizio il formalismo, che appare così lontano dal gusto dei moderni, aveva per gli antichi la capacità di creare «an undercurrent of aesthetic pleasure» (p. xx) che permetteva di depotenziare il carico emotivo altrimenti devastante delle sofferenze rappresentate sulla scena, rendendole sopportabili per il pubblico. In altre parole, solo tramite il piacere estetico legato alla marcata formalizzazione della versificazione e delle strutture musicali era possibile mantenere viva la consapevolezza del fatto che si era in presenza di una rappresentazione e non di una situazione reale, proteggendo in qualche misura il pubblico dalle conseguenze emotive più pesanti. Questa considerazione determina l'impostazione della traduzione di M., che si dice convinto della necessità di ricreare anche nella lingua d'arrivo, nei limiti del possibile, il senso delle rigorose costrizioni formali presenti nell'originale. Egli sceglie dunque di rendere le parti liriche in versi brevi, di prevalente ritmo giambico e trocaico, caratterizzati dalla presenza di rime finali. Benchè la rima sia un tratto stilistico estraneo alla versificazione antica, infatti, M. la giudica idonea «to make lyrical passages sound like songs to English-speaking readers» (p.ix), e dunque da una parte a rappresentare un accettabile sostituto della trama di corrispondenze che percorre i versi originali, dall'altra a comunicare il senso dell'alternanza fra canto e recitazione che scandiva la rappresentazione antica. Quanto alle parti recitate, M. ricorre a versi che presentano un ritmo affine a quello degli originali, rispetto ai quali risultano però più brevi: cinque piedi giambici invece di sei per i trimetri giambici, tre anapesti invece di quattro per i dimetri anapestici. Solo i tetrametri trocaici catalettici corrispondono alla misura dei versi eschilei, essendo composti da sette trochei e mezzo, (con l'eccezione dei vv. 1343 e 1346-7, composti da soli sei trochei e mezzo).

M. ha piena coscienza dell'impossibilità di ricreare pienamente la sonorità e il ritmo originale del testo (il nostro modo di leggere i versi greci, del resto, è solo convenzionale, e non può riprodurre le sottili sfumature dell'accento musicale che caratterizzava la lingua greca). Per questo egli rinuncia al tentativo

di imitare la complessa tessitura metrica delle parti liriche, accontentandosi di avvicinare almeno in parte il testo antico al lettore moderno, e di rendere percepibile la distanza che il testo tragico manteneva sempre rispetto alla lingua quotidiana degli spettatori antichi. Si tratta di una strada che merita di essere percorsa, anche se la funzione originaria del formalismo tragico, quale la tratteggia M., non può riproporsi identica per lo spettatore moderno, le cui reazioni emotive alla rappresentazione della sofferenza sono inevitabilmente diverse da quelle degli antichi, e la cui sensibilità alla lingua e al ritmo dei versi è mediata da una lunga tradizione letteraria molto distante da quella che avevano alle spalle gli spettatori dell'Atene del V secolo a.C.

I risvolti teorici restano comunque secondari rispetto all'efficacia e alla qualità della traduzione, che è ciò che interessa in prima istanza i fruitori di questo volume. Da questo punto di vista, il lavoro ha indubbiamente molti meriti. M. è un ottimo conoscitore di Eschilo, e utilizza con cognizione di causa i risultati della ricerca critica più recente[2]. La sua resa del testo coniuga felicemente la fedeltà al testo originale con un risultato estetico di pregio, che una lettura ad alta voce rende ancor meglio percepibile[3].

Come esempi significativi del ruscito connubio tra una resa fedele e una versificazione efficace basterà citare gli intensi versi giambici con cui Cassandra descrive la banda delle Erinni che imperversa nella casa degli Atridi («*A choir never leaves this house. It sings / displeasing melodies with evil words, / a band of kindred Furies always there, / carousing, bold from having drunk the blood / of human beings. They can't be sent away. / The song they sing surrounds the royal house. / They sing how madness started, spewing hate, / of one who trod his brother's marriage bed*»: vv. 1186-93) o la solenne invocazione anapestica che introduce il primo stasimo («*King Zeus and our ally, the Night, / who gave us magnificent glory, / who cast on the towers of Troy / a netting that neither the young / nor men fully grown overleapt, / slavery's impervious mesh, / the fabric of total disaster!*»: vv. 355-61). Decisamente efficace appare anche la resa del ritmo concitato dei tetrametri trocaici che nel finale si accompagnano allo scontro quasi fisico fra Egisto e i Vecchi del Coro (vv. 1649-51): «(Aegisthus) *Pay attention, loyal guardsmen! Here is work for you to do!* (Captain of the guards): «*At the ready, everybody! Be prepared to draw your swords.*» (Coryphaeus) «*I'm prepared to draw my weapon — what is more, to fight and die*» ecc.[4].

[2] A p. xi n. 2 M. dichiara di aver utilizzato soprattutto l'edizione di A.H. Sommerstein (Cambridge MA-London 2008) e il commento di D. Raeburn e O. Thomas (Oxford 2011), oltre al grande commento di E. Fraenkel (Oxford 1950) e all'edizione oxoniense di D. Page (Oxford 1972).

[3] Segnalo ai lettori interessati la possibilità di ascoltare uno stralcio della parodo, declamato da M. stesso, all'URL https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VW8Slo1hHE8.

[4] In questo passo molto controverso M. adotta la distribuzione delle battute proposta da

Dalle parti liriche merita una menzione il quadro agghiacciante dei momenti che precedono il sacrificio di Ifigenia, narrati da Eschilo in articolate sequenze giambiche. Si coglie bene qui il senso dell'operazione che M. intende compiere, trasmettendo al lettore il senso della «undercurrent of aesthetic pleasure» che permette di percepire e godere dell'ineffabile mistura di orrore e bellezza che permea il racconto del coro: «*Her gown, a splash of saffron dye, / unfolds, and silent darts / of pity that her eyes release / bounce off her killers' hearts. / A lovely painting, oh but how / the untouched virgin longs / to use her voice, for in the past / she'd lovingly sung songs:/ the third libation's paean in / her father's banquet hall*» (vv. 238-247). Altrettanto riusciti appaiono i versi che rievocano l'ingannevole sensazione di gioia che aveva accompagnato l'arrivo di Elena a Troia, strutturati nell'originale in sequenze giambo-coriambiche: «*One might call what came to Troy / a dream of cloudless skies, / riche's soothing ornament, / the darts of bashful eyes, / Love's heart-breaking bloom, but she / would swerve, and they would learn / how an happy wedding feast / could take a bitter turn*» (w. 739-45).

M. fornisce dunque ai suoi lettori un testo capace di restituire la solenne complessità dell'originale pur restando 'dicibile' e pienamente efficace sulla scena, e riesce a contenere entro limiti accettabili l'inevitabile perdita di alcuni elementi che, per la distanza temporale e culturale che ci separa dall'autore, non possono transitare immediatamente nella lingua moderna. Questo problema ovviamente lo pone di fronte, come ogni traduttore, a scelte non facili, di fronte alle quali il lettore esperto del testo di Eschilo può avere reazioni diverse. Trovo apprezzabile ad esempio la soluzione adottata per rendere l'intraducibile gioco etimologico cui fa ricorso Eschilo per il nome di Elena («*truly hell on ships. / Hell on men and city too*», vv. 689-90: M. sfrutta qui l'assonanza della parola inglese 'hell' con il radicale di ἕλεῖν, 'distruggere'), mentre la resa di ἀπόλλων ἐμός dei vv. 1081 e 1086 («*Apollo means destroyer!*») mi sembra un po' troppo didascalica e fa andare perduto il possessivo ἐμός, che sottolinea lo stretto legame fra il dio e la profetessa. Ai vv. 1432-3 il desiderio di semplificare e avvicinare il testo al lettore moderno fa perdere un dato significativo dell'originale. Clitemestra pronuncia un giuramento in nome della Δίκη di sua figlia, dell'Ἀρά e di Ἄτη, e aggiunge l'agghiacciante clausola, αἷσι τόνδ' ἔσφαξ' ἐγώ («alle quali ho sacrificato quest'uomo»). La frase è attenuata da M. in «*my accomplices*»: ma il tema della perversione del sacrificio e la presentazione della morte di Agamennone come contraccambio di quella, anch'essa sacrificale, di Ifigenia sono troppo

Sommerstein, che attribuisce un verso isolato al Comandante delle guardie. La partecipazione al dialogo di questo personaggio è dubbia, e personalmente trovo preferibile la sistemazione che assegna il v. 1650 al corifeo. Essa conferisce maggior forza alla ripresa, tipica della sticomitia di litigio, dell'esortazione εἶα δή, ritorta dal Coro contro Egisto (tale ripresa letterale avrebbe dovuto a mio giudizio restare tale anche nella traduzione).

importanti nel corso del dramma per poter essere omessi dalla traduzione. Anche ai vv. 1468-72 («*The god attacking Tantalids / employs a matching pair / of women doing as he bids*») il desiderio di attenuare una difficoltà sintattica porta M. a trasformare in un'affermazione descrittiva quella che nell'originale è una sgomenta invocazione del Coro al dèmone della stirpe che si scaglia contro i Tantalidi. Ora, l'invocazione è un tratto importante della crisi che il Coro sperimenta di fronte alla protervia di Clitemestra, e ad essa fa preciso riferimento la risposta della regina al v. 1476 con τὸν τριπάχυντον δαίμονα γέννης τῆσδε κικλήσκων (quest'ultimo verbo è qualcosa di più che il semplice «naming» con cui lo traduce M.).

In altri casi, si tratta di valutazioni estetiche più soggettive. Al v. 211, ad esempio, trovo che la traduzione «*Can either choice be right?*» stemperi poco opportunamente la durezza della domanda τί τῶνδ' ἄνευ κακῶν; («quale di queste scelte è priva di mali?»), che sintetizza il terribile bivio di fronte al quale si trova Agamennone, cui è dato di scegliere solo fra due sciagure. I celebri lecizi dell'inno a Zeus (vv. 160-72 sono tradotti molto efficacemente dal punto di vista del ritmo, ma confesso di avere difficoltà ad accettare la resa del v. 163 οὐκ ἔχω προσεικάσαι con «*I cannot find a synonym*». Anche ammettendo che questa sia l'interpretazione giusta del passo, cosa che non credo, il termine 'synonym', freddo e grammaticale, stride nel contesto di una riflessione così profonda sulla difficoltà di definire l'essenza, e dunque il nome, della divinità più potente.

Per converso, è apprezzabile il coraggio con cui M. traduce la controversa espressione ναυτίλων δὲ σελμάτων / ἱστοτρίβης (vv. 1442-3) per quello che molto probabilmente è, un crudo e volgare insulto («*who knew the sailors' benches well / and rubbed their masts*») che si fa eccezionalmente strada nella lingua tragica, sulle labbra di un personaggio eccezionale come Clitemestra, che oltrepassa tutti i limiti della convenienza e del discorso femminile. Un altro tratto interessante della traduzione è l'occasionale trasformazione di alcune parti in discorsi diretti, al fine di accrescere l'impatto emotivo dei versi. Questo avviene ad esempio ai vv. 639-43, quando l'Araldo, che vorrebbe tacere le notizie negative sulla sorte di Menelao, immagina l'arrivo in città di un messaggero che porta cattive nuove attribuendogli queste parole: «*The army flees! / The state has suffered one collective wound, / and many homes have sacrificed their man, / for that's the double lash that Ares loves, / two spears of ruin, bloody steeds of death*», e ai vv. 1600 e 1602, dove M. dà forma di discorso diretto alle imprecazioni di Tieste contro la sua stessa stirpe, pronunciate dopo aver scoperto la natura orribile del cibo che ha consumato.

Un ultimo punto sul quale vorrei soffermare l'attenzione è la soluzione adottata ai vv. 37-9, in conclusione della vivace *rhēsis* prologica del Φύλαξ, che vela di reticenza le sue allusioni alle vicende della casa di Agamennone: «*If palace walls could talk, / you'd hear some lively tales. Perhaps you*

catch / my drift. That's good. If not … my memory fails». M. introduce qui un'allocuzione in seconda persona («*you'd hear*») che non è presente nell'originale οἶκος δ' αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν λάβοι, / σαφέστατ' ἂν λέξειεν· ὡς ἑκὼν ἐγώ / μαθοῦσιν αὐδῶ κοὐ μαθοῦσι λήθομαι. I versi risultano così di fatto rivolti *ad spectatores*. Questa pratica è assente dal teatro tragico greco che conosciamo, ma è certo che il finale del prologo dell'*Agamennone* vi si avvicina moltissimo, pur senza varcare il limite dell'allocuzione diretta che invece il traduttore scavalca d'impeto. Si può essere o meno d'accordo su questa scelta: ma ciò che conta è che la formulazione di M. risulta in linea col testo di Eschilo nel sollecitare il coinvolgimento degli spettatori nella vicenda. Essi infatti, grazie alla loro conoscenza del mito, sono in grado di comprendere le allusioni criptiche del personaggio a ciò che avviene nel palazzo in assenza di Agamennone. Essi appartengono dunque alla categoria dei μαθόντες: per questo è un peccato che nella traduzione vada perduta la distinzione μαθοῦσιν … κοὐ μαθοῦσι, nella quale probabilmente gli spettatori di Eschilo probabilmente coglievano anche una risonanza del linguaggio dei Misteri eleusini (un aspetto che comunque sarebbe stato difficile far transitare in un testo destinato a lettori la cui esperienza religiosa non comprende nulla di affine al percorso salvifico di iniziazione che gli Ateniesi associavano alle segrete verità di Eleusi).

Al di là dei singoli punti di consenso e dissenso, dunque, la bella traduzione di M. rende il testo di Eschilo pienamente fruibile per un pubblico moderno, creando un flusso di emozioni che, se non può coincidere totalmente con quello che interessava gli Ateniesi del V secolo a.C., è in grado comunque di sollecitare domande profonde e piena compartecipazione emotiva. Grazie ad essa una vasta gamma di lettori e spettatori potrà fare esperienza della forza teatrale di un capolavoro assoluto della storia del teatro.

Enrico Medda
Università di Pisa
enrico.medda@unipi.it

N. G. Wilson (ed.), *Herodotus* Historiae*, Libri I-IV*, Oxford Classical Texts, Oxford: OUP, 2015, xiii+471 pp., £40,00, ISBN 978-0-19-956070-7.

N. G. Wilson (ed.), *Herodotus* Historiae*, Libri V-IX*, Oxford Classical Texts, Oxford: OUP, 2015, vi+440 pp., £40,00, ISBN 978-0-19-956071-4.

Also reviewed:

N. G. Wilson, *Herodotea. Studies on the Text of Herodotus*, Oxford: OUP, 2015, xxvi+202 pp., £50, ISBN 978-0-19-967286-8.

In this new edition of Herodotus' *Historiae*, Nigel Wilson has revised the (original) Oxford Classical Text as edited by the Danish scholar Carolus Hude, which was first published in 1906, revised in 1920, and last revised in 1927. In the current edition, Wilson incorporates much of the valuable work on the text that has been conducted since Hude's edition, in particular that of J. Enoch Powell and Paul Maas. Apart from their conjectures, he also has taken into account new readings from over 80 papyri. In addition, clarity in the *apparatus criticus* has been improved by the collation of two previously neglected medieval manuscripts, which belong to the so-called Roman family. The *apparatus criticus* is straightforward and, compared with previous editions (especially H. B. Rosén's *Herodoti Historiae*, in the Teubner's edition, Leipzig, 2 vols. 1987–1997 (series: Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana)), it appears both significantly reduced (in accordance with the OCT-series' aim) but as yet amply sufficient. The choice to remove, in text and *apparatus*, certain errors one way or another related to orthographic details is remarkable. Regarding the latter issue, Wilson rightfully assumes that "… in matters of dialect the manuscripts are unreliable and do not enable us to restore with confidence the forms preferred by the author" (volume 1, p. vi), who himself seems to have been uncertain at times as regards whether to prefer an Ionic or an Attic form. An elaborate volume, sc. *Herodotea*, elucidating many of Wilson's choices, has been published simultaneously: anyone wishing to investigate the text in greater detail should consult it. I applaud this new edition, which deserves to remain the standard edition for many years to come (even though it is not flawless or complete: a *stemma codicum* is manifestly absent even though, as Wilson states "[t]he stemmatic relations … are not entirely clear" (volume 1, p. ix);[1] the criteria to opt for a particular reading in the *apparatus* moreover sometimes remain shrouded in the mist, as we shall discuss further on).

[1] The main relations however are clear. The archetype of the Herodotus' tradition had two lines of descent, a fact that has been widely acknowledged and accepted, even by Wilson (*Herodotea* pp. xiii–xviii): the Florentine family (with MS A, according to Wilson, as the best MS for the entire text) and the Roman family (respectively Wilson's A-family and his **d**-family; in Hude respectively **a** and **d**).

For many decades, many ancient historians and classicists working with Herodotus' *Historiae* relied on the edition prepared by Carolus Hude that, in spite of its faults (e.g. in the presentation of some Persian names, like Artaphrenes for both the satrap of Ionia and his son instead of the correct Artaphernes, as well as several minor errors in the *apparatus*), provided a solid base for them. It had, however, become obsolete, if only because no readings were incorporated of the many Herodotus-fragments on papyrus which have been published since the last update of the Hude edition. These papyrus fragments not merely offer new readings but occasionally also provide us with interesting alternatives. The OCT-board's decision to seek for a new edition was, therefore, a necessary step to keep the series' reputation in place. The task to provide for the new edition was entrusted to Nigel Wilson, who -considering all- has executed his task admirably.

In my view, the main asset of this new edition is that it includes readings of the eighty-odd fragments of Herodotus found on Egyptian papyri known so far (in Rosén's Teubner-edition some conjectures from papyri were incorporated, but derived from a much smaller number of them), even incorporating some hitherto unpublished ones from Oxyrhynchus, as he, e.g. does for Hdt. 2.79.1, 8.112.1, and 8.130.2. Apart from that, Wilson also adopted, sometimes even unpublished, conjectures by other scholars[2] as well as provided some new conjectures himself. In combination, they offer a wide range of alternatives to choose from for many passages of Herodotus' text. Wilson guides the reader through all (or at least most) of these options in *Herodotea*, especially elucidating such passages that require special attention, if only because they have caused contention in the past. *Herodotea* thereby offers Wilson's audience a window to watch the artisan practising his trade. Sometimes it relates to trivial matters, like the number of Eualcidas' victories (*Herodotea*, p. 107 *ad* Hdt. 5.102.3), sometimes it really touches problems posed by the text itself (and, obviously, its constituting MSS as well), like in the case of Hdt. 3.14.10. In that paragraph, a particular problem concerns the word ὡς and its implications in the phrase καὶ ταῦτα ὡς κτλ.: Wilson discusses the various options (*Herodotea*, p. 49) before offering the possible solution we also encounter in the *apparatus* (volume 1, p. 246 *ad* line 228). Wilson also shares his doubts with the reader, as his excellent discussion on Hdt. 2.37.5 shows (*Herodotea*, p. 28): here are no clear-cut conclusions available, only puzzles.

A novelty, in my view, is the use of the double asterisk to mark, *inter alia*, beginning and end of passages that may have been afterthoughts of Herodotus

[2] Many of them made by Paul Maas (some of them probably suggested to Maas by his friend Enoch Powell), as Wilson acknowledges: N. G. Wilson, 'Maasiana on Herodotus', *ZPE* 179(2011), pp. 57-70 at 57. In this paper, Wilson informs us that he acquired from the widow of the late George Forrest Maas's copy of Hude's Herodotus edition, amply provided with marginal notes by Maas.

(cf. volume 1, viii). Some of these passages are not really integrated in the context, like, e.g., in Hdt. 5.9.3 (volume 2, p. 442 lines 81-83) and, perhaps, can be deleted. Others concern duplications: in Hdt. 5.69.2 (volume 2, p. 474 lines 933-935), to be deleted according to Powell, we find again the division by Cleisthenes of the Athenians into ten *phylae*, instead of the previous four, that Herodotus already mentioned before in Hdt. 5.66.2 (cf. volume 2, p. 472 lines 877-880), be it in slightly adapted form. Wilson consistently opts to not delete most of such phrases "if the sole objection raised has been that the passage in question would have been intelligible without them" (volume 1, vii). Wilson's option is based upon the fact that Herodotus composed his text "to be read aloud to a large public audience or to smaller private groups" (ibidem). Therefore, "a certain amount of repetition or redundancy of style is required" (ibidem). Though admitting "that some interpolations have found their way into the text" (ibidem), Wilson believes their number is far less than has been assumed previously and he therefore chooses to treat the text conservatively.

The double asterisks also appear at passages that have provoked discussion. An excellent example for this I find Hdt. 6.98.3. Wilson explains in *Herodotea* (p. 117) why he constituted the text as he did: it is a brief but comprehensive account of the background for his choice. Wilson also discusses conjectures suggested by colleagues in *Herodotea*: as an example I may refer to p. 120, where he discusses an interpolation possibly suggested by Enoch Powell and duly recorded by Maas. It concerns a much-discussed passage, a eulogy on the Alcmaeonids in general and Callias in particular (in relation with the so-called shield incident after the Battle of Marathon), regarding Hdt. 6.121 (line 1550) - 123 (line 1568). Involving omissions in MS A, potential interpolations, and a scholium, the constitution of these chapters is a delicate mix of uncertainties. Wilson's final conclusion is that he prefers "to speak of an 'alternative version not yet integrated in the text'". Even if not all solutions so achieved are wholly convincing, I believe that to present the struggles any editor of a text faces in this manner should be (or become) the standard procedure. It also means that, in fact, no diligent user of the edition can leave *Herodotea* apart.

As regards the *apparatus*, a word of criticism seems to be in place for Wilson's treatment of the MS tradition. I already noted above that a clear *stemma codicum* (or at least as clear as evidence permits) is absent. Worse is that it *appears* [my emphasis, JPS] that Wilson does not (always) clearly distinguish between MS A, according to Wilson dating to the tenth century,[3]

[3] Contrary to what Maria Luzzatto has claimed regarding MS A, viz. that folio's 1-34 were a late thirteenth century facsimile added to the MS, Wilson is adamant that MS A forms a unity, in its entirety written by two scribes in the early tenth century (*Herodotea*, p. xiv-xv and note 11). For the first book of Herodotus the issue certainly matters (Wilson believes 'A' to be "certainly … superior to the others" for Book 1: *Herodotea*, xv). To accept Luzzatto's view

and the MSS of the A-family, i.e. MS B and MS C. In spite of the fact that MSS B and C are independent of -even though related to- MS A, they only rarely figure in the *apparatus*: it could raise the question whether 'A' in the *apparatus* does, in fact, always solely refer to MS A or also to the A-family. Even though Wilson states "that only a few readings of B and C need to be reported" (*Herodotea*, p. xvi), it is unclear (even consulting *Herodotea*) where in the *apparatus*, in his view, this necessity comes to the fore. The problem is, moreover, enhanced by Wilson's pronounced appreciation for 'A' as the best manuscript for Herodotus' text (see above, note 1). The case is further complicated because -as the Teubner edition by Rosén makes clear- several readings of the **d**-family are also found in MS C: nevertheless, this concordance does not show in Wilson's *apparatus*. Not even absence of "the need to be reported" suffices to explain this omission. In this case, I believe therefore, Hude's option to define what Wilson refers to as the A-family as '**a**' is much more preferable, if only for clarity's sake. As it is, Wilson sometimes also seems to be too reluctant to point out the corruption that appears to be a common denominator for MSS of the Roman (or **d**)-family, of which MS T only rarely appears in the *apparatus*.

Though notably the *apparatus* therefore appears to be not at all flawless (as discussed) and could be well-served with an update when, in due time, a revision is asked for, this new Herodotus edition for the OCT certainly should, nevertheless, be highly commended, also because of the reasons already discussed. In spite of omissions, it generally is a meticulously executed edition, moreover one offered for an affordable price-tag (the Teubner edition, though with a more elaborate apparatus, is in textual approach less comprehensive, in my view, and more expensive). If a revised edition is ever considered, the publisher also might contemplate to address the pagination. The text proper in volume 1 ends with page 436: it is followed by a -very convenient- *index nominum* for volume 1, paginated as pp. 437-471; the text proper in volume 2 next starts with p. 439. Surely, there could have been found some clever way to avoid the same page number occurring twice? An additional feature I prefer in Wilson's edition (over the one by Hude) is Wilson's consecutive numbering of the lines per book instead of Hude's numbering of lines per page. As regards the text itself: obviously, sometimes Wilson prefers readings the reviewer would (probably) have not opted for: an example is Wilson's choice to read in Hdt. 5.101.3 (line 1489) πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Τμῶλον καλεόμενον (as, indeed, Hude did) instead of the reviewer's preference πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸν Τμῶλον καλεόμενον: Wilson opts

could mean one concedes that the text of MS A (for Book 1) may have been 'contaminated' by undisclosed conjectures (e.g. made by Joannes Tzetzes). Also see R. Cantore, 'I *Marginalia* dei primi trentaquattro fogli del Laur. plut. 70. 3 (A) di Erodoto', *BollClass*(3) 33(2012), 3-32. Raffaella Cantore, not referred to by Wilson, believes whether or not these folios are a facsimile remains an open question.

to follow here three MSS of which he admits that they "rarius citantur" (see *ad* Sigla); I prefer the reading found both in 'A' and '**d**': see volume 2, 496 *ad* line 1489 (Hude remains silent on the alternative option!). Since both options are grammatically sound, the choice here probably depends rather on personal preferences than on grammar. However, as Wilson is the editor and his option is sound, I really cannot complain (if only because the *apparatus* does function here as it should). The same conclusion is valid for the care taken by editor and publishers for both volumes constituting this edition and the, *de facto*, accompanying volume of the *Herodotea*. The combination of edition and *Herodotea* I find exemplary. Exemplary is also the typography (apart, perhaps, from the font size, which could have been two points greater for enhanced user comfort), which -as far as I have been able to check- is flawless. In conclusion, this edition is a real asset for the Oxford Classical Texts series.

Jan P. Stronk
Ancient History, Universiteit van Amsterdam
j.p.stronk@uva.nl

J.C. Mckeown–Joshua M. Smith, *The Hippocrates code: unraveling the ancient mysteries of modern medical terminology*, Indianapolis–Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2016, xxiii+370 pp., ISBN 978-1-62466-464-9.

Cómo aprovechar el legado grecolatino en la enseñanza de la terminología médica.

Envidia sana pero envidia, a pesar de la etimología latina del término–y ya que de étimos se trata–, es lo que ha sentido quien estas líneas escribe no al hojear u ojear sino al leer detenidamente y con fruición las casi 400 páginas de este libro. Por varios motivos: 1º. Porque una prestigiosa editorial de ámbito universitario, internacional, apuesta por una obra de contenido didáctico, no de corte teórico sino de didáctica aplicada, y más en el terreno de las "clásicas", y eso es en nuestro país una *rara avis*[1]. Los loables intentos de hacer algo parecido, esto es, demostrar y mostrar las bases grecolatinas de la terminología científica con fines didácticos y ensayar nuevas herramientas que contribuyan a mejorar la comprensión del léxico técnico por parte de nuestros estudiantes (¡de Medicina, Biología y materias afines!), solo se han dado, que yo sepa, en el ámbito de la Enseñanza Secundaria, no universitaria[2], y gracias al esfuerzo entusiasta y altruista de grupos de profesores partidarios de elaborar materiales activos de aprendizaje, tanto para sus alumnos como para compartirlos con otros profesores *on line*[3]. Las ediciones en papel también son muy meritorias

[1] Solo hay que echar un vistazo a su catálogo para descubrir cómo conviven investigaciones de vanguardia en torno a los clásicos junto a gramáticas elementales del griego y del latín. Remitimos a su web: https://www.hackettpublishing.com/classics (última consulta: 20 de noviembre de 2016).

[2] Dejo aparte de manera consciente trabajos como los de Javier del Hoyo, *Etimologicón. El sorprendente origen de nuestras palabras y sus extrañas conexiones*, Barcelona 2013, muy ameno, escrito en tono divulgativo, sin renunciar al rigor; el más académico de Bertha Gutiérrez Rodilla, *El lenguaje de las ciencias*, Madrid 2005, un pequeño manual de tipo general –en la línea de otros anteriores de la misma autora–, con amplia bibliografía, destinado a profesores, alumnos y profesionales; y los más exhaustivos de J. Mª Quintana Cabanas, *Raíces del léxico castellano científico y médico*, Madrid, 1997[2] y S. Segura Munguía, *Diccionario etimológico de Medicina*, Bilbao 2004. Con sus luces y sus sombras, y aunque por ejemplo Quintana Cabanas insiste en su intención pedagógica y en ser más texto de estudio que diccionario etimológico (cf. introducción), estas obras no están directamente orientadas a la enseñanza en las aulas, aunque puedan lógicamente utilizarse para preparar e impartir clases por la riqueza indiscutible de sus materiales.

[3] Destacamos la generosidad en este sentido de los integrantes del grupo Chiron, fundadores en 2006 de una web que se autodefine como "un espacio colaborativo para profesores de clásicas" (http://www.chironweb.org/) , donde pueden encontrarse todo tipo de recursos, entre ellos los destinados al aprendizaje del léxico de origen grecolatino. Cf. para etimologías del

en contenido, pero la presentación en forma de cuadernos habla por sí misma del modesto presupuesto económico dedicado a la empresa[4].

2º. Porque en el mundo académico anglosajón el profesorado universitario puede arriesgar, si decide emplear su tiempo y sus conocimientos en ensayar nuevas metodologías y elaborar nuevos materiales didácticos, sin temor a que estos trabajos –fruto de la experiencia en el ámbito docente diario– "desluzcan" su *curriculum*, o resten tiempo a la actividad científica *stricto sensu*, la única susceptible de evaluación ante los organismos competentes, la única que recibe emolumentos en España. No se teme, todo lo contrario, seguir al pie de la letra el lema clásico *delectare docendo*. En el ámbito anglosajón se presta mucha atención a la divulgación bien hecha, y también a las innovaciones docentes, que en modo alguno suponen renunciar a la ciencia. Como veremos más abajo, los autores de este libro, especialmente el Dr. McKeown, ya han dado buena muestra de tener interiorizado este aspecto en su amplia trayectoria profesional.

3º. Porque se presupone un público destinatario que por desgracia aquí no tenemos y difícilmente tendremos si no se produce un giro copernicano en el divorcio entre las ciencias y las letras que ha consagrado el panorama de nuestras sucesivas y nunca acabadas reformas educativas: el de los estudiantes de Medicina, Biología, Veterinaria, Farmacia, etc. Actualmente, en los planes de estudio de las Facultades españolas de Medicina, y en el área de Ciencias de la Salud en su conjunto, solo se estudia, de manera muy limitada, la asignatura de Historia de la Medicina, y eso es lo más parecido a la Tradición Clásica que podemos encontrar. Jamás se plantearía, al menos a corto o medio plazo, una asignatura orientada a sentar las bases del aprendizaje de la terminología científica, basado en la etimología, en la comprensión de las palabras a través de su historia. El alumno debe memorizar. Ha habido encomiables intentos de subsanar esta carencia[5], pero han quedado en vía muerta desde el punto de

griego http://www.chironweb.org/wiki/index.php?title=Etimolog%C3%ADa_griega y para el caso del latín: http://www.chironweb.org/wiki/index.php?title=Etimolog%C3%ADa_latina (última consulta: 20 de noviembre de 2016).

[4] Nos referimos al trabajo del Grupo Eleusis, compuesto por un grupo de profesores de Latín y Griego de la zona Sur de Madrid que, entre otras muchas publicaciones sumamente útiles para los docentes, han elaborado para el caso concreto de la terminología médica el cuaderno de materiales *In corpore sano. Un recorrido por el cuerpo humano y la medicina a través de las palabras y sus orígenes grecolatinos*, Madrid: Áurea Clásicos, 2005. Sirva también esta nota de reconocimiento a la meritoria labor de Áurea como librería y editorial especializada en materiales para enseñanza de las clásicas.

[5] Conocemos el de Francisco Cortés Gabaudán, Doctor en Filología Griega, quien estuvo hace años al frente de una asignatura, de libre configuración, que se ofrecía a los alumnos de la Facultad de Medicina y Biología de la Universidad de Salamanca para subsanar estas carencias. No ha tenido continuidad en los planes de estudios actuales, pero fruto de la misma fue el loable *Diccionario médico-biológico (histórico y etimológico) de helenismos* (CD ROM), Salamanca 2004. Posteriormente convertido en recurso on-line, un proyecto abierto con más de 7000 términos en la actualidad. Puede consultarse en la dirección: http://dicciomed.eusal.es/ (última

vista institucional. Al futuro médico no le queda más remedio que aprender de memoria las palabras que conformarán su jerga. Estas –de origen grecolatino en un elevadísimo porcentaje– convivirán con él a lo largo de su carrera profesional, adobadas con el creciente porcentaje del léxico que procede del inglés. Curiosamente los omnipresentes anglicismos médicos, perfectamente evitables, dan lugar a numerosos solecismos, falsos amigos, etc. cuando no se convierten a su vez en la vía de entrada de más latinismos, lo que origina una curiosa "relatinización" indirecta del castellano, a través del inglés[6]. Pero, ajena a estas preocupaciones filológicas, para la mayoría de usuarios y pacientes el prestigio social parece convivir perfectamente con la oscuridad del lenguaje, es más, a veces este oscurantismo lo acrecienta y hasta sirve para vender mejor el producto de farmacia o parafarmacia, y más tratándose de la ciencia aplicada a la cosmética, como bien ha puesto de manifiesto un trabajo reciente de Marisa Díez Arroyo[7].

Vistas las causas, vayamos por partes ante la obra que tenemos en nuestras manos, pues se trata de un buen "remedio" para la "enfermedad" que tenemos diagnosticada. Pero antes merece la pena detenerse en el quién es quién:

J. C. McKeown, que suele trabajar casi siempre en compañía de colegas (uno más uno siempre es más que dos)[8], doctorado por Cambridge, lleva años trabajando en la Universidad de Wisconsin en el *Department of Classical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* y, entre las numerosas publicaciones de este reputado especialista en Ovidio, destaca en el ámbito de la didáctica de las lenguas clásicas su curso introductorio de Latín[9] y otras obras, recientemente

visita: 20 de noviembre de 2016).

[6] Los médicos hablan de "enfermedades *severas*" (*several* en inglés / *severus* en latín) cuando deberían decir *graves*; *ántrax* es la palabra greco-latina (e inglesa *anthrax*) reutilizada para renombrar el *carbunco* castellano, se utiliza *resucitación* en lugar de *reanimación*, y así podrían mencionarse muchos ejemplos al respecto: resultados *dramáticos*, revisiones *rutinarias*, enfermos *puntuales*… y no solo descubrimos anglicismos léxicos sino también ortográficos, morfológicos y sintácticos, cuyas causas son variadas (confesadas e inconfesadas). Hay varios trabajos muy interesantes en este sentido; cf. J. Segura, "Los anglicismos en el lenguaje médico", *Panace@* 2.3, 2001, 52-57; R. Aleixandre-A. Amador, "Problemas del lenguaje médico actual (I). Extranjerismos y falsos amigos", *Papeles médicos* 10.3, 2001, 144-149; F.A. Navarro, "En pos de la verdadera causa de los anglicismos médicos", *Ars Medica. Revista de Humanidades Médicas* 1, 2002, 53-64.

[7] M. Díez Arroyo, "Scientific language in skin-care advertising: persuading through opacity", *RESLA* 26, 2013, 197-213.

[8] Se trata de aplicar a la propia experiencia la llamada a la cooperación entre doctores que propugnaba el mismo Hipócrates en sus *Preceptos* y que recogen en las primeras páginas de este libro los autores (p. v): "If a doctor occasionally has a problem with a particular case, or if he is in the dark because of his lack of experience, it is not improper for him to call upon other doctors so that through consultation he might learn more about his patient's ailment, and so that through cooperation there might be an abundance of help ready at hand" (Hippocrates, Precepts 8).

[9] J. C. McKeown, *Classical Latin: An Introductory Course*, Indianapolis 2010. Se trata de un manual que lleva asociada una página web (véase: http://www.jcmckeown.com/. Última

traducidas al castellano, que constituyen una deliciosa apuesta por la amena difusión del legado clásico[10]. A su docencia en lengua y literatura griega y latina hay que sumar las clases que imparte sobre Medicina Antigua y Civilización Griega y Romana. Las clases enriquecen la investigación y a la inversa.

A esta experiencia, para el caso que nos ocupa, se ha sumado la colaboración de un joven doctor: Joshua Smith, helenista que ha publicado ya varios trabajos sobre tradición poética y las obras de Arquíloco, Alceo, Anacreonte y Horacio. Smith, tras su paso por Wisconsin, donde se doctoró en 2013, trabaja en la Johns Hopkins University desde julio de 2015. Juntos han dado a luz esta empresa, más que un libro de texto, con una website que lo acompaña y completa[11]. Además, este curso introductorio ha contado con una buena lista de asesores, entre los que destacamos las veteranas figuras de Vivian Nutton y John Scarborough cuya trayectoria en estudios de historia de la medicina desde la antigüedad al Renacimiento habla por sí sola. En el caso de Scarborough hay que reconocerle además el mérito de haber sido uno de los pioneros en escribir una obra destinada al aprendizaje de la terminología médica desde el punto de vista de la historia de la medicina y, por lo tanto, de la historia de las palabras[12].

Con estas credenciales, y el tono utilizado, enganchan al lector desde el título del libro y la contraportada, para animarlo a entrar en los misterios hipocráticos: "The uncertainty is even greater in the case of Hippocrates, a shadowy figure about whom we know surprisingly very little (…) The background for the book's title page is symbolic of the situation. It is quite impossible to get a clear picture of the man behind the legend, but all the same he is undeniably a towering figure in the history of the ancient medicine."

Los autores parten de la base del impacto que tienen el latín y el griego en la terminología médica, hoy en día una jerga especializada, que maneja un lenguaje apto solo para iniciados pero prácticamente monopolizado por el griego y el latín. Dicho así, parece tratarse de una obviedad, pero no les falta razón para insistir en ello ante el destinatario nativo de la lengua inglesa, mientras que desde la perspectiva de una lengua romance como la nuestra pudiera parecer absurdo y redundante seguir insistiendo en esta idea. Cualquier profesor de lenguas clásicas en España, en el ámbito de la enseñanza secundaria y el bachillerato, dedica buena parte de sus clases a esto

visita: 20 de noviembre de 2016). Para más información, recomendamos la reseña que hizo de este libro y su metodología Antonio Ramírez de Verger publicada en *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2011.08.03.

[10] Cf. J. C. McKeown, *Gabinete de curiosidades romanas: relatos extraños y hechos sorprendentes* (traducción española), Barcelona: Crítica, 2011 y *Gabinete de curiosidades griegas: relatos extraños y hechos sorprendentes* (traducción española), Barcelona: Crítica, 2014.

[11] URL: http://hippocratescode.com/ (última visita: 20 de noviembre de 2016).

[12] J. Scarborough, *Medical Terminologies: Classical Origins*, Oklahoma Series in Classical Culture 13. Norman, University of Oklahoma Press 1992.

mismo, a enseñar etimologías del lenguaje científico, especialmente médico, curiosamente a unos alumnos que van a verse situados en las antípodas del bachillerato bio-sanitario, el de mayor prestigio y exigencia hoy en día en nuestro país[13]. Sin embargo, McKeown y Smith tienen en mente un alumnado universitario, y especializado, de ahí la interesante reflexión que hacen: "Even until the early 20th century, knowledge of Latin was commonplace among those with a high level of education, and Greek was frequently studied as well. Nowadays, however, Latin and Greek are no longer the central pillars of education. Latin has lost its status as the primary language of scholarship, and very few people have had any extensive training in that language, while Greek is even less well known. Nevertheless, for a variety of reasons Latin and Greek have remained the languages of choice when it comes to scientific terminology, including that of medicine. This principle is seen especially in the fact that the modern scientific community has made it a firmly regulated policy that new discoveries should be presented to the world via Latin and Greek nomenclature. For this reasons, even if Latin and Greek are not as popular as they once were, they nevertheless remain crucial to the scientific disciplines, and in fact it has been estimated that over 90 percent of biomedical terms in English are derived from Greek, from Latin, or from a combination of the two." (p. x)

Por otra parte, para un hablante de la lengua inglesa, y en concreto para el futuro médico, es más fácil entender la terminología médica de un texto escrito en latín que la del mismo texto en alemán. Y presentan al lector una sencilla actividad de lectura en ambas lenguas para que pueda comprobarlo por sí mismo ("Try it. You will be amazed", p. xi). El porqué resulta incuestionable; a la base común de parientes indoeuropeas, se añade la latinización del inglés, más fuerte en la época medieval con la conquista normanda, en un periodo especialmente relevante para la forja de la terminología médica en latín: "Latin itself –and particularly the terminology of medicine and of the other scientific arts– had already been permeated with Greek by the time it invaded the English language in the 11th century" (p. xi) y las conclusiones son claras: "As a result of these developments, English was heavily influenced by Latin and Greek both in technical and nontechnical vocabulary (…) Therefore, although English is not actually descended from either Greek or Latin, the influence of the two ancient languages on English is so strong that a modern English speaker finds it easier to learn scientific terminology based on Greek and Latin than would be the case if it were based on German". (p. xi).

[13] Es un secreto a voces que en numerosos centros concertados y privados de España se ha renunciado a impartir el bachillerato de letras y, por el contrario, en zonas deprimidas de las grandes ciudades algunos Institutos solo imparten ya estos en exclusiva, en la idea de que son más fáciles, con el objetivo de que los alumnos "titulen" –ojo al vocablo–. Esa parece ser la consigna, devaluando y desprestigiando ante la sociedad los contenidos y los vehículos que han forjado nuestra historia en general y la de la ciencia en particular.

Nada se da por sentado. No se olvidan estos profesores de situar la terminología en su contexto, y su premisa también les lleva a hacer un sucinto recorrido por la historia de la medicina desde Alejandría al Renacimiento. Con el objeto de seguir enganchando al lector desde la introducción (pp. ix-xviii), también se dedican unas páginas de la misma al proceso de formación de la terminología técnica a partir de las lenguas clásicas e invitan al lector a sorprenderse y divertirse con el estudio etimológico de las palabras y su evolución. Indican brevemente cómo se ha dado el proceso de *Anglicization* del latín de una manera muy sencilla en la mayoría de los casos: sin que la palabra cambie (*decor, error, pallor, tremor*), eliminando la terminación –us (*frigidus, horridus, tepidus, timidus*), cambiando la –a por una –e silente (*mixtura, natura, pictura, structura*), cambiando –as por –y (*brevitas, dignitas, gravitas, simplicitas*) o cambiando –x por –cious (*atrox, audax, ferox, vivax*). Subrayan cómo los hallazgos científicos han encontrado diversas soluciones a través del latín y el griego para las nuevas nomenclaturas (a excepción del famoso "quark", término que designa la partícula elemental que es componente de otras subatómicas, y que fue acuñado por el físico Murray Gell-Mann, basándose en una aparentemente arbitraria reminiscencia de la obra de James Joyce *Finnegan's Wake*). De este modo se han formado términos sólo con el griego (*pandemic*) otros solo con el latín (*omnivorous*), mezclando ambas lenguas (*pancultural*), mezclando el griego y otra lengua (*pananglosaxon*), latín e inglés (*omniloving*), o griego y otros elementos (*deoxyribonucleic*).

Antes de empezar a trabajar con este libro, también resumen de manera clara y sencilla cuáles son las partes del discurso: verbos, nombres y adjetivos; las partes de las palabras (prefijo, raíz y sufijo) para que sepa qué terreno va a pisar el usuario menos ducho en cuestiones lingüísticas. Y con estos precedentes y la bibliografía (Additional Resources, p. xxiii) cierran la introducción no sin explicar antes al lector cómo debe utilizarse el libro (How to Use this book, pp. xix-xxii), y la metodología y organización que se ha seguido en la presentación de los materiales; prevalece un orden lingüístico, lógicamente, y no médico. Se avisa del variado tipo de prácticas que se ofrecen en cada tema: de identificación de términos, definición, detección de errores, "completa huecos", etc. Una sorprendente variedad de ejercicios amenos y muy didácticos que pueden seguirse a gusto del consumidor, sin que este se desespere, ya que puede combinarlos y consultar los solucionarios al final de cada capítulo para comprobar sus progresos. No se pierden de vista los clásicos ni para sustentar su metodología didáctica, jugando con el lenguaje de los médicos: sería totalmente ridículo que un médico dispensase la misma cantidad y peso de una medicina a cada paciente (Plutarco, *Banquete* 643c), tampoco puede un paciente recibir el mismo tratamiento todo el tiempo (Hipócrates, Preceptos 7).

A lo largo de 28 capítulos, el manual se desarrolla en tres partes: Parte I: Latin, con catorce capítulos. Los tres primeros están dedicados a los prefijos latinos: I Latin Prefixes 1 (pp. 1-12); II Latin Prefixes 2 (pp. 13-24); III Latin Numerical Prefixes (pp. 25-35). Finalizado este bloque de prefijos, se sitúa el primer repaso (Review I: pp. 36-39). A continuación se dedican los seis capítulos siguientes a los sufijos: IV: Latin Suffixes 1 (pp. 40-50); V, Latin Suffixes 2 (pp. 51-61) y VI Latin Suffixes 3 (pp. 62-71) y se intercala el segundo repaso (Review II: pp. 72-75) antes del segundo bloque de sufijos: VII Latin Suffixes 4 (pp. 76-85), VIII Latin Suffixes 5 (pp. 86-97) IX Latin Suffixes 6 (pp. 98-109) y X Other Latin Prefixes and Suffixes (pp. 110-121). Un tercer repaso (Review III, pp. 122-125) precede a los últimos capítulos de la primera parte, dedicados a nombres y adjetivos: XI Latin Nouns 1 (pp. 126-141); XII Latin Nouns 2 (pp. 142-153); XIII Latin Adjetives 1 (pp. 154-168) y XIV Latin Adjetives 2 (pp. 169-182). Cierra la primera parte el cuarto repaso (Review IV, pp. 183-186). Los diez capítulos siguientes conforman la segunda parte, dedicada al griego, con uno inicial destinado al alfabeto (Chapter XV The Greek Alphabet, pp. 187-197), a continuación vienen los prefijos (Chapter XVI Greek Prefixes 1, pp. 198-208; Chapter XVII Greek Prefixes 2, pp. 209-219; Chapter XVIII Greek Numerical and Other Prefixes, pp. 220-230), y un nuevo repaso (Review V, pp. 231-234). Los siguientes capítulos se destinan a la sufijación: Chapter XIX Greek Sufixes 1, pp. 235-244; Chapter XX Greek Sufixes 2, pp. 245-254; Chapter XXI Greek Sufixes 3, pp. 255-264). Tras el bloque llega el sexto repaso (Review VI pp. 266-269) y otro bloque de materias: Chapter XXII Greek Compound Sufixes 1 (pp. 270-279), Chapter XXIII Greek Compound Sufixes 2 (pp. 280-289) y Chapter XXIV Greek Compound Sufixes 3 (pp. 290-300), que cierra el séptimo repaso (Review VII, pp. 301-304). La tercera parte se detiene en "otros tipos de construcción": Chapter XXV Bilingual Words (pp. 305-315); Chapter XXVI Special Derivations (pp. 316-327); Chapter XXVII Mythological Eponyms (pp. 328-337, en el que se incluye la terminología basada en la mitología: tendón de Aquiles, hermafrodita, narcisismo, etc.) y el último Chapter XXVIII Historical Eponyms (pp. 338-349), en el que se recorre la terminología científica que lleva el nombre de diferentes personajes relevantes de la Historia de la Medicina (*facies Hippocratica*, trompas de Falopio, trompa de Eustaquio, etc.). El último repaso es el octavo (Review VIII, pp. 350-354). Un rico apéndice corona la obra mediante la inclusión de un mapa, una tabla cronológica –sinopsis histórica de la Medicina–, un glosario de nombres propios, un índice de elementos de palabras, un índice con las materias tratadas en cada capítulo (esqueleto, partes del cuerpo, nervios, aparato digestivo, etc.) y otro con los temas de la medicina antigua que también se esbozan en cada uno de ellos (orígenes de la medicina, enfermedades, mujeres y medicina, cirugía, etc.) y, por último, un índice de monedas y otras ilustraciones incluidas en el manual.

Solo echamos de menos, por poner un pequeño reparo, una mayor presencia de Galeno, a lo largo de los pequeños y atinados fragmentos de muy diversos autores médicos y literarios en general que jalonan el texto y van mostrando al lector aspectos muy variados de la Historia de la Medicina grecolatina. No podemos olvidar que el médico de Pérgamo fue el primer intérprete de Hipócrates y un puntal básico en el proceso de sistematización de la ciencia médica. Además, como se indica en la interesante reflexión del cuadro de texto de la página 247, a propósito del status del griego sobre el latín como lengua de los médicos, "Interestingly, in some cases modern English speakers view Latin in the same way as the Romans viewed Greek. It is more dignified, for example, to use the Latin-based "excrement", "urine", and "vomitus" than various Germanic-based counterparts, some of which are, as Celsus would say, 'not suitable for decorous discourse'". Pues bien, ejemplo de ello fue el propio Galeno, un médico de la época de Marco Aurelio, cuyo mundo es romano, aunque naciera en una provincia del Este (Pérgamo), y que nunca utilizó en sus escritos la lengua latina.

Entre el aluvión de formaciones que se someten a estudio, y ya que con buen criterio se dedica un capítulo al alfabeto griego (que hoy casi nadie conoce) también podrían haberse incluido acuñaciones médicas que se basan precisamente en metáforas relacionadas con las letras griegas: deltoides, gammagrafía, lambdoideo, sigmoiditis, betasilina, quiasmatipia (en inglés: deltoids, gammagraphy, lambdoid, sigmoiditis, betasilin, chiasmatipia), etc.[14]. Ahora bien, se trata de *peccata minuta* que no resta un ápice a los méritos de la obra.

En definitiva, a la vista de este trabajo no podemos más que felicitarnos. El profesor o estudioso que se acerque al texto comprobará que estudiar el latín y el griego a través de los ojos de la ciencia no solo revela la extensión y la influencia de las lenguas clásicas sino también la urgencia y la necesidad de hacer más accesible este material histórico y lingüístico. Son numerosas las universidades que en el mundo ofrecen este tipo de estudios en las facultades de Medicina: no solo en Estados Unidos, también en Eslovaquia, en Turquía o en Canadá. Investigadores de diversa procedencia han demostrado –algunos basándose en entrevistas hechas a los propios estudiantes de Medicina y ciencias afines– que para la mayoría de los científicos el latín y el griego pueden ser un excelente vehículo para el aprendizaje de la terminología técnica. Y el método etimológico se muestra en este sentido como el más eficiente, más teniendo en cuenta que, por poner un ejemplo, solo la porción de terminología anatómica de origen grecolatino en el inglés es del 89% (65% latín, 24% griego)[15].

[14] Para el estudio de estas palabras en relación con el español, cf. Mª de la S. Moral Lozano, "La vida secreta de las letras griegas en el vocabulario de la medicina", en J.A. López Férez et al. (eds.), *Homenaje al profesor Alfonso Martínez Diez. Πολυπραγμοσύνη*, Madrid 2016, 495-505.

[15] Cf., entre otros, los artículos de L. A. Dean-Jones, "Teaching Medical Terminology as

Este libro se perfila como la demostración de que es posible acometer esta tarea, pendiente en nuestro país, de una manera innovadora y con un valor pedagógico real, sin renunciar a los valores intelectuales e históricos, combinando múltiples estrategias entre las opciones disponibles para la enseñanza de la terminología médica. Todo ello con un estilo directo, ameno, repleto de datos curiosos sobre la medicina antigua y moderna, sumamente útiles para el estudiante universitario en general, y para el de Medicina en particular.

Puede decirse en conclusión que, aunque en España no tengamos a los alumnos, ya tenemos el manual. Por algo se empieza.

Ana Isabel Martín Ferreira
Universidad de Valladolid
GIR Speculum medicinae
anabel@fyl.uva.es

a Classics Course". *The Classical Journal* 93 (3), 1998, 290–96. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3298183; Tom D. Turmezei, 'The Linguistic Roots of Modern English Anatomical Terminology'. *Clinical Anatomy* 25 (8), 2012, 1015–22. doi:10.1002/ca.22062. Mária Bujalková, "Are the Methods to Use Historical Lexicology (Etymology) in Contemporary Medical Terminology Teaching Reasonable?"*JAHR* 4 (7), 2013, 469–78. http://hrcak.srce.hr/110365. Sema*Özkadif, Selda Kılıç,* y Emrullah Eken, "How Much Latin Terminology Education Is Enough? The Views of Students". *World Applied Sciences Journal* 29 (2), 2014, 239–46. http://www.idosi.org/wasj/wasj29(2)14/15.pdf.

Dániel Kiss, (ed.). *What Catullus wrote: problems in textual criticism, editing and the manuscript tradition*, Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2015, xxx+194 pp., ISBN 978-1-905125-99-9.

L'estrema corruzione del testo di Catullo è cosa nota e già testimoniata da millenni. Gellio ad appena due secoli di distanza lamenta la circolazione di esemplari corrotti (6, 20, 6) con l'inserzione di vari errori ad opera di copisti distratti o ignoranti di cui si lamentano tutti da Cicerone (*Quint.* 3, 5, 6) giù giù fino a Gerolamo (*epist.* 71, 5). Va da sé poi che il succedersi delle copiature comporti il moltiplicarsi degli errori.

Ma la situazione catulliana doveva forse essere più grave di altre se dobbiamo credere alla *subscriptio* del codice *G* (*Sangermanensis*, Par. lat. 14137) il cui copista si scusa con il lettore e chiede venia per il degradazione del testo che comunque è meglio del nulla[1]. La precarietà del testo di Catullo risulta chiaramente dal volume *What Catullus Wrote. Problems in Textual Criticism, Editing and the Manuscript Tradition*, Swansea 2015, curato da D. Kiss, che raccoglie le relazioni di un Convegno tenutosi a Monaco nel maggio del 2011. Tutti i partecipanti si muovono con grande cautela e insistono sul carattere ipotetico di molte delle loro conclusioni, a sostegno delle quali hanno raccolto numerosi indizi, ma nessuna prova certa. Del resto la documentazione ad ora disponibile non consente altro. Emergono tuttavia nuovi elementi di notevole interesse.

Entriamo nel dettaglio. Il volume si apre con l'introduzione di Daniel Kiss che traccia in breve con equilibrio le varie tappe della tradizione manoscritta di Catullo e propone uno stemma largamente condiviso. Segue il contributo dello stesso Kiss, *The Lost* Codex Veronensis *and its Descendants: Three Problems in Catullus's Manuscript Tradition* (pp. 1-27). I tre problemi che si propone di affrontare sono nell'ordine l'identità del codice veronese, il valore dei *recentiores*, le cause della corruzione del testo manoscritto.

Problema I. A proposito del *Veronensis deperditus* Kiss giudica giustamente fantasiosa la ricostruzione di Billanovich così come evidenzia ipotesi incongruenti di altri studiosi, e a sua volta avanza le proprie ipotesi, suggestive certo, ma -lo dice egli stesso a più riprese- tutt'altro che certe:

[1] Tu lector quicumque ad cuius manus hic libellus obuenerit Scriptori da ueniam si tibi coruptus uidebitur, quoniam a corruptissimo exemplari transcripsit; non enim quodpiam aliud extabat, unde posset libelli huius habere copiam exemplandi. Et ut ex ipso salebroso aliquid tantum suggeret decreuit potius tamen coruptum habere quam omnino carere, sperans adhuc ab alliquo alio fortuite emergente hunc posse corigere. Valebis si ei imprecatus non fueris; 1375 mensis octobris 19 º quando Cansignorius laborabat in extremis etc.

p. 5: «it is possible, though of course far from certain»; p. 6: «this is also likely (though by no means certain)»; p. 13: «this suggests (although it does not prove)», ecc. Prova evidente ne è il fatto che Kiss stesso confessa di aver cambiato parere a distanza di brevissimo tempo, per es. a proposito dell'indovinello di Campesani. In un primo momento riteneva di non poter prestar fede all'indovinello di Campesani, quando saluta trionfalmente il ritorno del testo di Catullo da un luogo lontano, perché in contrasto con la testimonianza di Raterio che dice di averlo letto a Verona intorno al 966. Nell'articolo *Benvenuto dei Campesani y el regreso de Catulo a Verona*, in *Ianua Classicorum. Temas y formas del Mundo Clásico*, Madrid 2015, vol. III, pp. 271-278, affaccia l'idea che intorno al 1300 un amanuense forse di nome Francesco scoprì il codice a Verona, lo presentò al pubblico come proveniente da terra lontana per mascherarne la vera origine o aumentare l'importanza della sua scoperta. In seguito alcuni cittadini ritennero che l'evento dovesse essere celebrato in maniera adeguata da un poeta di prim'ordine e fecero ricorso al vicentino Campesani che offrì una falsa versione perché non informato sui fatti. Ma -aggiunge ora- la scoperta, già per sé eccezionale, non aveva bisogno di essere enfatizzata, per cui «the only plausible explanation for such a deceit would be that the manuscript had been acquired illicitly, and its real origins had to be kept secret» (p. 9). Anche questo però non è del tutto convincente in un'epoca che non riservava particolare interesse ai beni librari. Ecco perciò la nuova ipotesi contenuta in questo intervento: non ci sono prove che Campesani non dica la verità: il manoscritto di Catullo potrebbe essere rimasto a Verona fino al momento in cui l'ha letto Raterio (966 d. C. circa), poi uscito dalla città e di nuovo ritornato a somiglianza delle vicissitudini dei codici giunti fino a noi (per es. il codice *Oxoniensis* (*O*) è ora a Oxford; il *Sangermanensis* (*G*) scritto a Verona è ora conservato nella biblioteca Nazionale di Parigi; *R* (*Ottobonianus*) scritto a Firenze è ora nella biblioteca apostolica vaticana, tutti e tre, e molti altri ancora, si sono mossi dal loro luogo d'origine). Come sempre tutto plausibile, ma indimostrabile.

Problema II. Quanto ai *codices recentiores* Kiss intende fornire una risposta all'ultima delle tre domande che pone Reeve nella sua recensione alla edizione di Thomson del 1978 («Phoenix» 34, 1980, pp. 179-184): «And are there any passages where the correct reading is conserved by *O* alone?» (p. 10). Secondo Kiss ci sarebbe un solo passo in cui *O* presenta la lezione corretta (68b, 66); due passi in cui è affiancato da un *recentior* (61, 102 e 66, 55); un passo in cui è affiancato da due *recentiores* (57, 7), il che dimostrerebbe l'imperizia dello scriba di *O* e che tutti i *recentiores* presi in esame derivano da *X*.

Problema III. Già Gellio -si è detto- afferma che al suo tempo (II sec. d. C.) circolavano copie scorrette di Catullo. E questo crediamo che basti ad assicurarci che la corruzione del testo risale alle fasi più antiche della sua trasmissione. Non servono altre prove («we need further evidence to reach more secure conclusions», p. 15), ma ogni indagine puntuale arricchisce la

nostra conoscenza delle vicissitudini del testo. A questo fine Kiss compara il testo del c. 62 contenuto nel *Thuaneus*, codice del IX sec. (per la precisione del *Thuaneus* più le note di Parrasio e Petreio che dovevano essere contenute nel *Sannazarius*, copia dell'antologia posseduta da Sannazzaro e perduta nel XVI sec.), con quello di *OGR*. Vi individua tre tipi di corruttela: quelle comuni a *T*(*S*)*OGR*, quelle solo di *OGR*, quelle solo di *T*(*S*). Prende in considerazione i primi due gruppi per vedere quali errori vengono dalla fonte comune a *T*(*S*)*OGR* e quali si insinuano successivamente nella tradizione veronese, «though on rare occasions it is hard to tell whether the correct reading has been conserved in (*S*)*T* or in *OGR*» (p. 16). Risultato: i numerosi errori comuni suggeriscono che le due tradizioni non fossero separate almeno fino all'VIII secolo (contro l'ipotesi di Della Corte, *L'altro Catullo*, in Id., *Due studi catulliani*, Genova 1951, pp. 1-102, rist. in Id, *Opuscula* II, Genova 1972, pp. 165-266, accolta da Bardon nella sua edizione teubneriana del 1973, p. XV, di una tradizione indipendente da *V*). Non tutti i passi trascelti per dimostrare l'assunto ci sembrano però egualmente convincenti. Ad es. in 62, 11 *TOGR* leggono *aequalis* (vocativo plurale) corretto in *aequales* da Partenio. Ma questo *aequalis* bisogna proprio considerarlo un errore? Sappiamo che il nominativo plurale funge anche da vocativo e che Varrone (*ling.* 8, 66) attesta, per i temi in *-i*, l'esistenza di nominativi plurali in *-is*: *sine reprehensione uulgo alii dicunt… in multitudinis hae puppis restis et hae puppes restes* (cfr. per questa alternanza A. Ernout, *Morphologie historique du latin*, Paris 1974[3], p. 54). Agnesini (*Il carme 62 di Catullo. Edizione critica e commento*, a cura di A. A., Cesena 2007, pp. 210-211), non unico, la ritiene lezione corretta e mette a testo *aequalis* (al v. 11 e anche al v. 32 dove *-is* si trova solo in *T*, non in *OGR*) come arcaismo che potrebbe essere consono «al contenuto liturgico del carme». Egualmente è difficile considerare errore comune *comprendis* del v. 35 (*Hespere, mutato comprendis nomine Eous*: *comperendis T*, *comprendis O*, *comprehendis G R*), corretto da Baehrens (*Catulli Veronensis liber, volumen prius*, Lipsiae 1876, p. XLIII e *Catulli Veronensis liber, volumen alterum*, Lipsiae 1885, *ad loc.*) in *deprendis*. Nessun codice ha *deprendis*, non ci sono ragioni semantiche o metriche coercitive per la correzione, anzi per qualcuno (G. P. Goold, *A new text of Catullus*, «Phoenix» 12, 1958, p. 96) *comprendis* sarebbe da difendere come *lectio difficilior*. La spiegazione paleografica offerta da Baehrens per il corrotto *eosdem* di fine verso è certamente plausibile: *comprendis* errato si insinua nel testo al posto di *deprendis*, il copista corregge con un *de* soprascritto che poi slitta a fine verso e determina la forma *eospem* di *T*, *eosdem* di *OGR*, sanata da Schrader (1761) con la congettura *Eous*, e tuttavia si basa sull'assioma indimostrabile che *comprendis* sia errore. Del resto non mancano editori che mettono a testo anche la lezione *eosdem* dei codici sebbene meno efficace (H. Bardon, *Catullus. Carmina*, Stuttgart 1973; F. Della Corte, *Catullo. Le poesie*, a cura di F. D. C., Milano 1977). Qui vale il criterio del 'consenso della

comunità scientifica' chiarito dal contributo successivo di Biondi: «'a' reading becomes 'the' reading only if all editors, or at least most of them, agree on considering such reading as 'the' reading. And this until a new and better one emerges and is accepted by the consensus of scholars» (p. 38).

Tutti gli errori presenti nel c. 62 sono esaminati nel tentativo di spiegarne l'origine. Viene spontaneo però chiedersi perché siano stati esclusi dall'analisi i casi in cui *OGR* hanno la lezione corretta contro l'errore di *T*: potrebbe forse esserci materiale per ulteriori riflessioni sui rivoli della tradizione e della contaminazione. Come hanno corretto *OGR*?: da altro codice perduto? per congettura? Anche queste -è ovvio- domande destinate in ogni caso, salvo qualche ritrovamento miracoloso, a rimanere senza risposta.

L'articolo di Giuseppe Gilberto Biondi ('*Catullus, Sabellico [& Co.] and… Giorgio Pasquali*', pp. 29-52) verte sull'apporto che ci può venire per la ricostruzione del testo di Catullo dalle prime edizioni a stampa e dai testi umanistici. Ha innanzitutto impegno metodologico a partire da un'affermazione di Giorgio Pasquali: «Quel che si dice qui di manoscritti recenti vale nello stesso modo di collazioni umanistiche e di edizioni a stampa per le quali siano stati anche soltanto consultati codici ora perduti; tranne che specialmente quest'ultimo genere di testimonianze esige particolari cautele metodiche e ingegno critico, qual è concesso soltanto a pochissimi tra i filologi». Come correttivo all'assoluta soggettività proclamata da Pasquali Biondi propone almeno di distinguere due generi di 'lezione': *lectio scripta* e *lectio impressa*; la prima è una lezione, diffusa dalla stampa, ma già presente su qualche manoscritto precedente l'*editio princeps* (1472), la seconda, assente per quanto ne sappiamo nei codici, compare la prima volta in un testo stampato. La distinzione è utile perché «there is just a slightly greater chance that the *impressa lectio* will be a (new) conjecture, and the *scripta* an (ancient) transmitted reading» (p. 30), conservata da codici per noi perduti[2]. Risultati complessivi e 'certi' si potranno raggiungere solo quando tutti i codici recenziori e le prime edizioni a stampa saranno digitalizzati, per ora ci si deve limitare a sporadici sondaggi, tuttavia non privi di utilità giacché *lectiones* ritenute *impressae*, cioè congetture, a volte risultano *scriptae* (con le relative conseguenze almeno sulla storia della tradizione del testo). Così ad esempio Catull. 10, 30 è tramandato in *OGR cuma est grauis*, tutte le edizioni moderne hanno *Cinna est Gaius*, correzione attribuita concordemente a Puteolano nell'edizione parmense del 1473, ma *Cinna* figura in almeno quattro codici precedenti tale data (pp. 31-32). L'analisi di Biondi si concentra poi su alcuni *loci* del testo catulliano irrimediabilmente corrotti nei codici pozio-

[2] Si può aggiungere a conferma di questa terminologia in questo stesso volume (p. 81 n. 61) il commento di Palladio a Catull. 34, 3: «sed lector aduerte, quod in nouis **codicibus** tam **impressis** quam **manuscriptis** deest tertius uersus, quem nos in uetustiore exemplari inuentum suo loco audacter reposuimus».

ri, corretti grazie all'intervento di Sabellico e Avanzi. La scelta non è casuale: Sabellico è tradizionalmente ritenuto l'umanista che meno di tutti gli altri ha studiato Catullo, spesso sprovveduto, autore di congetture assurde, Avanzi di contro è *vir Catullianissimus*, dedito al veronese per tutta la vita, ricco di interventi risolutivi il più delle volte ricavati -ci dice- da *codices antiqui*, quindi da *lectiones scriptae* che in effetti talora figurano anche in codici giunti fino a noi anteriori al 1495, data delle prime *Emendationes*. Nel Catullo di Avanzi Biondi va dunque alla ricerca di lezioni ignorate o scartate dai contemporanei, tuttavia probabili *lectiones scriptae* (p. 34).

Per brevità sintetizzo due soli esempi. Nel carme 16, 9-10 tutti gli editori moderni leggono *et quod pruriat incitare possunt, / non dico pueris, sed his pilosis*, Avanzi ha invece, nelle seconde *Emendationes* del 1500, *hispidosis* che migliora l'esegesi e -l'ha dimostrato A. Agnesini, *Catull. 16, 10:* hispidosis, *una probabile lezione negletta*, «Vichiana» 11, 2009, pp. 244-257- è anche *lectio scripta* (pp. 248-250). *A fletu* in 66, 63 (*uuidulam a fletu cedentem ad templa deum me,* detto della chioma di Berenice che ascende al cielo) è concordemente ritenuto congettura di Palladio, ma il primo a mettere in campo *fletu* è proprio Avanzi, nelle prime *Emendationes*, che commenta «codex meus habet *uuidulum a fletu cedentem ad templa decume* sed non video sensum», si tratta quindi di lezione meccanica e non di congettura (p. 43) e così via. Possiamo aggiungere, a proposito di 66, 63, che il codice *Bononiensis 2621*, datato 1412, trascritto e studiato da G. B. Pighi (*Catulli codex Bononiensis 2621*, Bologna 1950), nell'interlinea sopra a *a fluctu cede-* legge *a fletu uel a luctu*. La aggiunta è della seconda mano, probabilmente quindi di Ermolao Barbaro che annotava il codice tra il 1471 e il 1482, cioè in epoca precedente le *Emendationes*. Accanto alla dichiarazione di Avanzi, dunque anche quest'altra testimonianza di *a fletu* farebbe propendere per una *lectio scripta* che circolava in quel periodo. Inoltre pure *a luctu*, ritenuto congettura di Baehrens (*Catulli Veronensis liber*, *volumen prior*, *cit.*), doveva essere piuttosto frequente in quel tempo probabilmente come *lectio scripta*, all'insaputa di Baehrens stesso.

E ancora un'osservazione marginale a partire dal *Bononiensis 2621*. *Impetum tardis* di *OGR* nel carme del faselo (4, 3 *neque ullius natantis impetum trabis / nequisse praeterire*) è sanato in tutte le edizioni critiche moderne con l'Avanzi delle prime *Emendationes* (*natantis impetum trabis*), ma Avanzi stesso si mostra incerto e nella seconda Aldina (1515) stampa *natantis impetum ratis*: entrambe le lezioni, *trabis* e *ratis*, figurano sempre nel *Bononiensi 2621*, soprascritte, sempre dalla seconda mano, a *tardis* e introdotte da *uel*. L'ignorato *ratis* (variante non citata in nessun apparato), probabile *lectio scripta*, meriterebbe qualche considerazione in più come poetismo epico. *Ratis,* attestato in Nevio (64 Bl. *Conferre queant ratem aeratam / qui per liquidum mare sudantes / eunt atque sedentes*) ed Ennio (384-385 V.^{2} = 377-378 Sk. *uerrunt extemplo placidum mare: mar-*

more flauo/caeruleum spumat sale conferta rate pulsum; 497-498 V.[2] = 515-516 Sk. *ratibusque fremebat / imber Neptuni*), frequente nell'*Eneide* (23 volte[3] contro due sole occorrenze di *trabs*[4]), si trova anche in un altro passo catulliano (64, 121-122 *aut ut uecta rati spumosa ad litora Diae / uenerit*, detto di Arianna trasportata dalla nave di Teseo)[5]. In questo caso dunque l'oscillazione di Avanzi nella scelta delle lezioni tra un'edizione e l'altra (viene da pensare -dice provocatoriamente Biondi proprio a proposito di questo carme- di essere di fronte a cinque editori diversi, cfr. p. 34) potrebbe essere ampiamente giustificata[6].

Quanto a Sabellico il sondaggio di Biondi mostra che è anch'egli studioso di acuto ingegno. Talvolta i suoi interventi sono molto arditi ed insostenibili, come *nunc aite* invece di *nuntiate* in 11, 15 (*pauca nuntiate meae puellae / non bona dicta*) e *uesca* anziché *uestra* in 29, 13 (*ut ista uestra diffututa mentula*). Tuttavia anche in questi casi Sabellico «gives proof of imagination and creativity, which are not sufficient, but are certainly necessary qualities for scientific research. These two examples give some indication of the fact that Sabellico, who must have perceived Catullus's taste for archaisms…, looks for conjectures that could have an archaic flavour (this is what he thinks when he conjectures *aite*) or which could sound like rare words (see *uesca*). The outcome is clearly poor, but these are not methodological mistakes, since the first conjecture moves towards the direction of the *usus scribendi*, and the second one towards that of the *lectio difficilior*» (pp. 45-46). Non è dunque per nulla paradossale la conclusione: «statistically speaking, the number of Sabellico's emendations and conjectures in Catullus turns out be just 20 (in over two thousand lines by Catullus): starting from what he is today given credit for, Sabellico might even be considered the one who, more than any other humanist scholar, hit the nail on the head in the passages he studied» (p. 46).

L'analisi strettamente storico-filologica di corruzioni e correzioni testuali dà occasione a Biondi di finissime analisi stilistiche. Citiamo a mo' di esempio Catull. 59, 4: *cum deuolutum ex igne prosequens panem*. Nelle prime *Emendationes* Avanzi contrappone alla lezione di vari testimoni quella del *codex suus*: *quum deuolutas igne prosequens partes*, che poi rigetterà, ma scrive Biondi: «I think that *partes* makes the whole scene much more

[3] *Aen.* 1, 43; 2, 25; 3,192; 4, 53; 4, 540; 4, 593; 5, 8; 5, 36; 5, 272; 5, 655; 5, 868; 6, 302; 6, 492; 7, 197; 7, 291; 8, 107; 9, 78; 9, 109; 10, 165; 10, 295; 10, 300; 10, 653; 10, 678.

[4] *Aen.* 3, 190-191 *hanc quoque deserimus sedem paucisque relictis / uela damus uastumque caua trabe currimus aequor* e 4, 566-567 *iam mare turbari trabibus saeuasque uidebis / conlucere faces.*

[5] Sulla storia e sul valore del termine cfr. E. de Saint-Denis, *Sens et évolution sémantique de* ratis *en latin classique*, «LEC» 14, 1946, pp. 55-63; C. De Meo, *Lingue tecniche del latino*, Bologna 2005[3], pp. 252-253.

[6] Non si può neppure escludere che *ratis* sia una glossa insinuatasi nel testo.

dynamic, and thus even more grotesque and sarcastic, since the idea suggested by *prosequi partes* is that of an uncontrolled and unseemly movement, while the picture evoked by *prosequi panem* is that of a more limited complex of gestures, according to which *Rufa* would be a more static and predictable target. In conclusion, it seems to me that, thanks to *prosequi partes, Rufa* would be captured as haphazardly picking up everything she can as the *semirasus ustor* is hitting her. The result is a scene that looks more like a farce than a comedy. Such an aspect, then, turns out to be amplified by the ambiguity of the meaning of *prosequi* (generically 'to follow', more specifically 'to attend a funeral, to go with a funeral procession')» (p. 42). Ancora a proposito di *a fletu*, precedentemente citato: «a *fletu*, construed *apo koinou*, would connect both *uuidulam* (*a fletu uuidulam* = agent) and *cedentem* (*a fletu cedentem* = 'place' from which); *cedentem* is, in turn, syntactically connected to *ad templa* (*ad templa cedentem* = place to which). Thus, the *ordo uerborum* would fit perfectly the spatio-temporal matrix governing the catasterism, which is characterized by two *topoi* (*de uertice* [scil. *reginae*] and *ad templa deum*) and one single time frame: the present participle *cedentem* (predicative of *me posuit*), which is almost a semantic oxymoron (*pono* is static, while *cedo* is dynamic). The lock is set in the sky by Venus not only as it is still wet because of the tears of the *comae sorores* (i.e. the remaining locks of the queen), but also while it is still moving: and this is exactly the miracle of catasterism» (pp. 44-45). E molto altro ancora.

Indagini e osservazioni di grandissimo interesse, come si è visto, da molteplici punti di vista, ma la cautela è d'obbligo, al punto che così si conclude l'intervento: «At this stage, then, we could conclude that philological research has reached a point where only general principles can be provided, whithout pretending to set any strict rules or draw up any rigid categories. Every reading, either *manuscripta* or *impressa*, *antiqua* or *noua*, every reading either unanimously accepted or never before taken seriously, must be considered on a case-by-case basis. And it must be evaluated always as a unique case, though always within two sets: on the one hand the entire manuscript tradition of Catullus's *Liber*, and on the other hand the whole community of Catullian scholars… One thing is certain: we will never be able to give scientific proof of the fact that a certain reading matches what Catullus precisely said. But it would be of some value in helping us to determine most of the extant words if we could be able to move just a step closer to 'the' source, which is the goal of textual scholarship. I know that this is a way to defer the whole problem, but at least we could make it a little bit closer to the goal of our scientific research» (pp. 48-49).

Julia Haig Gaisser, che da tempo si occupa della ricezione di Catullo nell'Umanesimo, dedica un lungo contributo a Pontano (*Pontano's Catullus*, pp. 53-91), che ha per Catullo, tra tutti poeti latini, una chiara predilezione. È

Pontano stesso che si presenta come 'nuovo Catullo' in *Phartenopeus* 1, 28 (dabile al 1458), ma già nella sua prima opera, il *Pruritus*, composta appena ventenne nel 1449, l'anno dopo il suo arrivo a Napoli, «he also imitated Catullus – knowledgeably, extensively, and creatively» (p. 54). A testimonianza di ciò la Gaisser propone il primo e l'ultimo carme del *Pruritus* (così almeno come possiamo ricostruirlo oggi), due testi chiaramente programmatici. Nel carme di apertura le allusioni ai Priapea e a Marziale si coniugano con quelle a Catullo. *Nouus libellus* nella stessa sede metrica del *nouum libellum* di Catull. 1, 1 proclama in entrambi i poeti un nuovo modo di fare poesia, per Catullo l'adesione all'alessandrinismo, per Pontano l'adesione a Catullo; *pruritus*, prima parola del carme incipitario di Pontano (*Pruritum feret hic nouus libellus*), evoca Catull. 16, 9-11 (*et quod pruriat incitare possunt / non dico pueris, sed his pilosis / qui duros nequeunt mouere lumbos*)[7]. L'allusione a Catullo 16 ritorna nell'ultimo carme del *Pruritus*, dedicato all'amico Leonte Tomacelli: *Leon, delitium tui poetae, / Nostrum dum legis arrige ad libellum / Cuius nequitiae procaxque lusus / Possunt herniolam senis uoracis / Samarrae patris irrumationum, / Vel siquid mage languidum, incitare*. Sottolineerei ancora, in questi pochi versi, proprio a dimostrazione della grande familiarità di Pontano con Catullo, in primo luogo *delitium tui poetae*, che viene sicuramente da Marziale (1, 7, 1-3 *Stellae delicium mei columba, / Verona licet audiente dicam / uicit, Maxime, passerem Catulli*), il quale però ne denuncia apertamente la matrice catulliana. *Samarrae patris irrumationum* non può non ricordare l'*Aureli, pater esuritionum* di Catullo 21, 1, un componimento scommatico dove figura anche l'unica occorrenza in tutta la latinità del sostantivo *irrumatio* (21, 7-8 *Frustra: nam insidias mihi instruentem / tangam te prior irrumatione*).

Una cosa è certa: Pontano aveva la possibilità di leggere Catullo, o in un manoscritto di sua proprietà o di altri ma facilmente accessibile, a differenza del Panormita, suo maestro, che nel carme 2, 23 dell'*Ermafrodito* (1425) lamenta proprio la difficoltà di reperire il testo del veronese. E tuttavia molti sono gli interrogativi che possono nascere: «Did Pontano bring a Catullus manuscript with him from the north, or did he find one in Naples? Was the manuscript he used for the *Pruritus* his only Catullus, or did he later acquire another? Did he even own a Catullus manuscript at this point, or merely use one belonging to someone else?» (p. 56). In primo luogo potrebbe essere utile sapere se Pontano ha avuto tra le mani il Catullo trascritto da Leonte Tomacelli (*codex Tomacellianus*)[8], l'amico e dedicatario del *Pruritus*. Il

[7] A questo passo e ai suoi rapporti con la poesia epigrammatica latina la Gaisser aveva già dedicato acute osservazioni in *Catullus and his Renaissance Readers*, Oxford 1993, pp. 222-228, ma cfr. anche R. Hartkamp, *Pontano zwischen Catull und Panormita: das Jugendwerk* Pruritus, in Th. Baier (hrsg.), *Pontano und Catull*, Tübingen 2003, pp. 219-233.

[8] Il *codex Tomacellianus* appartiene a un privato, cfr. D. Kiss, *The Codex Tomacellianus*, «Paideia» 68, 2013, pp. 689-711.

manoscritto contiene Tibullo, Properzio e Catullo; Tibullo redatto da un copista, Lutius, prima del 1440, Properzio e Catullo copiati da Leonte stesso tra il 1440 e il 1453/54, data della sua morte. Lo stretto rapporto di amicizia tra i due, entrambi anche cultori di Catullo, induce a formulare qualche ipotesi: 1) Pontano studied Leonte's manuscript of Catullus as he composed the *Pruritus*; 2) Pontano had a manuscript of Catullus that Leonte used as his exemplar; 3) the two simply shared an interest in Catullus and neither relied on a manuscript owned by the other (p. 58). Di contro a Kiss che preferisce la seconda ipotesi, la Gaisser sarebbe più incline alla prima. La questione resta aperta. In ogni caso Leonte, morto giovane, lascia in eredità al fratello Marino, che già possedeva Tibullo, la sua copia di Properzio e Catullo. Di Marino Pontano fu amico per più di cinquanta anni e sicuramente proprio quel testo fu accessibile a lui per tutta la vita.

La Gaisser si impegna poi a mostrare come di Catullo Pontano sia stato non solo imitatore, ma anche studioso ed esegeta. Forse anche grazie all'amicizia con Tito Strozzi, incontrato a Ferrara nel 1451, già affermato autore di elegie sulla scia di Tibullo e Properzio e nuovo dedicatario del *Pruritus*, Pontano nel 1460 copia i testi di Tibullo e Properzio in due manoscritti ancora conservati (p. 59). Di Catullo esplicitamente non sappiamo nulla, se non che ad un certo punto della sua vita ne possedeva e annotava una copia andata perduta pochi anni dopo la sua morte. Per ricostruirne le vicende e la fisionomia non resta altra via che cercarne le testimonianze indirette. Percorrendo questa strada la Gaisser giunge ad alcuni risultati importanti. L'esistenza del manoscritto di Pontano corredato di note è testimoniata da tre lettere di Summonte a Colocci (pp. 59-61). Per recuperarne le lezioni e le esegesi la Gaisser collaziona tre testi che citano espressamente gli interventi di Pontano. Si tratta delle note ascritte a Pontano da Francesco Pucci nel 1502 a margine della sua edizione reggiana di Catullo, Tibullo e Properzio del 1481 (pp. 62-64), del manoscritto di Basilio Zanchi a suo dire diligentemente tratto dall'esemplare di Pontano (pp. 64-67) e delle congetture attribuite a Pontano da Achille Stazio nel suo commento a Catullo del 1566 (pp. 67-71). Ma anche questo cammino è accidentato e tortuoso. Ad esempio l'originale di Pucci è andato perduto, ne esistono numerose copie (18 ne ha trovate la Gaisser), variamente ampliate o ridotte, per cui risulta difficile stabilire quali attribuzioni siano degne di fede, Zanchi è molto meno scrupoloso di quanto dichiari, Stazio pubblica la sua opera circa 20 anni dopo l'ultimo 'avvistamento' del manoscritto di Pontano. E in ogni caso non c'è concordia tra i tre autori: Stazio attribuisce a Pontano 13 interventi sul testo catulliano, questi tutti tranne uno (67, 32) sono citati almeno in una copia delle note di Pucci, solo 5 si trovano anche nel manoscritto di Zanchi. Insomma un percorso assai tormentato in cui è difficile districarsi. L'indagine consente comunque di far risalire a Pontano intepretazioni di solito attribuite per esempio al Poliziano come la lettura oscena dei carmi del passero e la restituzione delle asprirate nel c. 84 (pp. 71-

72). Attraverso lo studio dei due manoscritti di Properzio e Tibullo arrivati fino a noi la Gaisser prova a immaginare anche l'aspetto 'fisico' del Catullo di Pontano. È probabile che le annotazioni, come in Tibullo e Properzio, fossero scritte in forma di triangolo rovesciato con un piccolo ghirigoro all'apice. «Verses are often marked with a wavy line surmounted by three dots; frequently the passages so marked express truism or generic sentiments» (pp. 72-73). Quanto al contenuto dovevano essere presenti note varie storiche, geografiche, mitologiche e soprattutto metriche, molto più che in Tibullo e Properzio, dato che i metri di Catullo costituivano una grande difficoltà per gli umanisti (pp. 72-76).

Tuttavia siamo ancora sul piano delle ipotesi. Emerge però chiaramente la figura di Pontano acuto studioso di Catullo, capace di individuare i problemi testuali e proporre soluzioni ingegnose, di commentare con piena competenza la lingua catulliana. Il che nuovamente mostra quanto possa riuscire utile riconsiderare le ricerche linguistiche e filologiche degli Umanisti.

Antonio Ramirez de Verger, *Nicolaus Heinsius's Notes on Catullus* (pp. 93-106) segnala la necessità di riflettere su edizioni e commenti dal XVI al XVIII sec. per evitare il rischio di false attribuzioni, di ripetizioni, di omissioni. Per conto suo passa in rassegna le osservazioni di Heinsius, contenute negli *Adversaria* e nelle note scritte a mano sulla sua copia dell'*Aldina* del 1515. Si sofferma su un certo numero di varianti, alcune delle quali del tutto ignorate dalle edizioni moderne, per la precisione quelle di 25, 5; 8, 4; 10, 34; 55, 17; 64,21; 66, 45; 83, 6. Solo però in 66, 45 i codici poziori mostrano una palese corruzione, in tutti gli altri casi la *concordia codicum* offre lezioni accettabili, decidere è quindi tutt'altro che facile. Il verso 45 del carme 66 è tramandato da *OGR* nella forma priva di senso *cum Medi propere nouum mare*, *cumque iuuentus / per medium classi barbara nauit Athon*. Heinsius rifiuta *irrupere* dell'Aldina a favore di *rupere* sulla base di manoscritti e dell'*incipit* di Valerio Flacco (*rumpere cursum*), da lui edito e commentato (1702, p. 161). Tra i moderni non manca chi mette a testo *rupere* (Palmer 1896, pp. XLVI e 54; Schuster 1949; Pighi 1961 e 1974 ecc.; cfr. anche J. M. Trappes-Lomax, *Catullus. A Textual Reappraisal*, Swansea 2007, p. 212), la maggioranza invece preferisce *peperere* sulla base di η(codici recenziori scritti poco dopo il 1460). Certo nel contesto il terrore e la forza brutale sia di *rupere* sia di *irrupere* danno vigore al verso, *peperere* è forse più banale e comune, però risponde esattamente al dato storico, cioè all'impresa di Serse che fece tagliare l'istmo del monte Athos creando un 'nuovo mare'. Aggiungiamo che l'uso di *peperere è* già enniano *ann.* V.² = 435-436 Sk. *Noenu decet mussare bonos qui facta labore / nixi militiae peperere* e *frag. var.* 7 V.² *nam tibi munimenta mei peperere labores*. Buone ragioni dunque si possono portare a favore di tutte e tre le varianti. Lo stesso discorso vale in genere per altri passi studiati da Ramirez, dove spesso egli, dopo un'approfondita e fine analisi, riconosce la difficoltà

di scegliere. Così ad esempio per il carme 55, il carme della strenua ricerca dell'introvabile Camerio che -dicono le etere del portico di Pompeo- *en, hic in roseis latet papillis* (v. 12). Al v. 17 (*num te lacteolae tenent puellae?*) Heinsius, al posto del tradito *puellae*, propone dubitosamente *papillae,* ma già prima di lui il termine figurava nell'edizione commentata di Palladio del 1496, in Petreio (1528), in Dousa padre (1581). A sostegno della proposta di Heinsius Ramirez si sofferma sull'aggettivo *lacteolus* che risulta attributo consueto in greco e in latino per il seno, meno frequente per le fanciulle (pp. 98-100). Interessante anche il cenno alla presenza di entrambi i nessi, *lacteoleae papillae* e *lacteolae puellae*, nella poesia di Pontano (p. 104, n. 19), che credo, però, non dimostri nulla più della grande dimestichezza di Pontano con Catullo e forse anche l'alternarsi delle due *iuncturae* in codici catulliani per noi perduti, per quanto *lacteolae papillae* potrebbe essere creazione di Pontano poeta. Alcuni minimi indizi portati da D. Kiss, *Two Humanistic Conjectures in Catullus: 55.17* papillae *and 61.140* soli, «ExClass» 17, 2013, pp. 63-68, non mi sembrano sufficienti a fare di *lacteolae papillae* una congettura proprio di Pontano. Ulteriore argomento a favore di *lacteolae… papillae* è per Ramirez il fatto che «the term *puellae* with no pejorative adjective attached would be too elevated for the type of woman depicted in the poem» (p. 100). Senza spingerci con Morelli (*Quel che scrisse Catullo*, «Paideia» 71, 2016, p. 683, n. 57) a ritenere che nel finale Catullo intenda 'nobilitare' le ragazze «quasi come se a 'rapirlo' fossero state fanciulle meravigliose o mitiche Naiadi degne del canto del poeta», l'attenuazione del tono polemico potrebbe valere a blandirle per ottenere un aiuto nello smascheramento dell'amico, e, in ogni caso, il *lacteolae puellae* del v. 17 non cancella il *pessimae* del v. 10. Come in altri casi esegesi parzialmente diverse ed egualmente accettabili si possono portare a sostegno dell'una o dell'altra lezione[9]. A questo punto sembra quasi d'obbligo citare la spiritosa riflessione di Biondi a proposito di 59, 4: «I conclude with the opinion that: 's'i' fosse fuoco, arderei 'l mondo; / Catullo fossi *partes* scriverei; / poiché Gilberto tu soltanto sei / *panem* nel testo metti chiaro e tondo» (pp. 42-43). La stessa prudenza contraddistingue tutto il contributo di Ramirez, utilissimo per ricostruire la storia del testo, per evidenziare l'acutezza dei rilievi di Heinsius, per segnalare che molte delle sue scelte risalgono ad autori precedenti, per indurre a riconsiderare sul piano filologico ed esegetico passi che già avevano polarizzato anche l'attenzione degli umanisti.

Dello stesso tipo il saggio di D. Butterfield, Cui videberis bella: *the Influence of Baehrens and Housman on the Text of Catullus*, pp. 107-128, che ci porta più avanti nel tempo, al termine della grande stagione della

[9] Ad es. a Catull. 8, 4 per l'alternativa *ducebat* / *dicebat* Ramirez stesso riconosce, pur difendendo *ducebat*, la difficoltà di scegliere tra le due proposte, ma va ricordato che di *dicebat* non c'è traccia nei codici.

filologia ottocentesca. Butterfield presenta i due personaggi in tutta la loro grandezza e diversità di studiosi e di uomini con un'interessante apertura anche alle loro opposte esperienze personali. Baehrens, precoce e prolifico studioso di Catullo (*Analecta* 1874; edizione 1876; commento 1885), meritevole di aver intuito l'importanza del codice O scoperto da Ellis e di aver compiuto l'operazione di *recensio* della tradizione catulliana, fu poi oggetto di critiche riduttive e riguardato di solito con poco favore dagli studiosi successivi (cfr. schema delle congetture segnalate e adottate a p. 117), forse anche perché «Baehrens' work suffered a thunderous blow in having as the posthumous editor of his text K. P. Schulze, a scholar famed for neither his critical nor his codicological abilities. Of Baehrens' many conjectures in Catullus, Schulze's 1893 edition adopted only six» (p. 116). Di contro Housman, giunto tardi e quasi dal nulla all'University College di Londra nel 1892 e poi a Cambridge nel 1911, di Catullo non ha mai fatto l'edizione, ha pubblicato solo due articoli e due recensioni, una all'edizione di Schulze e l'altra a quella di Ellis, ma al di là della fama grandissima derivatagli da altri suoi studi (vd. edizione e commento di Manilio), anche l'apporto al testo di Catullo è ancora oggetto di discussione. Si tratta dunque di due studiosi di altissimo valore sul cui operato è opportuno tornare a riflettere.

Quanto al primo Butterfield esamina due passi per cui la correzione di Baehrens è generalmente entrata nei testi di oggi (64, 215 e 350, pp. 110-112) e tre congetture sottovalutate (44, 16-17; 76, 9-10; 116, 7, pp. 112-116), che tutte rivelano in vario modo l'ingegno dell'autore. Gli interventi di Housman -come si diceva per la maggior parte inediti- si recuperano dai testi della sua biblioteca personale ora custoditi in luoghi diversi, in particolare dalle note sulle sue copie delle edizioni di Ellis (1878) e di Schwabe (1886) e dai corsi sui *carmina docta* (escluso il 63) tenuti a Cambridge dal 1911 al 1936 e lì conservati, ricchi di spunti testuali ed esegetici. Utilissimo materiale per editori e commentatori finora trascurato (solo Goold pare se ne sia in parte servito per la revisione del testo della Loeb). Tra tutto questo materiale Butterfield individua due congetture, 64, 324 e 64, 282, estremamente convincenti ed economiche per lo più accettate dagli studiosi, e altre cinque inedite: 10, 30; 29, 20; 66, 66; 68, 155-156; 114, 6, più o meno persuasive, ma comunque prova tangibile dell'acume del critico. Resta -è ovvio- la necessità di procedere con estrema cautela, specie di fronte a uno studioso particolarmente incline alla congettura come era Baehrens.

L'ultimo articolo, *Poems 62, 67 and Other Catullian Dialogues* (pp. 129-155) di S. J. Heyworth analizza dal punto di vista strutturale, stilistico e intertestuale quattro carmi (10, 45, 62 e 67) a forma dialogica, connotati da ripetizioni che -argomenta l'autore- potrebbero essere la causa di alcuni guasti della tradizione. A volte le proposte di correzione, seppure presentate con la dovuta cautela, appaiono piuttosto forzate: così a 10, 25-27 (*'quaeso', inquit 'mihi, mi Catulle, paulum / istos commoda: nam uolo ad Serapim*

/ deferri') l'idea che *mihi* possa essere retto da *inquit* è in sé accettabile, ma determina interventi un po' troppo invasivi sul successivo testo tradito. Per quanto riguarda l'analisi e la ricostruzione di 66, 93-94 (p. 136) ci si aspetterebbe almeno un cenno alla ampia e puntuale discussione di Marinone (*Berenice da Callimaco a Catullo*, a cura di N. M., Bologna 1997², pp. 221-233). I problemi affrontati sono in ogni caso molto complessi e le argomentazioni condotte con rigore e acutezza; assai fini anche le esplorazioni della tecnica poetica catulliana (cfr. ad es. pp. 143-145).

Questa pur breve sintesi è sufficiente a illustrare l'altissimo livello di tutti i saggi raccolti nel volume, saggi tesi a coniugare, all'insegna di una doverosa prudenza, il minuzioso studio della tradizione del testo con l'analisi stilistica. La molteplicità delle suggestioni e delle ipotesi emerse di certo porteranno a riaprire il dibattito su controversi aspetti della trasmissione e dell'edizione del testo catulliano e stimoleranno ulteriori approfondimenti. Non si può non rilevare la grande utilità degli indici, della bibliografia, dell'elenco dei codici che rendono facilmente consultabile un libro certo ponderoso e complesso.

Mariella Bonvicini
Università di Parma
mariella.bonvicini@unipr.it

Virgile. Bucoliques. Texte établi par E. de Saint-Denis. Traduction d'Anne Videau. Introduction, commentaire et annotations d'Hélène Casanova-Robin. Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2014, lviii+296 pp., ISBN 978-2-251-24002-0.

En una reciente colección ("Commentario") de la prestigiosa editorial "Les Belles Lettres" salen estas *Bucólicas* virgilianas, bien traducidas al francés y bien arropadas en un comentario atento a las múltiples facetas de lo literario, recopilador de lo que la crítica anterior ha dejado suficientemente asentado y no falto de apreciaciones originales.

El libro consta de una introducción general (pp. VII-LVIII), en la que se abordan los aspectos fundamentales de la obra: la difícil cuestión de la biografía del poeta, la del género, sus modelos y fundamentos ideológicos, la de la cronología y composición, la de la "arquitectura", y la de los tópicos y el estilo. Sigue el texto bilingüe (sin aparato crítico) de cada uno de los diez poemas, acompañado de su correspondiente comentario (pp. 1-268), en forma de ensayo y no de anotación secuenciada de palabras y versos. Súmanse aún unas parcas notas complementarias (pp. 269-278), una tabla de cronología (pp. 279-280), una bibliografía selectiva (pp. 281-290), y el índice (pp. 291-296).

Paso revista a continuación a las diversas parcelas.

En primer lugar, la introducción general. A propósito de la biografía del poeta, la postura adoptada es, como ya últimamente se impone, la de una cierta cautela ante las *Vitae* antiguas, envueltas en la nebulosa del encomio y la magnificación y salpicadas de elementos maravillosos; y además muchos de los datos que nos ofrecen parecen haberse originado secundariamente, a partir de la reinterpretación historicista y biográfica de noticias ofrecidas por el poeta en su obra. Está bien esta cautela, y por eso, es comprensible que la exposición biográfica en este libro se tiña de dudas y titubeos ("On sait en effet avec une relative certitude...", "mais on n'a pu identifier précisement son statut social", "on pense que son pere...", p. VIII); aunque otras veces, con base en las mismas fuentes, se afirmen las cosas con más rotunda seguridad ("Virgile entama ses études à Mantoue, il les poursuivit à Crémone..."), y aun otras se haga concesión, sin más, a la hipótesis inconcreta ("Quel fut son soutien dans ces années-là? On suppose qu'il fut aidé par un notable du parti césarien", p. VIII). No entiendo bien, en cambio, por qué se deja de lado la autoridad de las biografías (que en ese punto no tienen por qué juzgarse como desviadas) al alumbrar la relación entre Virgilio y Octavio, y por qué se dice tajantemente (aunque se remita a "A. Michel, 1971" como apoyo) que "Virgile n'avait rien d'un poète courtisan" (p. X), explicándose en consecuencia la composición

de la *Eneida* como una decisión emanada sin más del arbitrio del poeta, sin ninguna presión ni imposición externa. Sabemos que hubo postura personal de Virgilio, pero después de una sugerencia de Octavio: ¿por qué dudar de esto?, ¿tal vez porque molesta hoy la idea de un Virgilio subordinado a autoridad alguna? Evidentemente eso no es razón. Quizá haya sido solo por resumir, pero uno tiende fácilmente a pensar que Augusto es silenciado a propósito del viaje último del poeta desde Grecia a Italia (p. XI) solo para no estorbar al aserto previo de que Virgilio no era en modo alguno un poeta cortesano. Y tampoco sé de dónde proviene la afirmación de que en su lecho de muerte el poeta pidió "qu'on ne conservât que certains fragments de l'*Éneide* et qu'on brûlat le reste qu'il jugeait trop imparfait" (p. XI), pues no es eso exactamente lo que dice Donato (*Qui cum gravari morbo sese sentiret, scrinia saepe et magna instantia petivit, crematurus Aeneida: quibus negatis, testamento comburi iussit ut rem inemendatam imperfectamque. Verum Tucca et Varius monuerunt id Augustum non permissurum. Tunc eidem Vario ac simul Tuccae scripta sub ea conditione legavit, ne quid adderent quod a se editum non esset, et versus etiam imperfectos, si qui erant, relinquerent*). Pero, en fin, aparte de notar en esta introducción la presencia de algunos condicionantes y servidumbres de la crítica de nuestro siglo, quiero con mucho más énfasis manifestar mi complacencia al constatar puntos de vista originales y agudas percepciones en las que Hélène Casanova-Robin demuestra equilibrio y mesura en la valoración de las cuestiones tradicionalmente debatidas. Por ejemplo, queda muy oportunamente puesta de relieve (pp. XIII-XVI) la relación del Virgilio bucólico con los versos de Lucrecio en los que se explicaba el fenómeno del eco y el origen de la poesía pastoril, como un canto "intimement lié à la nature et symbolique d'un art de vivre"; y queda muy bien explicada y constatada la arquitectura total de la obra, siguiendo a P. Maury, aunque se extrema debidamente la prudencia a la hora de seguirle en su interpretación simbólica (pp. XXIII-XXX). Bien sintetizada está igualmente la cuestión de la cronología de las distintas piezas (pp. XIX-XXIV), aunque yo creo que se debe abrir la puerta a una posible reedición de la obra en años ulteriores por el propio poeta, a tenor de elementos presentes en ella que difícilmente podrían explicarse si no es en el clima "augústeo" posterior a la batalla de Accio. Y bien está –de acuerdo ya con nuestros hábitos de filólogos clásicos atentos a la tradición de las obras– la somera mirada final a la fortuna de las *Bucólicas*, al menos en la literatura latina posterior, medieval y renacentista (pp. LII-LVIII).

En cuanto al texto latino, reproducción del de Saint-Denis, constato –y es de lamentar– que la traductora y la comentarista han renunciado a ofrecer la más mínima noticia sobre la transmisión y las variantes, dando por hecho sin duda que toda esa información constaba ya en otro lugar (en la antigua ed. bilingüe de Saint-Denis, claro está), u obedeciendo a lo que tal vez sea una imposición de la colección. Pero al menos en *Buc.* VI 77 debe corregirse la

errata *mutatis* por *mutatos*, una errata que, por cierto, afeaba ya el texto de Saint-Denis en su reedición de 1983, pero no en su versión originaria, de 1949 (desgraciadamente, el paso del tiempo no siempre mejora las cosas), y que se reproduce aquí, en una cita que de ese lugar se hace en el comentario (p. 165). Y en cuanto a la traducción (que se debe a Anne Videau), me parece en líneas generales correcta y elegante. No está en verso, pero conserva la línea versal, y en su contención y ajuste al original latino conserva muchas de sus bellezas. No obstante, dejo aquí mi opinión sobre lugares concretos. En I 13 me parece que el adjetivo *aeger* traducido por "malade" orienta al término hacia la enfermedad física más que la anímica –si mi competencia española del francés no me engaña–, y que debería tenerse en cuenta en IX 5 la secuencia *Nunc uicti, tristes, quoniam fors omnia uersat*, paralela de *aeger* por tratarse de la misma situación, para decidir el sentido dado al adjetivo. Aunque se trata de una cuestión totalmente menor, creo que en la traducción del término *capella* se debería ser regular y no ceder a verterlo unas veces como "chèvre" (así en I 13 y 74, VII 3 y IX 23) y otras como "chevrette" (así en II 65, III 96, IV 21 y X 7, 30 y 77), habida cuenta de que en este caso no existe en latín tal opción y *capella* es siempre la cabra (doméstica). En VI 81 creo que se debe mantener en la traducción el signo de interrogación, puesto que los vv. 74-81 conforman una frase interrogativa directa. Me parece plausible, sin embargo, que la traductora se haya atrevido a dar en *consederat* de VII 1 un valor preciso de compañía ("s'était assis auprès de moi") que no se suele encontrar en las otras traducciones, y en esa misma égloga aplaudo también la versión del v. 16 (*et certamen erat, Corydon cum Thyrside, magnum*), fiel al original hasta en el orden de palabras, y al mismo tiempo natural: "et il y avait concours, Corydon contre Thyrsis, grand concours".

Y paso ya a comentar el comentario, que es la parte más estimable, sustancial e importante de este libro. Creo que, en conjunto, proporciona una muy valiosa ayuda para la intelección cabal de cada una de las piezas, y que atiende a la gran gama de cuestiones que afectan a lo literario, tanto las de índole temática como las de índole formal. Pero, puesto que está organizado de forma ensayística, aun con abundancia de epígrafes y divisiones, pierde eficacia cuando lo que se busca es la glosa de un verso o expresión concreta. Por otra parte observo una notoria irregularidad en la estructura y segmentación –no en la extensión– de los comentarios a cada pieza, y de ello nos percatamos con una sola mirada al índice; aunque sin duda la propia materia desarrollada en cada poema –que se sigue siempre como eje para el comentario– justifique en parte tal irregularidad. Encuentro en esta exégesis muchas buenas e inteligentes formulaciones, que son luz verdaderamente para un pasaje determinado o para una pieza entera. Por ejemplo, como conclusión del comentario de la primera égloga, se dice sentenciosa y luminosamente sobre sus últimos versos (p. 38): "Les deux espaces de Mélibée et de Tityre, dont le caractère inconciliable constitue l'armature de toute l'églogue, semblent

ici réunis, le temps d'une vision poétique". E igualmente como fin del comentario a la IX se lee esta frase (p. 243), perspicaz y clarificadora: "Tout au long de l'églogue, les personnages sont répresentés en marche, poussés par un mouvement qui semble les mener hors du lieu bucolique qui n'est pas d'actualité, en direction de la ville...". Los pasajes de contenido metaliterario son objeto de particular atención, y glosados con especial énfasis. Bien señalado está siempre el omnipresente intertexto teocriteo, y aún los otros muchos intertextos, griegos y romanos, de esta poesía esencialmente docta, y al tiempo comprometida. Y hay una especial querencia a la justificación de homofonías y de hechos de la métrica como recursos –de que presuntamente se vale el poeta– para poner de relieve o subrayar o potenciar un determinado contenido; en este punto quiero demorarme un tanto, porque considero que por esta vía se puede llegar y se llega a excesos gratuitos y a una hipercrítica de tono muy subjetivo y que difícilmente podría explicar las intenciones y los hallazgos del creador. ¿Es verdad, de verdad, que, a propósito de la égloga I, "la coupe trihémimere trochaïche au v. 6 souligne le caractère assez solennel de l'interpellation" (p. 17)? ¿O que, en la misma página, "la métrique met ainsi en évidence *deus* au v. 6 devant la coupe et *otia* en clausule"? ¿Es verdad que, en I 19 "la place du terme *Romam* à la coupe 7^{e} semble destinée a révéler l'émotion" (p. 22)? ¿Es verdad que en II 1 (y 73) «les trois césures soulignent la dimension émotionelle de ces vers, tandis que le remplacement des spondées initiaux par des dactyles, au vers 73, contribue à marquer la fin de cette peinture de la passion" (p. 45)? Yo creo que, aunque el hábito de los comentaristas tienda inveteradamente a explicar cada recurso rítmico en íntima dependencia con la materia significativa a la que se asocia, no siempre es así. El ritmo de la poesía se consigue con esos medios, métricos y a veces homofónicos, y esa es su función primaria (y casi me atrevería a decir "autónoma"), pero no siempre estos medios, o más bien muy pocas veces, tienen una función añadida de pregnancia, subrayado o puesta de relieve, del contenido al que van asociados. Cuando eso ocurre en el caso de las homofonías, hay que hablar desde luego de "onomatopeya" y no de "aliteración"; y es verdad que a veces en lo concerniente al orden de palabras, y especialmente en casos de hipérbaton o encabalgamiento, puede haber ejemplos de sinergia contenido-forma debidos a la implícita voluntad del poeta, o a su inspiración inconsciente incluso, y está bien que el comentarista señale esos casos y los alumbre. Pero estoy convencido de que este es un camino por el que los intérpretes corremos el riesgo de hablar más de nuestras propias quimeras que de la obra que deberíamos interpretar. Y a veces basta con catalogar tal o cual fenómeno, coadyuvante al ritmo, sin pretender adivinar la presunta razón del poeta para asociarlo con tal o cual contenido. A pesar de esas citas antes aducidas, donde me parece que puede haber cierto exceso de interpretación, también diré –porque no quiero ensombrecer un comentario que en líneas generales está muy bien delineado– que en otras muchas ocasiones tal tipo de

explicaciones está justificado de forma tan ponderada y razonable que resulta bastante convincente.

Después del comentario, hay unas someras notas complementarias (pp. 269-277), más convencionales (y a menudo un tanto superfluas, porque podían haberse subsumido en el comentario), glosadoras mayormente de términos mitológicos o geográficos, en las que a veces se filtran equivocaciones. Por ejemplo en la nota 5 de la égloga II (p. 270), que explica el término Nais/Naïade, se dice erróneamente: "La nymphe est una divinité aquatique, la naïade est attachée aux bois". O en nota 2 de la égloga V (p. 271), donde se dice de las Dríades, no menos equivocadamente (y no sabemos con base en qué fuentes), que eran "divinités des eaux douces". En descargo de esas equivocaciones hay que decir que en la nota 8 de la égloga VI (p. 272) las Náyades sí que están correctamente definidas como "divinités des eaux douces", contra lo que se decía en los lugares antes citados. Siguiendo por este ámbito de diosas y agua, en la bucólica VII la nota 7 glosa a Galatea como diosa marina, y la nota 8 glosa el término "Nereida", que calificaba a Galatea, como "Petite-fille de Nérée, divinité marine": está claro que ambas notas habrían podido juntarse en una que dijera simplemente que Galatea era una nereida, esto es, una hija de Nereo y Doris. Más equivocación sobre diosas del agua: la Aretusa invocada por el poeta en el primer verso de la égloga X es definida erróneamente (p. 277) como «nymphe marine, fille de Nérée et de Doris...»: no, Aretusa no es ninguna nereida, como cualquier buen diccionario mitológico podrá atestiguar y como queda bien claramente expuesto en el propio comentario a la égloga, pocas páginas antes (pp. 254-255), donde se explica muy bien la conexión de esta ninfa con la Arcadia primero y con Sicilia después. No son, desde luego, lo mejor del libro estas notas.

De la bibliografía, que es selectiva, nada tengo que decir, sino lamentar la ausencia de autores españoles, sea su ausencia por la razón que sea.

El conjunto de la obra, en conclusión, a pesar de los leves desaciertos ya dichos, se nos muestra como una obra provechosa, que ha calado profundamente en la poesía pastoril virgiliana, nos la ha glosado de nuevo con sensibilidad y erudición, y nos ha abierto los ojos para ver en plenitud su mensaje.

Vicente Cristóbal
Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
vcristob@ucm.es

Nicholas Horsfall, *The Epic Distilled: Studies in the Composition of the Aeneid*., Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2016, xv+160 pp. $75.00, ISBN 978-0-19-875887-7.

Il recente volume di Horsfall è di fatto una rielaborazione del saggio pubblicato in italiano dall'autore nel 1991 con il titolo *L'epopea in alambicco*. Sebbene infatti la prefazione ribadisca a più riprese che il nuovo studio non è assolutamente da considerarsi una traduzione inglese dell'*Alambicco*, la struttura del saggio, il numero e il titolo dei capitoli, molti degli esempi discussi e soprattutto il metodo di lavoro di H. restano in larga misura gli stessi, anche se notevolmente arricchiti dall'esperienza dei cinque commenti a libri dell'*Eneide* realizzati dallo studioso inglese tra il 2000 e il 2013[1].

L'approccio di H. al testo dell'*Eneide* consiste essenzialmente in una minuziosa e dettagliata esplorazione delle fonti presumibilmente impiegate da Virgilio, con particolare attenzione agli aspetti storici, geografici, antiquari, religiosi, mitologici ed etnografici. Polemizzando larvatamente con il metodo intertestuale, che fonda il dialogo tra autore e lettore sulla possibilità di cogliere allusioni di tipo prevalentemente (se non esclusivamente) letterario, H. si dichiara più interessato ad altre forme di allusività che presuppongono un' "enciclopedia" comune e condivisa dal poeta e dai lettori dotti di età augustea: molti dettagli materiali come le descrizioni di armi e di abiti, i nomi geografici, i riferimenti a riti religiosi, le tracce di linguaggi tecnici e settoriali costituiscono nell'ottica di H. continue sfide lanciate da Virgilio all'erudizione dei lettori e il compito dell'interprete moderno è quello di ricostruire, nei limiti del possibile, il bagaglio di conoscenze e la biblioteca stessa cui il poeta attingeva durante la composizione della sua opera.

L'attenzione per il dettaglio è senza dubbio la cifra caratterizzante dell'analisi condotta da H., che forse troppo spesso si limita ad accumulare osservazioni dotte su singole parole o singoli versi, osservazioni che restano talvolta irrelate e fanno pensare più a un commento che a un saggio organico[2]. Proprio ai suoi commenti H. rinvia di continuo e in maniera non di rado compendiaria e allusiva: tale scelta, se da un lato si spiega con la volontà di non ripetere considerazioni già fatte, dall'altro rende a tratti difficile seguire il

[1] N. Horsfall, Virgil, *Aeneid* 7. Commentary, Leiden 2000; Virgil, *Aeneid* 11. Commentary, Leiden 2003; Virgil, *Aeneid* 3. Commentary, Leiden 2006; Virgil, *Aeneid* 2. Commentary, Leiden 2008; Virgil, *Aeneid* 6. Commentary, (2 voll.), Berlin 2013.

[2] Di «capitoli allettanti e misteriosi anche se un po' disorganici» parlava anche Geymonat nella sua recensione all'*Alambicco* (*RFIC* 122, 1994, 375), mentre R. Thomas, sempre a proposito del volume pubblicato da H. in italiano, scriveva con maggiore severità «it is a book which never transcends the sum of its parts» (*Vergilius* 39, 1993, 77).

ragionamento, che in molti punti non è "autosufficiente" e richiederebbe una continua consultazione degli altri lavori dell'autore per essere pienamente compreso. Quasi in ogni pagina il lettore si imbatte in affermazioni del tipo «I have discussed it in detail in my note on…» (p. 8) oppure «I am not, however, about to repeat the ample discussion in my commentary *ad loc.*» (p. 131), che conferiscono al discorso un carattere autoreferenziale a tratti fastidioso.

Il peculiare e ricercato stile di scrittura di H. si delinea già nei titoli dei dieci capitoli in cui il libro si divide. In particolare il primo (*To peel the artichoke*, pp. 1-15) riprende l'immagine programmatica della pelatura del carciofo, metafora già impiegata nell'*Alambicco* per illustrare il lento e paziente lavoro necessario a raggiungere il "cuore" della complessa e stratificata tecnica poetica dell'*Eneide* attraverso l'applicazione di una versione aggiornata della critica delle fonti: «… perhaps you could make some progress, towards the succulent heart of the poem, so to speak, by applying an updated form of source-criticism to the twelve books…» (pp. 1-2). Il metodo è esemplificato da una lettura del celebre e problematico passo sul ramo d'oro di *Aen.* 6, 201-211, a proposito del quale H. propone una serie di osservazioni puntuali, soffermandosi in particolare sui presunti legami con i riti di Diana a Nemi, sulle allusioni ai misteri eleusini e su un possibile riferimento all'epigramma introduttivo della *Ghirlanda* di Meleagro, dove il ramo d'oro rappresenta Platone: quest'ultima allusione, come viene ribadito a p. 95, potrebbe essere letta come un segnale dell'influsso esercitato dalla concezione platonica dell'Aldilà sulla costruzione dell'Oltretomba virgiliano. Un po' sbrigativa la discussione sul participio *cunctantem* del v. 211, che esprime la resistenza opposta dal ramo d'oro a Enea, in apparente contraddizione con quanto preannunciato dalla Sibilla a 6, 146-147 (*ipse volens facilisque sequetur/ si te fata vocant*[3]): H. liquida l'incongruenza sostenendo che *cunctantem*, lungi dal sollevare dubbi sull'idoneità di Enea a ricoprire il suo ruolo e a scendere nell'Oltretomba, indicherebbe solo la naturale resistenza di un ramo che è ad un tempo flessibile ma anche fatto d'oro, tanto più che Enea non dispone della forza sovrumana di un Ercole. Chiudono il capitolo due appendici dedicate rispettivamente all'oracolo di Albunea (*Aen.* 7, 81-106) e agli antecedenti storici e figurativi della "parata degli eroi" di *Aen.* 6, 754 ss.

Il secondo capitolo (*Ceaselessly wrangling in the bird-cage of the Muses*, pp. 17-30) tenta di ricostruire ipoteticamente la biblioteca personale di Virgilio a partire sia dalle (scarse) informazioni che abbiamo sulla circolazione e consultazione di libri in età augustea, sia dagli innumerevoli riferimenti ricavabili dall'opera stessa del poeta. Oltre all'ovvia conoscenza di opere letterarie, H. valorizza opportunamente il ruolo svolto dalle fonti prosastiche, come ad esempio testi scientifici (Aristotele e Teofrasto, soprattutto nelle *Georgiche*), letteratura paradossografica, scolii e commenti ai poeti, manuali mitografici.

[3] Segnalo per inciso il refuso *se* in luogo di *si* nella citazione di questo verso a pag. 8.

Il terzo capitolo (*Doctus et lector*, pp. 31-44) enuncia uno dei principi-guida del metodo di H., ovvero l'idea che il poeta dotto esige un lettore altrettanto dotto, capace di raccogliere le "sfide" lanciate da un testo che presuppone un amplissimo ventaglio di competenze erudite nei più svariati ambiti. Non sfugge peraltro a H. il fatto che l'*Eneide*, la cui popolarità e diffusione presso un vasto pubblico è ben attestata da fonti epigrafiche e archeologiche (si pensi alle numerose citazioni virgiliane nei graffiti pompeiani, ma anche in papiri e *ostraca*), potesse essere letta a vari livelli e che certamente non tutti i lettori di Virgilio fossero in grado di cogliere le sottili allusioni contenute nei passi più complessi. La discussione si snoda attraverso una nutrita serie di esempi di cui non è possibile dar conto in dettaglio: si tratta in gran parte di allusioni a questioni di astronomia, genealogia mitica, geografia, nonché casi di riferimenti anonimi a personaggi la cui identificazione risulta problematica e presuppone la conoscenza di tradizioni mitografiche minori.

Il quarto capitolo (*Erudition and invention*, pp. 45-60) affronta la questione dell'originalità di Virgilio in rapporto alla tradizione precedente. Interessanti ad esempio le osservazioni sulle tappe del viaggio di Enea verso l'Italia, che presuppongono un dialogo a distanza con l'*Odissea* nella misura in cui i Troiani spesso si avvicinano a luoghi e personaggi già incontrati da Odisseo, ma li osservano, per così dire, a distanza: «we will pass shortly to Virgil's ingenious means of distancing Aeneas from Odysseus' adventures, and 'seeing from not far away' will emerge as a preferred technique of non-involvement: we avoid unwelcome 'replays' of the same episodes…» (p. 48). H. si sofferma poi su due personaggi inventati da Virgilio ma tributari di varie tradizioni precedenti, letterarie e non, ovvero il naufrago Achemenide (nel quale si riconosce, tra gli altri, il modello del Filottete sofocleo) e la vergine guerriera Camilla, che richiama a un tempo figure leggendarie della storia di Roma come Clelia e figure mitologiche come le Amazzoni. Anche nel capitolo quinto (*The invention of myth*, pp. 61-77) sono raccolti molti casi in cui Virgilio innova o arricchisce la tradizione mitologica precedente con elementi provenienti da contesti diversi: tra gli esempi più interessanti si può citare il motivo, proveniente dalle *ktìseis* greche, della fondazione come ritorno a una patria originaria, ben presente nella rappresentazione del viaggio dei Troiani da oriente verso occidente o la re-interpretazione di Enea come eroe compiutamente epico, raggiunta sia attraverso il ridimensionamento di aspetti negativi del personaggio presenti nella tradizione omerica (i suoi infelici combattimenti con Achille e Diomede), sia attraverso la valorizzazione della sua vicinanza rispetto a Ettore. Chiude il capitolo un'appendice dedicata ai cosiddetti *insolubilia* mitologici, ovvero casi in cui non è possibile spiegare l'origine di certi epiteti o di riferimenti a episodi e personaggi che restano per noi oscuri.

Nel sesto capitolo (*Inconsistencies*, pp. 79-94) H. si sofferma su casi di incoerenze e contraddizioni interne all'*Eneide*, molte delle quali già

notate dai commentatori antichi, che spesso le riconducono allo stato di incompiutezza del poema. H. tende giustamente a minimizzare alcune di queste incongruenze e in generale si mostra scettico circa la possibilità che Virgilio in sede di revisione finale avrebbe eliminato ogni contraddizione interna: «the poet had never seriously intended to spend a few years on 'ironing out' the inconsistencies so far identified» (p. 93). In alcuni casi è possibile che il poeta rifletta un'incertezza delle sue fonti, come quando a breve distanza definisce Diomede Etolo (*Aen.* 10, 28) e poi Argivo (11, 243), provenienze entrambe attestate dalla tradizione. Anche la duplice discendenza dei re di Alba Longa, ricondotti a Enea e Creusa in *Aen.* 1, 267 ss. e a Enea e Lavinia in *Aen.* 6, 760 ss. si spiegherebbe con un'oscillazione delle fonti annalistiche. L'unico caso in cui H. ammette una vera e propria incoerenza, che Virgilio avrebbe probabilmente eliminato nella revisione finale, è quello delle due versioni discordanti sulla morte di Palinuro in 5, 827 ss. e 6, 337 ss. D'altra parte lo stesso H. riconosce che alcuni libri, ad esempio il terzo, rivelano uno stato di maggiore incompiutezza rispetto ad altri («some books, and/or some parts of some books, were left in a higher state of finish, or polish, or accuracy, than others: *Aen.* 3, for example, does seem to need quite a lot of revision», p. 81): è dunque possibile che i casi di incongruenze non volute e dovute alla mancanza dell'ultima mano siano più numerosi di quanto H. sia disposto a concedere.

Il capitolo settimo (*Signposts by the wayside*, pp. 95-110) è dedicato all'analisi di alcuni 'segnali' linguistici che alludono a una fonte specifica o indicano più in generale il tono e la *Stimmung* prevalente di un determinato passo. Ad esempio il fatto che Venere-cacciatrice nel primo libro vesta il *cothurnus* (*Aen.* 1, 337) alluderebbe al carattere tragico della vicenda di Didone, che la dea racconta a Enea. Ancora, nel proemio del settimo libro espressioni come *tempora rerum* (7, 37[4]), *status* (7, 38) o *primae… exordia pugnae* segnalano la matrice storiografica del passo e confermano l'impressione che «the war between Aeneas and Turnus is repeatedly and consistently characterized as a civil war» (p. 99). Analogamente alcuni epiteti o dettagli relativi alle armi e alle descrizioni belliche conferiscono al racconto un "colorito" omerico, mentre episodi come la caduta di Troia o personaggi quali Didone, Polidoro, Andromaca, Ecuba rinviano a modelli tragici. Altri passi si conformano allo stile che H. definisce "Old Roman", soprattutto là dove il testo è tributario del linguaggio degli epitafi, delle orazioni funebri o della poesia arcaica in saturni e senari, mentre la componente eziologica talora presente nell'*Eneide* rinvia sia alla poesia alessandrina sia a Varrone.

[4] Questa la punteggiatura generalmente preferita dagli editori: H. invece, sulla scorta di Peerlkamp, preferisce interpungere dopo *tempora*, legando *rerum* a *status* sulla base del parallelo di Liv. 8, 13, 2 *iam Latio is status erat rerum* (cfr. P. Vergilius Maro, *Aeneis*, rec. G. B. Conte, Berolini et Novi Eboraci 2009, 198). Il riecheggiamento di stilemi storiografici ci sarebbe comunque in entrambi i casi.

L'idea dei "signposts" è certamente interessante, anche se a tratti risulta un po' vaga, in quanto non si capisce se tali espressioni segnalino il riferimento a un genere letterario o a un testo specifico o indichino più genericamente la "tonalità" di un passo: lo stesso H. si interroga su quale sia il termine più adatto a esprimere la sua idea («'tone', 'key', 'shade', 'tint'?», p. 101) e riconosce naturalmente che diversi episodi hanno un carattere, per così dire, "politonale" («The austere welcome that Evander gives Aeneas is both Callimachean and no less 'old Roman'», p. 108).

Il capitolo ottavo (*So the story goes*, pp. 111-134) analizza l'uso che Virgilio fa di espressioni quali *dicitur*, *ut fama*, *perhibent*, *si credere dignum*, ovvero le cosiddette "note Alessandrine", che segnalano a un tempo il riferimento a una o più fonti e la presa di distanza da esse. Secondo la classificazione proposta da H. queste formule in alcuni casi indicano l'adesione a un antecedente noto e preciso, in altri casi evidenziano il carattere tradizionale di una denominazione geografica o tecnica, in altri ancora sono impiegate per conferire autorevolezza a elementi o personaggi che sono in realtà innovazioni virgiliane. In un certo numero di passi, infine, le note alessandrine sembrano esprimere la cautela dell'autore che non vuole assumersi direttamente la responsabilità di narrare eventi sovrannaturali o fantastici.

Il capitolo nono (*The poet as jackdaw, and the role of anachronisms*, pp. 135-144) si propone di spiegare la funzione degli anacronismi virgiliani, volti a "modernizzare" il mondo epico-eroico ereditato da Omero, avvicinandolo all'età augustea: in particolare l'eziologia ricostruisce un continuum tra l'età di Enea e quella di Augusto e «the Trojans, still essentially Homeric figures enlivened by occasional modern details while on the way to Italy, once they enter the Tiber mouth, begin right away to act like Romans» (p. 136).

L'ultimo capitolo (*An epic of many voices*, pp. 145-156) ribadisce l'idea che per la comprensione del poema virgiliano non sia sufficiente riconoscere i suoi modelli letterari, ma occorra tener presenti anche altri ambiti (che H. chiama, con termine forse un po' fuorviante, «voices»[5]), ai quali il poeta ha attinto nella composizione dell'opera. L'idea è illustrata dalla lettura del passo di *Aen.* 2, 355-369, in cui si descrive la resistenza di Enea e compagni ai nemici durante l'ultima notte di Troia, versi nei quali H. individua, accanto a *tòpoi* letterari come il lamento sulla caduta di una città, una serie di rimandi alla storia, alla fisiologia e alla storia naturale. Chiude il volume un indice dei nomi e delle cose notevoli, mentre sarebbe stato forse utile anche un indice dei luoghi e dei passi discussi, oltre ad una bibliografia completa dei lavori citati.

[5] Nell'ambito degli studi virgiliani il termine fa pensare subito allo studio di R.O.A.M. Lyne, *Further Voices in Vergil's* Aeneid, Oxford 1987, il quale a sua volta riprendeva l'espressione da A. Parry, *The two voices of Virgil's* Aeneid, *Arion* 4, 1963, 66-80. H. si affretta a precisare che «the title of this chapter should not be taken as the first shot in some confrontation or engagement with Parry's article, or with Lyne's book, and what follows will have nothing at all to do with the direction(s) they took» (p. 145).

Possiamo concludere che lo studio di H. offre agli studiosi di Virgilio una grande quantità di materiale erudito utile alla lettura di numerosi passi del poema: ciò di cui si sente la mancanza è una prospettiva interpretativa più ampia, che trascenda le osservazioni su singoli passi e renda conto della tecnica compositiva virgiliana, senza ridurla esclusivamente ad un abile *bricolage* (espressione impiegata dallo stesso H.). Il tipo di lavoro più congeniale a H. resta probabilmente quello del commento, come egli stesso ribadisce a pag. 150: «I do happen to believe that it really is detailed commentary that does most to clarify the unsolved problems of Virgilian studies».

Lisa Piazzi
Università di Pisa
lisa.piazzi@unipi.it

Egil Kraggerud, *Vergiliana. Critical Studies on the Texts of Publius Vergilius Maro*, Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2016, 363 pp., ISBN 978-1-138-20134-7.[1]

Scholars who edit the writings of Vergil start out from a privileged position. While we owe our knowledge of most of classical Latin literature to relatively corrupt manuscripts from the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, for the greatest Roman poet of all we have eight incomplete late antique manuscripts and two dozen others from the eighth and the ninth centuries, which are backed up by an indirect transmission consisting of several commentaries and a rich harvest of quotations from antiquity. Far from being spectacularly corrupt, Vergil's manuscripts transmit most passages in at least one plausible version, and often in several. Recent critical editions have documented this exceptionally rich source material with increasing fullness and accuracy.

Editors have not failed to respond to the unique antiquity of these manuscripts: Vergil's oldest codices have received an accolade from as level-headed a scholar as R. A. B. Mynors, while Gian Biagio Conte has stated confidently that they enable us to restore the original text of the *Aeneid*.[2] This editorial optimism has been mirrored in the reconstructions of the text: as Kraggerud puts it, "textual conservatism has become more rooted in the course of the last century" (p. 1), thanks to the editions not only of Mynors (*Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid*: 1969) and Conte (*Aen.*: 2009, *Geo.*: 2013), but also of Geymonat (*Ecl.*, *Geo.*, *Aen.*: ^{2}2008), Rivero, Estévez Sola, Librán Moreno and Ramírez de Verger (*Aen.*: 2009-11) and Ottaviano (*Ecl.*: 2013).

At the start of this book Kraggerud makes an appeal "for a slight change of paradigm" in Vergilian textual criticism (p. 1). He states that its "ambition … is to influence future editors and encourage them to become a little braver than they have been for the last hundred years or so", arguing that "the ancient paradosis is too lacunose and arbitrary to serve as the sole basis for the text" (p. xv), which he illustrates by documenting the extent of

[1] This review has been written with the help of a Beatriu de Pinós Fellowship (reference: 2014 BP-B 00071), held within the research group LITTERA (2014SGR63) at the Universitat de Barcelona, and an OTKA Postdoctoral Fellowship (OTKA 2015/1 PD 116524), held at Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest.

[2] R.A.B. Mynors (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Oxford 1969, p. v; G.B. Conte (ed.), *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis*, Berlin-New York 2009, p. vii "Testes enim potissimi, quibus freti *Aeneidos* textum restituere in integrum possumus, libri sunt aliquot sub aevi antiqui occasum scripti".

the differences between the earliest manuscripts and by listing some passages where the genuine reading does not appear in any of them (pp. 5-7). He also notes with slight disapproval "how often editors move in a flock, adhere to national preferences or simply take over some forerunner's text and punctuation" (p. xv). As remedies, he recommends the careful study of every textual problem and a more open-minded attitude towards conjectures (pp. 1-5).

The body of his book consists of 109 short chapters, each of them devoted to a passage in Vergil that is in some way problematic. Almost all of the problems discussed have to do with textual criticism in a broad sense, including clarifying the meaning of the transmitted text and verifying its authenticity (the crucial task that Paul Maas called *examinatio*). Most chapters are based on past articles by Kraggerud, which have been reproduced with or without additions; some have been rewritten or replaced by a new piece that modifies or recants an earlier opinion. The volume sums up a significant part of the life work of the author, who is currently Professor Emeritus at the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Oslo. It adds a personal touch that the book does not offer a systematic re-examination of every problematic passage in Vergil, but merely discusses a selection. Some parts of the text receive more attention than others: out of 109 chapters, 22 are devoted to the *Eclogues* but only 7 to the *Georgics*, which are more than twice as long and no less challenging; in the *Aeneid* Books 6 and 9 receive the most space with 18 and 20 chapters, respectively.

While Kraggerud treats the transmitted text with greater scepticism than recent editors, he proposes a broad range of solutions to the problems that it presents. He puts forward conjectures of his own, advocates those of other scholars, recommends a manuscript reading or defends the transmitted text, while sometimes altering its punctuation. He combines this methodological flexibility with the sensitivity to style and linguistic usage that is required from every competent critic, and with an impressive knowledge of earlier scholarship on the text of Vergil. He advocates conjectures made by familiar figures such as Bentley, Ribbeck and Baehrens as well as the little-known but excellent Frisian scholar Johannes Schrader (1721-1783) and the somewhat infamous but highly productive Dutch philologist Petrus Hofman Peerlkamp (1786-1865). On the other hand, he makes fairly little use of recent scholarship on the literary aspects of Vergil's writings. His studies of individual problems tend to be perceptive and thoroughly presented, sometimes excessively so; there are some lengthy lists of parallels where a brief reference to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* would have sufficed. But if there are any capital sins in textual criticism, being too thorough is surely not one of them.

I will consider the core of this book in two ways: first by discussing all of Kraggerud's proposals that concern a well-known part of the writings of

Vergil, namely Book 4 of the *Aeneid*, and next by commenting on the main kinds of proposals that he makes.[3]

In a chapter originally published in *SO* 65, 1990, 67-70, Kraggerud argues convincingly for Peerlkamp's deletion of ***Aen.* 4.126** *conubio iungam stabili propriamque dicabo*, a verse that is identical to 1.73, where it makes good sense. Here it is out of place: *conubio iungam stabili* can only be supplied with an object awkwardly from line 124, *propriam* does not agree with anything nearby, and the line oddly characterizes the tryst of Dido and Aeneas in the cave as a properly enacted marriage. Remove the line and all these problems disappear. It has now been bracketed by Conte (2009).—At ***Aen.* 4.176** *parua metu primo* Kraggerud advocates Baehrens' brilliant conjecture *initu*, which yields the right sense, picks up Lucretius 1.383 *initum primum,* and is palaeographically plausible. He concludes that this remedy "has yet to be adopted wholeheartedly by a courageous editor" (p. 180).—Kraggerud provides an authoritative discussion of the textual problems in the famous comparison of the restless Dido with Pentheus and Orestes (***Aen.* 4.469-73**). Here most recent editors have kept the transmitted text, but G.P. Goold has accepted two conjectures in his revised Loeb edition (1999): Samuel Allen's *Euiadum* "of the Bacchants" at 4.469 *Eumenidum ueluti demens uidet agmina Pentheus* and Jeremiah Markland's *Poenis* at 4.471 *scaenis agitatus Orestes*. Kraggerud advocates Allen's conjecture, or rather the form *Euhiadum*, as Roman authors tend to write *Euhias*, conserving the internal aspiration of *euhoe* (incidentally, this form is also closer to the reading of the manuscripts). He bases his arguments on a study of the intertextual connections between this passage and Euripides' *Bacchae*. One might add that *agmina* "throngs, bands" makes better sense if it refers to the Bacchants, who tended to operate in groups. Kraggerud argues further that in view of the close parallels with Euripides' play, "Markland's argument against the word *scaenis* in the next example loses its weight" (p. 188). In fact the phrase *scaenis agitatus Orestes* is not just acceptable, but a number of recent interpretations of this part of the *Aeneid* have shown it to be heavily charged with meaning.[4] Eliminating this artful oddity would impoverish the text. Kraggerud proceeds to clarify that *scaenis* means not "the stage"

[3] In each case I start out from the text printed by Mynors (1969). I normally give no page references to Kraggerud's book, whose chapters follow the sequence of Vergil's text.

[4] See e.g. E.L. Harrison, "The Tragedy of Dido", *EMC* 8, 1989, 1-21, at 4-5; A. Barchiesi, "Future Reflexive: Two Models of Allusion and Ovid's Heroides", *HSCP* 95, 1993, 333-65, at 353; S.J. Harrison, "Response to Akbar Khan", in A. Sommerstein (ed.), *Religion and Superstition in Classical Literature*, Bari 1996, 29-37, at 35, quoting M. Fernandelli, "Tragico e tragedia nell'episodio cartaginese dell'Eneide", Diss. Turin 1994; S.M. Goldberg, *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: Poetry and its Reception*, Cambridge 2005, 116-8; F. Mac Góráin, "Virgil's Bacchus and the Roman Republic", in J. Farrell, D.P. Nelis (eds.), *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*, Oxford 2013, 124-45, at 127.

but "a kind of revolving background", "a building forming the background of the scene" (p. 189), from which he infers that the dramatic scene Vergil has in mind here does not come from Pacuvius, as was stated already by Servius, but from Euripides' *Orestes*.—At ***Aen.* 4.112** most manuscripts (and most recent editions) read *foedera iungi*, but the variant *foedere* is acknowledged by Servius and it appears in an eighth-century codex. Kraggerud offers cautious support for the latter, but makes the important observation that "Vergil's syntax may have been more flexible than shown by today's editions" (p. 175).—The transmitted text of ***Aen.* 4.224-5** has Jupiter describe Aeneas as *Dardaniumque ducem Tyria Karthagine qui nunc / exspectat fatisque datas non respicit urbes*. It has been controversial for long whether *exspectat* could be used intransitively here (thus e.g. *OLD* s.v. *exspecto*, 4) or the text has to be emended. Earlier conjectures include *Hesperiam* (Housman) and *optatas* (Kraggerud, *PVS* 25, 2004, 161-3) as well as *Tyrias … / res captat* (Courtney). Here Kraggerud proposes the reconstruction *Tyrias … / res spectat*, but this would result in an awkward jingle in *res spectat fatisque datas non respicit*; moreover, the meaning of *spectat* "he watches over, inspects" seems rather too bland for this context. Out of the conjectures that have been put forward, Housman's *Hesperiam* may be the best, but it would create a long, disjointed, awkwardly trailing clause. Could those defending the transmitted reading be right after all?

In general, Kraggerud's conjectures tend to require limited alterations to the transmitted text: as he remarks in connection with his excellent proposal *nunc* at ***Geo.* 1.500-1** *hunc saltem euerso iuuenem succurrere saeclo / ne prohibete*, "[m]inimal change can work wonders" (p. 110). The end result too must be satisfactory, and here *nunc* removes the incomprehensible *hunc saltem … iuuenem* "this young man at any rate".—Meanwhile, at ***Ecl.* 3.62** *Et me Phoebus amat* Kraggerud's *At* tidies up the meaning of the text and introduces a common formula of transition.—Another intervention that only involves changing one letter comes at ***Aen.* 2.139** *quos illi fors et poenas … reposcent*, where a superfluous *et* strongly suggests that the text may be corrupt. However, Kraggerud's proposal *forsit* is a risky bet, as this abbreviated form of *forsitan* only appears in classical Latin at Horace, *Satires* 1.6.49 and it could be a one-off coinage by Horace.[5] We should look for another remedy.—At ***Aen.* 7.598** the transmitted text puts the words *nam mihi parta quies* into the mouth of King Latinus, rather oddly, as he is exasperated, and not content or at peace. Kraggerud's brilliant conjecture

[5] *forsit* has also been conjectured at Ter. *Andr.* 957 and *Eun.* 197 by L. Havet (*RPh* 30, 1906, 191). In both passages the manuscripts write *forsitan*. But as far as I can tell, Havet's proposals have not been adopted in any edition; the critical edition of S. Prete (Heidelberg 1954) has *fors* in the former passage and *forsan* in the latter. It is always risky to conjecture such an extremely rare word.

rapta obtains the right tone and meaning at minimal cost; it deserves to find its way into every critical apparatus, and arguably also into the text.—Less convincing is his solution for ***Aen.* 2.738-40** *heu misero coniunx fatone erepta Creusa / substitit, errauitne uia seu lapsa resedit, / incertum*, where he proposes to write *fato mea rapta*; but *meo* would be superfluous after *misero coniunx*, and the loose syntax of *fatone* may perhaps be admissible in such an emotional passage. (Mynors prints *lapsa* in 2.739, which stands in Mnq, but Kraggerud tacitly accepts *lassa* from the majority of manuscripts, for good reason.)

Kraggerud advocates a number of conjectures by earlier scholars. One of them affects a puzzling passage at ***Ecl.* 10.44-8** *nunc insanus amor duri me Martis in armis / tela inter media atque aduersos detinet hostis. / tu procul a patria … / Alpinas, a! dura niues et frigora Rheni / me sine sola uides*, where Gallus ostensibly complains that he is at war (44-5) and his beloved Lycoris is in the Alps (46-8). Many other passages in the poem show him to be in peaceful isolation in the Arcadian countryside (9-15, 26, 31-6, 42-3, 55-7), where there is not the slightest hint of warfare. The contradiction is removed by Heumann's conjecture *te* for *me* in line 44, which is advocated convincingly by Kraggerud. It results in a text in which it is no longer Gallus who is in a war zone but his beloved Lycoris, who is evidently accompanying a lover on a campaign through the Alps near the upper reaches of the Rhine.—***Aen.* 7.128-9** *haec erat illa fames, haec nos suprema manebat / exitiis positura modum* reinterprets a previous prophecy by Helenus that Aeneas and his companions would bite into their tables (3.394). All authoritative sources write *exitiis*, but *exiliis* appears in some late manuscripts, most likely due to a conjecture or a creative error. However, Kraggerud is right to contend that "as to content it is by far the better alternative", and the change from one form to the other is minimal.—At ***Ecl.* 6.23-4** Silenus pleads with the shepherds who have tied him up: *"quo uincula nectitis?" inquit. / "soluite me, pueri; satis est potuisse uideri. …"* The last words are somewhat puzzling, so Peerlkamp conjectured *uieri*, while Kraggerud would write *satis est potuisse uiere* "it is enough to have been able to tie (me) up" . This is ingenious but unconvincing, as *uieo, uiēre* means "to weave, plait", for example willow twigs into wickerwork (*uimen*), and not "to bind, to tie up". Either the transmitted text is correct after all, or we should look for another conjecture.

In some other chapters Kraggerud argues for a textual variant conserved in the manuscripts or the other ancient sources of the text that has not found favour with recent editors. At ***Aen.* 9.128-30** *Troianos haec monstra petunt, his Iuppiter ipse / auxilium solitum eripuit: non tela neque ignis / exspectant Rutulos* Turnus sneers that the transformation of the boats of the Trojans into sea-nymphs is a sign that Jupiter has turned against

them. But it is a weak taunt that the boats "do not wait (any longer) for the weapons and the fire of the Rutulians". Kraggerud offers a convincing solution: we should put a comma after 9.129 *eripuit* and accept M's reading *exspectans* in the following line. Jupiter has not had the patience to wait for the Rutulians; he has decided to destroy the Trojan fleet himself.—At ***Aen.* 5.850-1** Palinurus asks *Aenean credam (quid enim?) fallacibus auris / et caeli totiens deceptus fraude sereni?* Most manuscripts write *caeli*, pseudo-Acro quotes the passage with this reading, and it is acknowledged by Servius *auctus*. On the other hand, one ancient manuscript (P) and two Carolingian ones (cγ) write *caelo*, which is also supported by Servius and Tiberius Donatus. In cγ *caelo* is followed by *sereno*. Mynors and Conte print *caeli ... sereni*, but Kraggerud rightly points out that this results in a clumsy text. He proposes to write *fallacibus auris / et caelo, totiens deceptus fraude sereni?* In fact substantival *serenum* "A clear sky, bright weather" (*OLD* s.v.) is well attested, and it is helpful to have *fraude* clarified by a genitive.—At ***Ecl.* 7.63-4** *Phyllis amat corylos: illas dum Phyllis amabit, / nec myrtus uincet corylos, nec laurea Phoebi* all manuscripts write *uincet corylos*, but Servius *auctus* states that the ancient commentator Hebrus or Hebrius quoted the verse with the reading *uincet Veneris*. Kraggerud argues convincingly that this reading is superior to the transmitted text. It may be an early conjecture or a creative error or (more likely perhaps) a relic of the genuine reading. It deserves serious consideration in any case.—While ***Aen.* 1.646** is transmitted in all early codices in the form *omnis in Ascanio cari stat cura parentis*, a papyrus in the John Rylands Library reads *caro*. Kraggerud defends this reading, adducing many parallels to show that Vergil tends to use *carus* in a passive sense to mean "beloved", which is just what one would expect. That meaning would be appropriate in this passage, which highlights Aeneas' loving care for Ascanius. But Vergil's use of *enallage*, a figure of speech in which an adjective is deliberately "misaligned" with the wrong noun, has been well documented;[6] and here it would put an interesting emphasis on the mutual bond of affection between father and son. Moreover, *cari* may be slightly less cacophonic than *caro ... cura*, and it is hard to see how *cari* could have arisen from *caro*, rather than vice versa. Here it seems best to apply the maxim that *lectio difficilior potior est*.

One matter to which Kraggerud pays particular attention is punctuation. Of course the Romans did not have anything comparable to our rich system of commas, full stops, colons, semi-colons, and all the rest. All the same the modern punctuation of classical Latin texts is highly significant, as it reflects our understanding of the syntax. This should put into perspective

[6] See esp. G.B. Conte, *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Vergilian Epic*, transl. S.J. Harrison, Oxford 2007, 58-122, esp. 70-6.

Kraggerud's ironical statement that "I have fought more than half of my professional life for a semicolon instead of a comma after line 4 in the prologue to the Aeneid" (p. 131). His case for this punctuation of ***Aen.* 1.4** strikes me as convincing.—Commentators have struggled with the syntax of the description of L. Iunius Brutus, the founder of the Roman Republic, at ***Aen.* 6.820-3** *natosque pater noua bella mouentis / ad poenam pulchra pro libertate uocabit, / infelix, utcumque ferent ea facta minores: / uincet amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido*. Kraggerud argues cogently that *infelix* must stand in enjambment at the start of verse 822 and after it, *utcumque* must start a new sentence; so we need a full stop between the two and nothing more than a comma at the end of the line.

On occasion, Kraggerud argues that the transmitted text should be conserved, as at ***Ecl.* 4.28-9** *molli paulatim flauescet campus arista / incultisque rubens pendebit sentibus uua*, where A.J. Woodman has argued (at *CQ* n.s. 60, 2010, 257-8) that the initial words should be reshuffled so as to read *incultus molli flauescet campus arista / paulatimque rubens pendebit sentibus uua*. Kraggerud offers a convincing defence of the transmitted text: the grape has to hang *incultis … sentibus* if it is to be the fruit of a miracle.—***Ecl.* 1.67-9** *en umquam patrios longo post tempore finis / pauperis et tuguri congestum caespite culmen, / post aliquot, mea regna, uidens mirabor aristas?* has puzzled interpreters for long. Kraggerud gives his support to those who take *post aliquot … aristas* to mean "behind some sheaves of grain" (W. Berg). But why only a few (*aliquot*)? However we answer this question, the difficulty of this passage is at odds with Vergil's usual clarity. E.J. Courtney may have been right in suspecting textual corruption (at *WJA* n.s. 33, 2009, 81), but his proposed remedy *a! aliquot* does not seem much better than the ailment.—The Magna Mater describes a sacred grove in the Troad at ***Aen.* 9.85-7** *pinea silua mihi multos dilecta per annos, / lucus in arce fuit summa, quo sacra ferebant, / nigranti picea trabibusque obscurus acernis*. "Lines 85 and 86 look like alternative versions" (p. 289) and the former has been bracketed by Ribbeck. In a piece that first appeared in *SO* 73, 1998, 95-6, Kraggerud argues against this deletion, as the transmitted text makes sense and *pinea silua mihi* provides the personal focus that could be expected here. The line has now been kept by Conte (2009), who argues against Ribbeck's deletion *in apparatu*. Both Kraggerud and Conte assume that the *lucus* is part of the *silua*, but I cannot see how this meaning could be extracted from the text, where *lucus* stands in apposition to *silua*. That renders disturbing the contrast between the "forest of pinewood" (*pinea silua*) in verse 85 and the spruces (*piceae*) and maples (*acres*) that appear two lines later. Could lines 85 and 86-7 be authorial variants that somehow made their way into the transmitted text? Or could line 85 have been cobbled together by an

interpolator on the basis of examples such as *Geo.* 2.208 *et nemora euertit multos ignaua per annos*?

A handful of chapters study passages from a purely literary point of view, without a hint of textual controversy. Kraggerud's discussion of Vergil's imitation of Ennius at ***Aen.* 6.846** is excellent. He studies the imitation of Catullus at ***Aen.* 6.460** in a chapter that is longer but less illuminating. His pages on the amoebean stanzas at ***Ecl.* 7.29-44** lack the analytical focus of his contributions to textual criticism, but they prepare the ground for a section in which he advocates Perret's attractive proposal to let two strophes exchange places and speakers at ***Ecl.* 7.53-60**.

While the contents of this book are very good indeed, its presentation is less satisfactory. One reason for this has to do with the way in which earlier articles by Kraggerud have been revised for publication in this volume. The revisions have focused on the problem at stake, adding further arguments or indicating changes of mind by the author. They have not taken into acount systematically the most important recent publications in the field, such as the aforementioned editions by Conte, Ottaviano, and Rivero *et al.*, and the important commentary on the *Eclogues* by Andrea Cucchiarelli (2012). Many of the quotations from Vergil in this book are accompanied by an *apparatus criticus*. One would expect the latter to follow the best available source, that is, the Teubner editions of Conte (2009/2013) and Ottaviano (2013), but often it is based on the Oxford Classical Text of Mynors (1969), which is less complete and less reliable. As a result, the reader constantly has to check the editions of Conte and Ottaviano and modify Kraggerud's arguments in line with their apparatus.

The care with which this book has been produced also leaves something to be desired. It was not an inspired decision to locate the notes not where most readers would have expected them—at the foot of the pages, after every chapter, or at the end of the book—but tucked away after groups of chapters on the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics*, and Books 1-4, 5-8, and 9-12 of the *Aeneid*. The final group of notes is followed by a short bibliography, but this does not include every work that has been quoted in a short form in the volume (see e.g. p. 86). The layout is inconsistent, with new additions set apart from previously published passages in several different ways, and with examples of careless formatting (e.g. on p. 100). The author writes in a lively, witty and clear English, but (like this reviewer) he is not a native speaker, and a number of mistakes in his text have not been corrected.[7] More disturbing are the typographical errors, some of which distort the meaning of the text. For ex-

[7] P. 1 "I have my primary attention directed", p. 36 "to beware his words", p. 58 "There is no need nor natural to see him", p. 146 "If accepting" (for "Whether to accept"), etc.—There are slips in the title on p. 181 ("*A.* 4. 223–4", for "224–5") and in the subtitle on p. 231 ("if one letter is taken away", for "is added").

ample, the critical apparatus to *Georgics* 3.519 reads "reliquit **MxPabirxnδe** […] : relinquit **Mrωγ**" (p. 120). Rather puzzlingly, this attributes two contradictory readings to manuscripts M and r, and it quotes manuscript x twice. A look at the edition of Conte reveals that it is the source of this apparatus, but his siglum "M^x" (standing for a textual variant of unspecified origin in M) has become "**Mx**" and *relinquit* should have been followed by a capital R, not a lower-case one.[8] The kind and frequency of linguistic and typographical errors in this volume make one wonder whether it has passed through the hands of a professional copy-editor or a proof-reader.

None of these things should distract from the fact that this is a very good book. It makes a valuable contribution to the reconstruction of several dozen passages in Vergil, as a result of which it will be obligatory reading for all future editors and commentators, and it can safely be recommended to anyone interested in these parts of the text. But Kraggerud's arguments for a paradigm shift in Vergilian textual criticism have deeper implications. He shows convincingly that Vergil's earliest surviving manuscripts are, for all their value, not free from fault. This renders unsustainable the position of Pasquali, who asked "Was there always an archetype?" and concluded that a transmission *recta via* (i.e. without an archetype, with the different lines of transmission going back directly to the author's manuscript) was "likely […] if not for all of Vergil, at least for entire books of the *Aeneid*."[9] In fact even the 27 conjectures of modern scholars that were admitted to the text by as conservative an editor as Mynors make it likely that there did exist an archetype (or something of the kind) for each work of Vergil's. The conjectures proposed or advocated by Kraggerud provide further support for this position. It is not the least of the merits of his book that it forces us to think again about the transmission of these important texts.

Despite the antiquity of the earliest surviving codices and the relative abundance of other sources on the text of Vergil, including later manuscripts and ancient quotations, we know fairly little about the earliest stage of transmission, when the *Bucolics*, the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* were copied on papyrus.[10] We can only speculate as to what a *stemma codicum* would have

[8] Further typos include p. 16 "grammtical", p. 33 "*cuspides* [for *–e*] *gressus*", p. 63 "Corydonos" in *Ecl.* 7.40, p. 139 "seavum", p. 145 "Achillevs", p. 152 "his apparatus [of] 1895", p. 167 the unmetrical "subsistit" for *Aen.* 2.739 *substitit*, p. 243 "*Gaius* [for *Gr-*] *homo*" at *Aen.* 10.720, etc.

[9] G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Florence 1952, chapter II "Ci fu sempre un archetipo?"; *ibid.* p. 21 "Altri testi che siano tramandati *recta via*, non ne conosco; ritengo probabile che lo stesso sia avvenuto, se non per tutto Virgilio, almeno per interi libri dell'*Eneide*".

[10] For two excellent attempts to make inferences from the sources see E.J. Courtney, "The Formation of the Text of Vergil", *BICS* 28, 1981, 13-29 and J. Velaza, *Itur in antiquam silvam: un estudio sobre la tradición antigua de Virgilio*, Frankfurt am Main 2001.

looked like or what would have happened to the archetype. Corrupt readings could have entered the tradition in at least two ways: during the very first stage of the transmission of the text, as it was composed, edited and copied before reaching a broader public; or later on through the rise of a vulgate that came to outnumber or displace all other versions of the text.[11]

Dániel Kiss
Universitat de Barcelona &
Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem (Budapest)
kiss@ub.edu

[11] The rise of a vulgate text has been documented within the manuscript tradition of Dante's *Commedia*, a text comparable in some ways to the *Aeneid*: see P. Trovato, *Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Lachmann's Method: A Non-Standard Handbook of Genealogical Textual Criticism in the Age of Post-Structuralism, Cladistics, and Copy-Text*, Padua ²2017, 299-333, esp. 328-30.

Stephanie McCarter, *Horace Between Freedom and Slavery: The First Book of* Epistles, Madison-Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2015, 378 pp., ISBN 978-0-299-30570-3.

Thanks to her welcome engagement with Horace's first book of *Epistles* Stephanie McCarter joins a distinguished band of enthusiasts for this endlessly fascinating collection of verse letters. It is one of the main attractions of the collection that it insists upon being read as a coherent book, something it would be difficult to do for, say, the books of satires. Michael McGann (*Studies in Horace's First Book of* Epistles, Brussels 1969), Ross Kilpatrick (*The Poetry of Friendship: Horace,* Epistles I, Edmonton, 1986), Ralph Johnson (*Horace and the Dialectic of Freedom*, Ithaca 1993), and David Porter ('*Playing the Game: Horace* Epistles 1' in *Classical World* 96.2002.21-60) have all demonstrated in their different ways how nigh on impossible it is to discuss any one of these fine poems in isolation from others in the book. Shared themes and echoed language seem to link the poems one to another, links further strengthened by the arrangement of the poems in the book. What is more, we look for a degree of consistency in what might once have been called its message or doctrine, since Horace is pretty clearly writing with a view to helping his readers get a grip on their own lives, thanks to what he chooses to tell us of his own situation, somewhere over half way down the road of life (even if that situation is to some extent fictionalized).

McCarter sets out her stall clearly in the introductory chapter. Her Horace is divided between presence and absence, a division intrinsic to the epistolary form of the poems: a letter comes from someone absent, who may promise presence, only to revoke it, or from someone who longs to exchange absence for presence. There are other absences too: chiefly youth, and what was appropriate to youth (lyric poetry, symposia, love affairs). But there are compensatory presences, above all moral reflection and the countryside. McCarter's primary focus is the problem of individual freedom or independence (pp. 4-18). This was of course a philosophical issue (pp. 21-23)—'autarkeia', but it could never be discussed as pure theory, especially within a hierarchical society like Rome's. Her aim is to discover how the poet negotiated his success, both personal and poetic, within and despite the constraints of Roman high society. Her plausible conclusion is that Horace took an eclectic approach to philosophy and advocated adaptability and moderation, which he himself had classically dubbed 'the golden mean'. Finally McCarter explains how she organized her argument on pp. 23-4; she feels there is a plot to the collection, a movement from a sort of intransigent freedom to moder-

ation and adaptability. She aims to demonstrate this by grouping the letters thematically, as they seem to be focused on philosophy, location, friendship, and poetry. McCarter also argues strongly that Horace's striving to establish a balanced freedom has a political dimension within the emerging principate. She reckons that the poet is responding to the political changes in Roman life in the early years of Augustus' rule.

Since these two matters, plot and political response, are the only ones on which I am at all inclined to disagree with her basic approach to the interpretation of the poems, I will first explain why I do so, and then move on.

As regards plot, which McCarter is not alone in advocating, it proves difficult to integrate into any notional plot a number of the letters. Take for instance the ninth, a 'letter of introduction' to Tiberius. It isn't concerned with independence or *libertas*, nor are philosophy, location or poetry an issue; unsurprisingly then it receives scant attention on p. 162. Friendship is the theme that justifies its place in the collection, and Horace seems to be doing no more than what any well-placed friend would do to give someone a 'leg-up'. But underlying the ninth letter is the problem of managing the great ones of Rome, an issue that resurfaces in the thirteenth poem, addressed to Vinnius. McCarter speaks of his 'bumbling servility' (p. 162, and cf. his alleged 'bumbling obsequiousness' on p. 21). But Horace's fear is that Vinnius prove maladroit, not servile; servility is foisted in so as to give the letter a place in the discourse of independence and the supposed plot of the collection. What Horace wants Vinnius to avoid (faults he implies he avoids himself) are pushiness and self-importance. So the issue in the ninth and the thirteenth letters is tact, not servile status, whether Vinnius', Horace's, or the poems'. Finally, consider the claim made on p. 83 that in line 63 of the second epistle—'hunc [animum] frenis, hunc tu compesce catena', 'the chain…in particular evokes ideas of slavery.' Only runaway slaves were chained once dispatched to an *ergastulum* in the country. Since the reins or bridle mentioned in the same line clearly allude to managing a horse, the chain suggests to me at any rate the guard-dog at the front door, not a human slave. The notion of slavery is once again dragged in, so that McCarter can assert on p. 84 that 'Horace makes issues of independence and servitude central to his poem'. Not in my view. To sum up: it is plain that in putting the collection together Horace indeed focused on the themes McCarter identifies, and they are deployed in varied combinations in most of the poems. But it is less than fair to the poet to impose 'Systemzwang' on every poem in the whole collection.

McCarter is also not alone in reckoning that Augustan poets had views on and responded to contemporary political life. Born into what we call the late Republic, survivors of civil war, they surely ought to have been concerned with the onset of autocracy, or so many believe. It may be suggested however that they need not have been troubled, given their civil status as equestrians. Ernst Badian pointed out in his *Oxford Classical Dictionary* article on *eq-*

uites that equestrians 'formed the non-political section of the upper class', a claim not easily set aside. Granted there were equestrians, like Maecenas, who exercised influence on public affairs, it was of a private nature. Maecenas never held public office, and the equally influential Atticus scrupulously avoided it (as scrupulously as he maintained valuable friendships with 'political' men of every persuasion). Badian went on to observe that the *equites* of the late Republic were too disparate in composition and too non-political to form a stable grouping. My own feeling is that this assessment of the political role of *equites* has not been sufficiently taken into account by those who detect political engagement in the 'Augustan' poets. Horace indeed fought for Brutus at Philippi, but that does not mean he fought in defence of the political system of the day; his attachment to Brutus may have been purely personal, as was, say, the attachment of Gaius Mattius to Julius Caesar (Cicero couldn't fathom it, oddly enough). Many will doubtless make no objection to McCarter's sense that Horace reconfigures the notion of 'freedom' to harmonize it with the political transformations of the day, but a modest demurer to the supposition can be made, for lack of evidence that the *libertas* of an *eques* was in any way compromised by the changes evolving in Rome's political life under Augustus. I therefore find with McGann the political reading of the end of the sixteenth epistle, the scene borrowed from Euripides' *Bacchae*, unconvincing (pp. 153-60). It might be worth remembering that Augustus could not compel Horace to become his private secretary.

A further point may be made on Horace's supposed response to the Augustan political settlement. His addressees generally appear to be young men, that is to say they have entered adulthood knowing only a post-Actium Rome. Their fathers could tell them about the free-wheeling *libertas* of yore, but it formed no part of their experience. They needed guidance in dealing with the new social hierarchy, something their fathers had to make the best of and might well have had difficulty accommodating themselves to; for their sons that hierarchy was both the present and very probably the future. So the intransigent independence of the Republic (think Cato) arguably wasn't something they might have regretted or aimed to re-instate. Now that I've set out my reservations regarding the search for an underlying plot to the collection and for a response to the evolving political situation, I turn to the individual chapters, with which, as I've already indicated, I am in broad sympathy.

The first chapter is dedicated to the fundamental issue of the collection, personal independence. Personal independence is most at risk in the relation between patron and client, and for Horace that means his friendship with Maecenas. The role Maecenas plays in the first epistle is interesting. In all the other introductory poems in which he appears he is simply the addressee. Only in this poem is he presented as trying to 'commission' poems from Horace, namely more lyrics. This prepares us for the issue of the valid personal

claims upon the individual and how he is to negotiate them. The guiding figure to emerge in the discussion is Aristippus, whose talismanic role in Horace's thinking has for some time been recognised; attention can also now be drawn to Mario Citroni's chapter entitled 'The value of self-deception: Horace, Aristippus, Heraclides Ponticus, and the pleasures of the fool (and of the poet)' in Philip Hardie (ed.), *Augustan Poetry and the Irrational*, Oxford, 2016. Aristippus will provide the doctrine of moderation (p. 25), so that in following him Horace can move from inflexibility to compromise (p. 34): freedom can only ever be partial.

The second chapter finds Horace dealing with issues of inconsistency and illness (poems 1, 8, 15). McCarter sees ethical contemplation as the avenue to equanimity. Now at this point she rightly announces that *aequanimitas* is one of the goals towards which the poet's reflections move (the index on pp. 350-1 provides helpful direction), but this wasn't announced in the introduction or in the first chapter. My point is that the issues the poems raise aren't so easily reduced in number, and the nuances of Horace's ethical reflections are varied. McCarter is justified in claiming that adaptability is needed to secure equanimity. And yet there is in this chapter an element of exaggeration: it is excessive to charge Horace with dishonesty in earlier descriptions of his dining habits (p. 58). He makes it clear that he wants better wine when he's on holiday by the sea: *ad mare cum ueni* (15.18); he can put up with anything at home. This is not to say that the important fifteenth epistle fails to expose Horace's inconsistency—I'm concerned only with its gravity. These poems can be funny too.

The third chapter opens out one of his central roles, as instructor in ethical thinking (poems 1 and 2, with focus on the latter). McCarter certainly secures my support in her able demonstration that the poet as reader of poetry has the advantages of eclecticism and flexibility over the philosopher; he is not bound to create or adhere to a system. Horace thus tacitly repudiates Epicurean cautions about the correct interpretation of Homer (pp. 72-3). The more philosophically grounded readings of Armstrong and Moles are repudiated, rightly in my view.

Horace's role as moral adviser in letters 4, 5, 6, and 12 is the theme of the fourth chapter. The keynote is moderation, since the addressees all seem to be given to an extreme (isolation, severity, pursuit of wealth). The opening words of the sixth poem, *nil admirari*, serve as a motto or keynote of the poet's advice, advice he needs to bear in mind himself.

The fifth chapter turns to the issue of leisure, *otium* (letter 7 and 16). The seventh is of course a poem of capital importance in the collection, and McCarter's treatment of it is well-balanced. I've already indicated that I part company with her in the interpretation of the final section of the sixteenth poem, but it must be made clear that her reading cannot be dismissed as eccentric. This is just one of those issues upon which opinion is divided.

The sixth chapter brings together letters 10, 11, and 14. The country life cannot after all completely satisfy, especially the claims of friendship. The eleventh letter is corrective of the tenth, in recommending indifference to place, another facet of *aequanimitas*. In the fourteenth poem the bailiff is a figure on to whom Horace can project the less flattering aspects of his own character, especially inconstancy. McCarter feels that their contest ends in a draw, but I demur: Horace is in charge and the bailiff stays in the country, so far as we can tell. It is Horace who is left to sort out his problems on his own; the bailiff must do as he is told.

In the seventh chapter McCarter brings Aristippus centre-stage for discussion of letters 17 and 18, poems which clearly form a sort of diptych. I find her reading of the seventeenth poem exemplary, but as regards the eighteenth, I feel that she errs in company with Johnson and Oliensis in failing to give sufficient weight to the considerable difference in social status between Horace (son of a freedman) and Lollius (possibly the son of a consul, at any rate born into the contemporary elite) when each 'entered' society. Still, this is the stand-out chapter in the book for me.

The eighth chapter combines letters 3 and 19, both concerned with literary production. Independence as a writer of poetry in Rome was peculiar, given that so much Latin poetry avowed its debt to Greek. So Horace can once again urge moderation in literary imitation; he can also substantiate his doctrine in his own practice—his poems are a sort of *techne* to guide practitioners on to the path of literary success.

The conclusion combines letters 13 and 20. I've already voiced my concern about the 'loaded' reading of the thirteenth poem, but agree that the 'manumission' of the book in the final poem is in fact a form of submission, now to the judgment of a reader.

It must be clear from what I've said that I find the interpretations offered in this work generally sober and reliable, and only occasionally do I part company with McCarter's opinion. When she disagrees with a scholar she deals fairly and fully with the position she deems unsatisfactory. Her extensive reading is up to date and comprehensive. And yet there remains one matter, the control of Horace's Latin, that causes me considerable disquiet, and to it I turn in conclusion.

To provide some context for what I am about to say, I need to make it clear that McCarter's is the third book by a debutant scholar that I have reviewed recently. All three show in different measures poor command of Latin. Now I'm well aware that those who start to learn this difficult language later in life than I was fortunate enough to do have a steep up-hill climb. But they also have supports, guides, and resources, such as grammars, dictionaries, and largely reliable standard translations against which to check their own understanding of the texts, which are the very foundation of their scholarly work. McCarter's book throws into relief some issues which I now want to address.

First, the presentation of the text. Horace's Latin is far too often misprinted, in many cases thanks to the word-processor's 'autocorrect', as I confirmed by my own attempts to type the Latin correctly; but that is no excuse nowadays, since even undergraduates learning the language must be alive to the problem. (Chrysanthe Tsitsiou-Chelidoni also noted the large number in her *BMCR* review of 2017.01.52, n. 2.) Here is my list of misprints or misquotations: p. 26 (*purgatum*, but correct on p. 86), 54 (*corpora* for *corpore*), 76, 96 & 110 (Cicero), 143, 144, 145, 148 (*frigid* for *frigida*), 149 (*platinum* for *platanum*! It reappears on p. 306 n.66), 150, 163 (*partier* for *pariter*), 167 (*receipt* for *recepit*), 168, 178, 180, 194, 198, 203 (*matron* for *matrona*), 207, 213 (*Docilis* for *Dolichus*, and this even enters the translation), 265, 283 n. 13, 287 n. 5, 310 n. 30 (*content* for *contento*), 315 n. 35. Are we becoming little better than the monkish scribes once vilified by textual critics?

Secondly, there is the more serious issue of defective translation. McCarter usually provides her own translations of Greek and Latin as announced on p. 276, n. 11. It is a good principle to make one's own translation, but that translation should be checked against others, since we can all make mistakes, however advanced we are. If we disagree with a standard translation, it is sound practice to make a case for our own interpretation. McCarter's translations are sometimes wrong, and sometimes 'loaded' in favour of her interpretation of the poem.

The translations I find wrong are the following and the translation of Horace's *Epistles* I regard as providing the standard is Fairclough's characteristically colloquial English in his admirable Loeb edition: p. 56 'offend' for *offendar* 'quarrel with'; on p. 61 Aristo of Chios is mistranslated (one rather wonders why no one noticed this sooner); 'voices' for *voces* 'sayings' (p. 68); 'grief' for *dolor* 'vexation' and 'frame of mind' for *mens* 'wrath'; p. 94 *candide* at 4.1 (and 6.68) is misunderstood: it isn't our 'candid' or 'frank' but 'well-disposed, kindly' (here I think Fairclough's 'impartial' is wrong); p. 110 Cicero mistranslated (*ecferri* = 'to be elated'); p. 116 'arts' for *artes* 'works of art'; p. 171 'is not agreeable' for *conveniet* 'will not fit'; p.179 Seneca mistranslated; p. 197 'suffering' for *patientia* 'endurance' and 'celebrated' for *celeberrima* 'crowded'; p. 198 'duty' for *negotio* 'business' [West]; p. 200 'the tranquil the name of the distressed' for *aequus iniqui* 'the just of unjust'; p. 201 *tamen* isn't 'moreover' but 'nonetheless'; p. 209 'obsequiousness more than is right' for *obsequium plus aequo* misconstrues: *plus aequo* qualifies the adjective *pronus*, not the noun *obsequium*; p. 277, n. 23 Cicero mistranslated.

Tendentious translation is a related problem, but fortunately rather less frequent a one than outright error. McCarter offers 'dark readings'; fair enough, but it won't do to darken the colours unnecessarily. For instance on p. 53, and again on p. 209 *occurri* at 1.95 is rendered with 'I have run to meet

you'. But 'I met with/bumped into you/I come your way' is the standard translation, adopted also in the *OLD* s.v. *occurro* 7, and cf. *Serm.* 1.4.135-6 *sic dulcis amicis* | *occurram* and 1.9.61. Horace's meeting with Maecenas is casual, accidental, not designed and not necessarily hurried. Before McCarter imposed her translation she might have checked to see if there was a sort of 'vulgate'; if there was (as indeed there is) and she didn't like it, then the onus was on her to undermine it in favour of her own translation. A second case of 'loaded' translation is 'servant' for *minister*, used of Vinnius (p. 258); as a free man, he's an agent or helper (*OLD* s.v. 3), not a servant. But McCarter wants the word servant because it bolsters her interpretation of Vinnius is servile. While on the subject of that epistle, I'll end with a case of skewed interpretation. McCarter ought to have balked on p. 258 at Oliensis' notion that Horace 'teaches' Vinnius, described in the opening line as *proficiscentem*, as if he were a 'Stoic wayfarer [a *proficiens*]'. *Proficio* 'I make progress' and *proficiscor* 'I depart' may well be related etymologically but they certainly aren't related in meaning, and the different quantities of the initial syllables make it unlikely (in my view) that any Roman reader would have thought *proficiscentem* suggested the Stoic *proficiens*.

McCarter has given lovers of the first book of *Epistles* a refreshing survey of its range and variety.

Roland Mayer
King's College London
roland.mayer@kcl.ac.uk

Andrea Cucchiarelli (trans., comm.). *Orazio. L'esperienza delle cose (Epistole, Libro I)*. Letteratura universale Marsilio, 317, Venezia: Marsilio Editori, 2015, 182 pp., € 14.00 (pb). ISBN 978-88-317-2312-1.

The format of the book is compact (small pages), and its overall size stylishly slender (a mere 182 small pages). This is a series where hard choices have to be made, since all that has to be said has to be said with precision, and much else that might be said has to be merely hinted at, if not completely left aside. Andrea Cucchiarelli is a prominent scholar of Latin literature whose (by now rather long) history of writing insightfully on a wide range of topics in the field, but with a particular on-going interest in Horace, has made him one of the few scholars who is a 'must read' in whatever he writes, but especially when he writes on Horace. The book's title *L'esperienza delle cose*, though not intended meta-poetically, is appropriate to Cucchiarelli himself, because it describes not only the life experience that Horace draws upon in *Epistles* book 1 to develop a working philosophy of freedom and contentment for his own use (a didactic work, aiming at the poet's own self-improvement, taking the form of letters to others: not an all-encompassing 'On The Nature of Things', in other words, but one individual's experience of those things, and his coming to terms with them), it speaks also to Cucchiarelli's own long experience with the writer of these letters: Horace, the craftiest poet that Rome would ever produce. That long experience in dealing with Horace in all his many genres, meters, and moods, is on full display in the book. And it is that wide-ranging expertise and deep experience that makes this book rise well above the tight limits that have been put on it to keep it so appealingly readable and small.

The book begins with a series of introductory reflections on the poet's determination, announced in the opening lines of the first epistle, to detach himself from his old life as an overly busy and involved man and a famous performer, in order to pursue wisdom and achieve peace of mind. The connection between that desire for emotional detachment and renewal and the letter form itself is brilliantly explored in these pages, where it is argued that the epistolary genre is neatly matched to the self-detachment that the writer wants to achieve, since the letter form itself marks out a distance between the writer and his addressees. The addressees of these letters, mostly young Romans who are launching themselves into their careers at the time when these poems are written, are 'involved' in their busy worlds in ways that the poet once was, but no longer is. The distance that separates 'them' from 'him' is a physical space that these letters are made to cross. But it is also a gap that

separates Horace from his addressees in terms of time lived and experience gained; a gap that separates Horace from his old self, allowing him to see himself for what he once was, and to mark the silliness of all those 'things' that he once thought so all-important. From this seasoned perspective, the poet's old passions, as taken up with anew by his many friends (Lollius, Celsus, and even Tiberius), look silly and absurdly overblown. They are as child's play, and 'games' that the poet once enjoyed. And yet, as Cucchiarelli points out, the distance that Horace has gained from experience has not turned him into a misanthrope who can no longer sympathize. The advice that he offers in these poems is neither condescending nor doctrinaire. Doctrine, it turns out, is something that he no longer finds terribly useful. It is, rather, a load he can no longer bear, and that he does not wish to load on anyone else. Instead, the advice that he passes on to his addressees derives from his own experience, and it is well meant, as from an older friend to his young admirers, whom he wants to help out. No scolding elder or ideologue, the man who writes these letters is genuinely curious about the doings of his addressees, and he expresses concern for their well being. And he rather wishes that he were young again himself.

The short introductions to each poem are an extremely helpful guide not only to the themes, persons and structures of the poems, but to their larger function within the book. Cucchiarelli is especially good at charting swings in tone and shifts in attitude from poem to poem (as from poems 8 to 9 to 10), and he does not worry too much about who some of the more mysterious addressees actually 'are' since the poems themselves give us just enough information to assign them characters and functions within the poems where they appear. Many of the themes sounded in the book's excellent introduction are revisited in the commentary that follows. The line-by-line analysis is clear, concise, and helpful. But it also bursts with fresh surprises, often tucked away in well-travelled places where one least expects to find them. One such surprise came in my encounter with the note on the famous motto, *nil admirari*, in the first line of letter 6. In the poem's introduction, and in the explanatory notes on line 1, readers are alerted not only to the philosophical principles behind the phrase, with the usual cf.'s regarding Epicurean *ataraxia* and Stoic *apatheia,* but to the importance of the phrase's un-assignability: in the end, no particular school can claim ownership of *nil admirari*, since the idea that it conveys belongs to many schools where it takes many forms.

In developing this point, Cucchiarelli draws a connection between the phrase's negative formulation and the poet's determination, also negatively construed, to not commit himself to any particular philosophical creed (*nullius addictus iurare in verba magistri*, 1.1.14). He indicates that Horace in these poems has a habit of figuring his philosophical project in negative terms. That penchant for negative construal, though it is easily lost sight of

(and, in fact, I have never seen it pried into before) is extremely important. It suggests that the project of these poems is not about finding and taking on new ideas, but of jettisoning bulky and unhelpful ones. It is about not getting lost in the weeds of doctrinal elaboration. Having this pointed out changes the way one reads the book as a whole. With it, one realizes that philosophical learning is itself part of the problem that needs to be sorted through and solved by the book, as much as it is the solution to the poet's woes. Horace does not need more philosophy, he needs less of it! It is part of the load that he carries into these poems and that he is determined to lighten, paring down to what is useful in the present. In advising Numicius that *nil admirari* is just about the one and only thing that he needs to keep in mind for a happy life, the poet is demonstrating to his young addressee how he has pared things down to the bare minimum from the unwieldy bulk of learning (Epicurean, Stoic, Pythagorean, and so on) that stands behind the un-assignable phrase, and he is also pointing out how 'stunned amazement' is exactly wrong approach to take towards philosophical learning itself.

The loads that the poet seeks to shed in the course of the book are many, and they include the trappings and expectations of the life that Horace lived as a celebrity in the city, especially in the aftermath of the publication of his *Odes* (books 1-3). As seen through the jaded but healing retrospective of *Epistles* book 1, the poet's 'spectacular' success (noting the ludic and gladiatorial metaphors of the opening lines of 1.1) had brought him more toil and worry than happiness. His life as a sought-after celebrity had taken a toll: he had become overworked and overfed, prematurely grey, and rather fat. To lighten his load the poet must reconnect with some of the advice that he gave to others in his *Sermones*. Cucchiarelli's commentary is very attuned to these connections with Horace's earlier works. Already in "Return to Sender: Horace's *sermo* from the Epistles to the Satires," in G. Davis (ed.), *A Companion to Horace*, Malden: Blackwell, 2010: 291-318, Cucchiarelli treated readers to a preview of his commentary by reading book one of the *Epistles* as a sustained re-thinking of matters covered in the *Sermones*. That sensitivity to the multiple ways that the poet's earlier hexameter poems figure into, and are finished off by his letters to friends is one of the more important and enlightening features of the commentary. Cucchiarelli knows the *Sermones* very well, and it shows in nearly every page of the commentary (for a typically fine example see his note connecting *principibus placuisse viris* of 17.35 not only to 20.23 *me primis urbis belli placuisse domique*, but to *S.* 1.6.62-3 *magnum hoc ego duco / quod placui tibi*).

To shed the bulk of what weighs him down, Horace must, above all, find a way to say 'no' to Maecenas. After all, it is Maecenas who is behind Horace's political wherewithal, his celebrity, and his wealth. He is the one who has fed him fat. The seventh letter puts on vivid display the difficulties of saying 'no' to his illustrious patron, who now wants to load him with yet more

gifts, along with all the unseen obligations that go with those gifts. It does this most memorably through the parable of little fox that gets stuck in the grain bin, and the story of the once-happy Volteius Mena who is made miserable by the gifts that are given to him by his generous, but demanding patron, Philippus. In introducing the poem, Cucchiarelli points out that the letter presumes a 'summons' from Maecenas ('una sollecitazione') asking Horace to return to the city, and he points out not only that Maecenas was wont to apply significant pressure to his poets in order to get what he wanted (noting the *haud mollia iussa* of Virg. *G.* 3.41; it would have been nice to see this connected to the *non laeve iussa Philippi* in v. 52), but that, back in his younger days, Horace was willing to drop everything to respond to a last-minute summons from Maecenas. These larger memories of Horace's long experience with Maecenas, as remembered from *Sermones* 2.7.32-4, and helpfully pointed out by Cucchiarelli in his introductory remarks on *Epist.* 1.7, both contextualize and add further dimensions to the poet's response to his patron's summons. They help us see Horace acting determinedly, and tending to his own needs, in ways that he either could not, or would not before. In putting Maecenas off until the snow flies, Horace is not merely asking his patron for more time; he is asserting himself, speaking to Maecenas in forthright ways that he had never spoken to him before. He is speaking to his patron in ways that show just how far he has come. Put differently, the polite refusal of the poem's opening lines shows Horace in the act of shedding his load. In the end, his struggle in this poem is not with Maecenas (Maecenas had always been pushy, and he was used to getting what he wanted), it is with himself.

Surprises like the ones described above are many in the line-by-line commentary. Other notes that I found particularly helpful and insightful include the gloss on *Actia pugna* at 1.18.67, where the discussion turns from the grandiose *naumachiae* that were staged by the triumvirs and emperors to staged sea-battles of a more limited, 'domestic' kind, such as one sees fancifully pictured on a painted frieze from the remains of a Roman villa that once stood on the grounds of the Villa Farnesina (a stone's throw from Caesar's aquatic amphitheater in Trastevere), and that is now on display in the Museo Nazionale Romano. The commentary on 1.19, the last true 'epistle' of the book, is extremely helpful in that it shows how the first twenty lines of the poem concern issues of imitation as much as they do issues of poetic inspiration, and water versus wine. I think *temperat* in line 28 might have been helpfully connected to issues of mixing water and wine (it is a common wine-mixing metaphor in Horace, and elsewhere), but the note that follows on *pede mascula Sappho* in the same verse is an impressive and convincing exploration of the letter's most singularly difficult phrase, rightly connecting the ablative *pede* to *mascula*, in the sense of 'maschia nel piede' ('manly in her foot' or 'step,' i.e. she leaves deep pioneering tracks of her own for others

to follow). At fist glance, the translation of *conviva tribulis* with 'il misero convitato della tribù' at 13.15 looks off the mark. But the note explicating the phrase makes clear that the adjective 'misero' is not only defensible, but necessary, and that it comes from insights brilliantly observed. Cucchiarelli explains that the man of humble means in this line is confused and out of his league: he does not know how the protocols of a formal dinner operate, and he has no servant to carry his shoes. The note shows a deep sensitivity towards all the cultural information and angst that is packed into the touching picture that Horace paints in the line. One sees a similar sensitivity towards rich meanings packed into tight spaces in the clever translation of *premunt* with 'asfissiano' ('asphyxiate') at 1.5.29. The translation combines the two basic senses of the verb (*OLD premere* 9 'crowd'/'press' and 26 'choke'/'squeeze the breath out of') that Horace has put to work in tandem to describe the 'choking' stench that wafts from a *triclinium* that is 'crowded' too tightly.

The poems that are the topic of this volume are packed with meanings that cannot possibly be explored in full. And yet they need to have their fullness acknowledged. Andrea Cucchiarelli has found a way to do this, saying all the most important things that need to be said, without getting lost in the weeds. Like Horace, he has mastered the art of jam-packed precision. Despite whatever popularity the book achieves as a prominent contribution to a compact popular series, it is, above all, a serious contribution to the scholarship of Latin literature. As good as you will find anywhere.

Kirk Freudenburg
Yale. Department of Classics
kirk.freudenburg@yale.edu

Karin Margareta Fredborg, Minna Skafte Jensen, Marianne Pade and Johann Ramminger (eds.) *Karsten Friis-Jensen*, *The Medieval Horace*, Analecta Romana Instituti Danici - Supplementum, 46. Roma: Edizioni Quasar, 2015, 229 pp., ISBN 978-88-7140-600-8.

The crucible of medieval classicism was the schoolroom. Even in the earliest, proto-monastic schools, the poetry of pagan authors as well as late-antiquity's early Christians was presented as a model of the mechanics, and artistry, of Latin writing. Just as the church reforms of the eighth and the tenth centuries institutionalised the religious life, they also secured the place of Golden and Silver Age *auctores* in a syllabus recognised as the standard across Western Europe. The transfer of this pattern of pedagogy first into secular schools and then, from there, into universities, did not displace the pagans or diminish their magisterial status, despite the increasing identification of Christian theology as the ultimate end of education in the art(s) of language. In fact the techniques and the topics of the high-medieval schools extended the breadth and the critical depth of readings in classical poetry, creating a new apparatus – the *accessus*, the gloss – on which could be raised systematic criticism of a whole canon of works. The effect of the rapidly evolving environment of the schools on the knowledge and reception of the best-known pagans – Ovid, Virgil – has been sharply focused in recent decades through the painstaking codicological and textual analysis of such scholars as Ralph Hexter, Frank Coulson and Christopher Baswell. Yet the experience of another of the Augustans, Horace, although recognised to have been prominent among the medieval student's pagan masters has been left largely in the shadows of little known, still unedited manuscripts. Over the course of a productive career devoted to material of this kind, Karsten Friis-Jensen was able to pinpoint some of the important moments in Horace's passage through this fast developing critical environment. An exemplary editor, he also provided for further study critical texts of the cribs, glosses and fully-formed commentaries which framed his works for generations of students and their masters from the Twelfth-Century Renaissance to the coming of print. Now, to mark his untimely passing, these representative examples of his meticulous craft are republished under a title which should bring both his scholarship and his theme to wider attention.

Perhaps the most significant contribution here is Friis-Jensen's challenge to the established view that the generation, in the course of the thirteenth century, of new manuals on the art of poetry represented a break away from, even a rejection of, the classical *auctores*, and their long dominance of the

schoolroom. He makes the case that an anonymous commentary on Horace's *Ars poetica*, dated to the twelfth century, which he names the 'Materia' commentary for its *incipit*, 'Materia huius auctoris…', and edits in full for the first time, in fact is the 'missing link' between the reception of *Ars* itself and of the *artes* of the contemporary masters, such as Geoffrey of Vinsauf and Matthew of Vendôme. Its transmission of Horatian lore to the new manuals ensured that the shade of the pagan master still presided over the teaching and practice of the *ars versificatoria* even as the new manuals themselves secured the status of syllabus staple.

Tracing the *accessus* tradition that followed Horace through high-medieval manuscripts, Friis-Jensen finds that the study of his poetic art was commonly accompanied by some exploration of the *auctor* himself and the context, as it was perceived, for his body of work. Students were taught that Horace wrote for each of the four ages of man. This framed the Odes, in particular, as an appropriate diet for youth since they would nourish not only their mental but also their moral formation. The mantle of Moral Horace, guardian and mentor of impressionable youth, Friis-Jensen suggests emerged as a seam in the expanding apparatus of introductions, glosses and fully-formed commentaries. Although in these essays he does not reach towards any comparative perspective with this or any other insight, there is an obvious point-of-contact here with the critical tradition that is built around Ovid – especially Metamorphoses – between *c.*1200 and *c.*1400 and it must be hoped that re-publication will catalyse others to progress the train of thought.

In a synoptic sequence of essays that complete the collection, Friis-Jensen demonstrates that with his status renewed rather than replaced by the thirteenth-century *artes poeticae*, Horace entered the early renaissance as the subject and object of those that aspired to neo-classical Latinity. Petrarch's determination to imitate Horace, Friis-Jensen argues, extended to the formulation of his *Canzoniere* as a counterpart to the Odes. While the outcome may have been unique, the Florentine's interest was not unusual even as fresh, broad currents of classicism washed across Latin Christendom, and Friis-Jensen draws attention to the continued promotion of the *Ars* through a new generation of commentaries through the transition from script to print.

There is much of value here for medievalists and classicists and perhaps especially for those whose studies in medieval reception have, at least implicitly, tended towards claiming an Ovidian exceptionalism in the status and sustained influence of the Augustan auctor. It is marred only by the poignancy that now it will fall to others to profit from what this fine scholar achieved.

James G. Clark
University of Exeter
J.G.Clark@exeter.ac.uk

Philip Hardie, *Ovidio, Metamorfos*i. Volume VI, Libri XIII–XV. A cura di Philip Hardie. Testo critico basato sull'edizione oxoniense di Richard Tarrant. Traduzione di Gioachino Chiarini. Scrittori greci e latini. Milano: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla - Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 2015, lxv+717 pp., € 30.00, ISBN 978-88-04-65162-8.

Only ten years after the appearance of the first volume in the ambitious project of a multi-authored commentary on the *Metamorphoses* sponsored by the Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, the series has been brought to its conclusion with Philip Hardie's contribution on Books 13-15. The completed commentary is an extraordinary accomplishment, to be celebrated by students and scholars of Latin literature in general and not only of Ovid. Under the supervision of the general editor Alessandro Barchiesi, the commentary has the texture of a harmonious whole. This is a remarkable achievement in and of itself, in as much as the project represents the labors of five distinguished Ovidian commentators (Barchiesi himself, Gianpiero Rosati, E. J. Kenney, Jay Reed, and Philip Hardie), two translators (Ludovica Koch and Gioachino Chiarini), and the eminent literary critic Charles Segal, who supplied the general introduction to the series in its first volume. Not to be forgotten is the contribution of Caterina Lazzarini, who compiled the indices that appear at the end of the final volume and will be a welcome tool to many a relieved reader. The completed series is a worthy tribute to Segal and Koch, the dedicatees of its first volume, whose untimely deaths deprived us of even greater contributions.

The final volume of commentary by Philip Hardie (H) is a trove for all who have admired his many contributions to Latin literary scholarship. The contours of the volume follow the now familiar pattern of the earlier books. The text and apparatus are taken from Richard Tarrant's Oxford Classical Text of 2004. As with other volumes in the series, the editor has diverged from that text, with differences duly noted in the introduction (pp. LIX-LXI). H registers 54 instances in which he prints a text different from Tarrant's in Books 13-15, not a very high percentage in 2,629 lines of verse. For the most part these differences amount to relatively insignificant changes in punctuation, or preferences in choice of variants without major interpretative consequences. One such difference in 14.196 is probably a slip, as it is not reflected in the notes or translation. Of the 22 lines bracketed as interpolations in these books by Tarrant, H restores 13, and although there are good grounds for finding Tarrant overly aggressive in such cases, in two instances H may have been better advised to follow his lead.

In 14.645 ff. Ovid describes how Vertumnus disguises himself as a rustic to gain access to Pomona, the object of his unwanted attentions:

tempora saepe gerens faeno religata recenti
desectum poterat gramen uersasse uideri;
saepe manu stimulos rigida portabat, ut illum
iurares fessos modo disiunxisse iuuencos;
falce data frondator erat uitisque putator;
induerat scalas lecturum poma putares.
miles erat gladio, piscator harundine sumpta.
denique per multas aditum sibi saepe figuras
repperit, ut caperet spectatae gaudia formae.

Tarrant discusses the passage in an article that appeared in advance of his edition, arguing that line 651 should be bracketed as a "collaborative interpolation,"[1] probably originating in a marginal notation that contained a line remembered from elsewhere. In this case the surviving intertext intertext is Prop. 4.2.27 and 37, although it is entirely possible that the interpolated line is a citation from some lost text. The line is rhetorically weak, without verbal or intellectual point as a conclusion for the six-line period preceding it, and it is contextually out of place as a disguise for Vertumnus in Pomona's garden. But for H, as for other recent commentators he is following,[2] the intertext doesn't call the passage into question, it guarantees it. The same process of thought may be observed in a number of other textual decisions. At 14.817 the parallel at *Trist.* 2.35 vouches for H.'s preference for *orbem* here, even though *urbem* suits the context better.

Since textual criticism is not the primary goal of this project or this volume, and because the commentators' interventions are relatively sparse and leave the interpretation of the poem largely unaffected, there is no need to linger on such points. But they do serve to underscore the principal focus of this volume, which lies in Ovid's engagement with contemporary and predecessor poets, in both Latin and Greek. And in the 415 pages of H's commentary, the student and the scholar will find a rich collection of materials in notes that bristle with H's characteristic panache for teasing out unexpected connections.

A collective verdict on the six folumes of this commentary will require a sustained period of digestion. H's contribution is clearly a capstone achievement. Readers will appreciate the rich and detailed analyses of

[1] R. J. Tarrant, "The soldier in the garden and other intruders in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *HSCP* 100, 2000, 425-7.

[2] K. Sara Myers, *Ovid: Metamorphoses, Book XIV*, Cambridge 2009, 651, who in turn follows L. Galasso, "L'edizione di Richard Tarrant delle Metamorfosi di Ovidio: una discussione", *MD* 56, 2006, 119-20.

the debate over the arms of Achilles in Book 13, with ample reference to the Homeric intertexts as well as tragedy, both Greek and Roman. Ovid's extensive allusion to the narrative of the *Aeneid* in 13.623-14.608 provides rich material for H's engagement with Ovid's approach to intertextuality. On occasion one might wish, or at least I might wish, for H to be more explicit in signaling how he interprets Ovid's deployment of intertextual alerts. For example, on Ovid's famous four-line digest of the story of Dido and Aeneas at *Met*. 14.78-81, he refers to Sergio Casali's excellent paper on "other voices,"[3] but does not himself explicate the negative reading that Ovid encapsulates here. This is not the only occasion on which H refrains from noting how Ovid manipulates the intertextual background to offer commentary on his predecessors. For example, at 13.444 his reluctance to allow for Ovidian editorializing leads him to accept Slater's banal emendation *infesto* in place of the pointed *iniusto* of the paradosis.

More typical of H's approach are his exemplary treatments of episodes such as Iphis and Anaxarete (14.698-764), which plays out against a complex background of literary influences, ranging from Latin elegy to Hellenistic narrative, much of it lost. Exemplary, too, is H's deployment of the Callimachean intertexts in the final metamorphosis of the poem, the apotheosis of Caesar (15.745-870). H will not be surprised that I sometimes find him pressing the intertextual button too hard, but even some readers less skeptical than I may find the notion of Ovid as Cicero incarnate (p. 621) in the Epilogue (15.871-9) a text too far. Quibbles are the stuff of any reading of an outstanding commentary, and the marginalia that H's volume will generate will be full of them. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Ovid aspired to a broad readership—*ore legar populi*. As H notes, "Ovidio avvicina a sé il *populus*, a differenza di Orazio," and the evidence in the ancient reception teaches us that he achieved this goal. Readers have always responded to the miraculous qualities of the *Metamorphoses*, even when scholars have not. H's final volume in this wonderful series signals that we now live in a period when those two audiences have converged.

Peter E. Knox
Case Western Reserve University
Peter.Knox@Case.edu

[3] "Altre voci nell' "Eneide" di Ovidio", *MD* 35, 1955, 59-76.

Marguerite Johnson, *Ovid on cosmetics: Medicamina faciei femineae and related texts*. London-New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016, xiii+171 pp., ISBN 978-1-4725-0657-3.

Marguerite Johnson (who has books on Sappho, Boudicca, a source collection with Terry Ryan on gender and sexuality, and *Alcibiades and the Socratic Lover/Educator* with Harold Tarrant) offers us this new volume, *Ovid on Cosmetics*, in a Bloomsbury series on Ovid (alongside other books by Rebecca Armstrong, Sarah Annes Brown, Yasmin Hadskell, Paula James, and Genevieve Liveley). Professor Johnson aims to provide a comprehensive overview of Ovid's technical writing on cosmetics, a subject that will come as a surprise to the many readers who are familiar with Ovid mainly through his epic poem the *Metamorphoses*. Johnson's unusual subject, cosmetics (and Ovid's poems relating to this), is something that until recently would have been downplayed as a topic worthy of serious scholarly interest. The fascination that we all now seem to feel for the intimacies of daily life in antiquity (Kelly Olson's *Dress and the Roman Woman: Self-Presentation and Society* [2008] offers a good parallel to this book) makes Marguerite Johnson's welcome subject a timely one.

In *Ovid on Cosmetics* Marguerite Johnson provides a Latin text and translation plus commentary (geared to the English translation and explaining the logical or narrative sections of each poem, rather than a traditional line-by-line account) on the *Medicamina Faciei Feminae* (chapter 1: Ovid's 100-line didactic poem on women's cosmetics), *Amores* 1.14 (chapter 2: "Corinna" has a "bad hair day" and loses her locks to a *calamistrum*, a "curling iron"), *Ars Amatoria* 3.101-250 (chapter 3: advice to women on, amongst other matters, hair, clothes, hygiene, cosmetics, and hairdressing), *Remedia Amoris* 343-356 (chapter 4: how the sight of the cosmetics that woman will use on her face can cure a suitor of his infatuation), and *Ars Amatoria* 1.505-524 (chapter 5: advice to men on the best way to cultivate their bodies). There is a long Introduction offering background information and interpretations to the five chapters that covers the following topics: Greek and Roman attitudes to bodily beautification; "the Roman body" (bathing, cosmetics, mirrors); Ovid on *cultus*, *munditia*, and *ars*; Ovid and Augustus' moral legislation; and a brief discussion of the literary and generic characteristics of the *Medicamina*, the *Amores*, the *Ars Amatoria*, and the *Rededia Amortis*. There are four appendices (1: Notes on the Latin text; 2: Glossary of cosmeceutical terminology [the adjective "cosmeceutical" usually indicates cosmetic products with biologically active ingredients

claiming to enhance skincare efficacy]; 3: Ingredients in the *Medicamina* recipes; 4: Roman weights and measures and equivalents [the basis for her own "recipes"].)

The *Medicamina Faciei Feminae*, perhaps because it is the one "free-standing" poem in her collection, is at the heart of Marguerite Johnson's edition - just as her book title suggests. Part of the aim of her volume – as well as elucidating cosmetic lore - is to make the *Medicamina* more accessible and more a part of what students and scholars understand as Ovid's corpus. Concerning the *Medicamina* Johnson elucidates her mode of interpretation as follows: "Most of the few publications on the work focus on its didactic nature, yet its sensual qualities are also important. Dispensing with the hexametric tradition of instructional poetry and adopting with the hexametric tradition of instructional poetry and adopting the elegiac meter of the *Amores*, Ovid speaks to his female audience on an intimate topic in an intimate manner" (p.23). Johnson also believes that Ovid's stance in this strange poem is essentially a feminist one: he "cultivates female skin, instructs and assists in beautification and holds an elegiac mirror for woman to gaze at the finished product. The demarcation point of privacy and secrecy that traditionally marginalizes the woman at her toilette is thereby breached by Ovid in a poetic exercise that traverses gendered separation" (p.23). This later position is one that Johnson repeats in her versions of the other poems within *Ovid on Cosmetics*. In all of the pharmaceutical detail of *Ovid on Cosmetics* it is easy to forget these two lines of interpretation – and that Johnson is as interested in literary criticism as she in *Realien*.

Ovid on Cosmetics foregrounds Marguerite Johnson's fascination with Ovid's surprising technical knowledge relating to women's and men's attempts at self-beautification. Her book title is quasi scientific. This becomes clearer in the commentary section of the book, especially that devoted to the *Medicamina Faciei Feminae*. Approximately two thirds of Marguerite Johnson's commentary on the *Medicamina* is devoted to Ovid's five cosmetic "recipes" (these are: a mixture to increase the brightness of the complexion; a recipe to produce a smooth complexion; a combination designed to improve the skin of the whole body; a mixture that will presumably remove bodily swellings; and a fifth prescription designed to remove blemishes from the face; the five concoctions comprise about 50% of the extant poem). She begins her discussion of each of these with a proper and almost modern "cookbook recipe", indicating ingredients, portions, weights, and methods. Johnson attaches notes detailing how these "treatments" (*medicamina*) worked according not just to Ovid but also to ancient writers such as Aristotle, Theophrastus, Celsus, Pliny, Scibonius Largus, Pliny, Dioscorides, and others. Ovid and and the other writers from antiquity who touch on comparable prescriptions and ingredients seemed to think these things really did work. From what Marguerite Johnson has to say in her commentary, so

do we. That is just what many readers will hope to learn from a book like this one. Johnson is especially interested in how Ovid's poems offer parallels for modern culture.

Johnson technical enthusiasm may be best displayed in the commentary on the *Medicamina*, but it is also to the fore in her notes on the other supporting poems and portions of poems in *Ovid on Cosmetics*. These technical sections are perhaps the most novel parts of her fascinating book. In the notes on *Amores* 1.14 there is information concerning hairdressing, the *calamistrum*, and wigs. In the notes on the *Ars Amatoria* 3.101-250, there is a discussion on hygiene and on how to disguise the use of cosmetics, and on hairdressing. The chapter notes on the *Remedia Amoris* 343-356, and *Ars Amatoria* 1.505-524 are brief (as are the Latin passages) and offer less detail. They concern more generally Ovid's themes of personal cultivation (*cultus*) and cleanliness (*munditia*).

Who were the women and the men to whom and of whom Ovid writes in these poems? Johnson suggests : "Rather than the simplicities of the idealized *matronae* of epic and historical texts, or the *mertrices* (prostitutes) and *puellae* ('girls', `girlfriends') of the elegiac poets, or even the ghastly hybrids of the wife-whore of satire, Ovid's women are sophisticated, classy, and well-groomed urbanites" (p.17). But who are these "classy and well-groomed urbanites"? Citing *AA* 33-34 (p.20) Johnson suggests that these urbanites were not free born married women, *matronae*, but *meretrices* and freedwomen or *libertinae*. The dividing line, however, between *matronae* and *libertinae* cannot always have been easy to draw, she believes (citing Jasper Griffin, Katarina Volk, and Lindsay Watson – p.20-21). Such may have been the women of the *Medicamina* and the *Ars* and *Remedia Amoris*. The women of the *Amores*, if not their audience, were *meretrices* or prostitutes (p.28). The men addressed in *Ars Amatoria* 1.505-524 were "sexually excitable (perhaps predatory) men" (citing Peter Greene, p.28), presumably well born, air-headed and as yet unmarried. They were not like us, in other words, and their interest in cosmetics and cosmeceuticals cannot necessarily be confused with the modern one. It feels at times in *Ovid on Cosmetics* as if we are meant to see Ovid's men and women as fellow humans with most of the same cosmetic enthusiasms as we do, and that such interests are perhaps to be found in all large urban societies. But Marguerite Johnson does not belabor this controversial point, nor does she need to in such an technical book.

For whom is *Ovid on Cosmetics* aimed? The intended readers are social historians of Rome above all (compare, for example, Mark Bradley's collection *Smell and the Ancient Senses*); readers and students with a concern for gender and sexuality (for whom the audiences of these poems would be particularly of interest); historians of medicine, and of course literary historians, critics, and students of Ovid. There is not enough Latin in the

book (there is about 350 lines) for it to become the basis for an upper level Latin course, but it could be used profitably in conjunction with a selection from, for example, the *Amores*. *Ovid on Cosmetics*, linking literary criticism with the study of material culture and gender and sexuality, is an absorbing addition what is becoming to a bourgeoning scholarly genre.

Peter Toohey
University of Calgary
ptoohey@ucalgary.ca

Ingo Gildenhard, Andrew Zissos, *Ovid,* Metamorphoses*, 3.511-733*. Latin Text with Introduction, Commentary, Glossary of Terms, Vocabulary Aid and Study Questions, Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2017. ISBN 978-1-78374-082-6.

I. Gildenhard y A. Zissos (de aquí en adelante G-Z) han escrito juntos diversos trabajos sobre la poesía de Ovidio. Ahora publican este volumen dedicado a la fábula que cierra el libro 3 de las *met.* de Ovidio: la de Penteo. Este mismo episodio fue años atrás el objeto de estudio de J. Godwin en *Ovid: Metamophoses III. An extract: 511-733.* With introduction, commentary and vocabulary. Bloomsbury: London-New Delhi-New York-Sydney, 2014. Me atrevería a decir que la obra de G-Z supera a la de Godwin debido a una amplia introducción y a un comentario mucho más extenso.

Open Book Publishers presentan en su web la serie de Classics Textbooks como "ideal for A-level and undergraduate students of Latin, and for anybody studying the language first time"[1]. Con este libro G-Z se atuvieron a los preceptos de la serie y crearon un comentario muy útil para lectores noveles o para cualquiera que se acerque por primera vez a la fábula de Penteo.

El volumen comienza con un apartado dedicado a las abreviaturas (ix-xii). Continúa después con la introducción. El primer apartado de esta, "Ovid and His Times" (3-7), contiene unas breves notas sobre la vida de Ovidio. El cuadro cronológico (4-5) en el que se señalan los principales hitos históricos, literarios y de la vida del sulmonés fechados entre la década de los 50 a.C. y el año 17 d.C. puede ser de gran utilidad para cualquiera que comience a interesarse por el mundo antiguo. G-Z presentan la siguiente sección, "Ovid's Literary Progression: Elegy to Epic" (9-12), como una adaptación de su artículo "Inspirational Fictions: Autobiography and Generic Reflexivity in Ovid's Proems", *G&R* 47, 2000, 67-79. En este apartado se ofrece una visión de los diferentes géneros en los que Ovidio escribió y se concluye que "his take on epic is as unconventional as his efforts in elegiac and didactic poetry had been" (12).

No cabe duda de que las *met.* no son un poema épico al uso debido a la gran cantidad de mitos que contienen y la diversidad de los mismos, a su tema principal, al cambio constante del foco narrativo, a la gran cantidad de personajes, al tono, a la mezcla de géneros y las relaciones intertextuales que mantienen con gran número de textos, a su preocupación por la credibilidad o a la mezcla de mito e historia dentro de una especie de historia universal. Sobre todas estas cuestiones reflexionan G-Z en el tercer apartado, "The

[1] https://www.openbookpublishers.com/section/31/1/classics

Metamorphoses: A Literary Monstrum" (13-29), en el que ofrecen una visión panorámica de esta gran epopeya.

La introducción avanza desde lo más general a lo más concreto y presenta ahora la materia tebana que ocupa los vv. 3.1-4.603 ("Ovid's Theban Narrative", 31-7). Los autores se centran sobre todo en el comentario de las acciones que enmarcan la "Tebaida" ovidiana (33-7). En el siguiente apartado, "The Set Text: Pentheus and Bacchus" (39-69), G-Z se ocupan de las fuentes e intertextos de la fábula de Penteo (39-45): Eur. *Bac.*, [Theocr.] *Id.* 26 e *h. Hom Bacch.* Quizás convendría que hubiesen mencionado aquí la tragedia *Penteo* de Pacuvio, a la que se alude por primera vez y de pasada en la p. 27. Esta tragedia latina es recordada en diversos momentos del comentario (véase, e.g., 155 *ad* 557-8; 163; 166 *ad* 574-6; 168 *ad* 582-3; 209) para recordar que Ovidio pudo haber tomado de ella el nombre de Acetes. G-Z prosiguen con el análisis de los personajes. La presentación de Tiresias (46-8) permite conocer su participación en otras obras literarias, su vínculo con Tebas, su tendencia a cambiar de sexo y su adquisición de la videncia. Similar es la presentación de Penteo (48-53), descrito en comparación con el de Eur. *Bac.* y a través de su discurso (esp. vv. 538-40, 553-6). La presentación de Baco (53-8), por su parte, consiste en un repaso de su historia mitológica y de su presencia en obras literarias y artísticas. La última sección del capítulo está dedicada a Acetes (58-64) que, según G-Z, evoca tres personajes literarios: el timonel del *h. Hom.*, el Dioniso disfrazado de las *Bac.* y el homónimo camarada del dios en el *Penteo* de Pacuvio (61). Los autores también deliberan sobre la posible identificación del timonel con el dios (58-63). Sobre este tema vuelven en ciertos lugares del comentario y parece que se decantan por la equivalencia entre los dos personajes, es decir, creen que Acetes es el propio Baco (véase, e.g., 195 *ad* 658-60).

El último capítulo de la introducción se titula "The Bacchanalia and Roman Culture" (65-7) e informa de la relación existente entre la fábula de Penteo y la intervención del Senado romano contra el culto de Baco en el año 186 a.C.

G-Z presentan ahora el texto de la fábula. Dividen los 222 vv. que la componen en fragmentos de entre 5 y 13 vv. seguidos por una serie de cuestiones de morfología, gramática, sintaxis, métrica y retórica ("Study Questions"). También proponen el análisis retórico y estilístico de determinadas oraciones o versos ("Stylistic Appreciation") y sugieren preguntas sobre el contenido del texto, que pueden sacar a relucir temas de la vida, de la política, de la cultura o de la literatura latina e incluso su comparación con situaciones de la actualidad ("Discussion Questions"). Gran parte de las preguntas pueden ser resueltas con la ayuda del comentario (115-221). Para facilitar la comprensión o la traducción, el texto latino va acompañado de una selección de léxico con su traducción al inglés.

Quizás en un intento de guiar a los lectores menos experimentados por el texto latino, G-Z han introducido demasiadas comas en él. Señalo aquí algunos versos en los que las comas son, en mi opinión, prescindibles: vv. 527; 528; 551 *sine crimine, …*; 559; 572; 584; 602 *monstroque viam, quae …*; 646 *a cunctis, …*; 675; 701 *Echionides, nec …*; 707; 721. En el v. 634 la coma puesta después de *Proreus* (*"pone metum" Proreus, "et quos contingere portus / ede velis!" dixit*) incluso dificulta ver la relación sintáctica entre *Proreus* y *dixit*. Yo, por mi parte, haría más evidente el ablativo absoluto *manibus post terga ligatis* del v. 575 encerrándolo entre comas y en el v. 676 *at Libys obstantis dum vult obvertere remos,* añadiría una coma tras *Libys*. Asimismo, eliminaría el punto y coma del v. 532 *attonuit mentes?' Pentheus ait; 'aerane tantum*. G-Z también hacen uso de los dos puntos en lugares en los que dicha puntuación es bastante controvertida: vv. 546-7, 560, 623, 640, 656, 660, 681[2].

Los paréntesis que Tarrant[3] puso en los vv. 568-71 han sido eliminados. Esto implica un retroceso con respecto al texto oxoniense, donde el símil de estos versos se habría entendido como una acotación teatral[4]. En el comentario a los vv. 568-9 G-Z destacan que "[t]he intrusion of the narrator in the first person (*ego … vidi*) is highly unusual for the epic genre" (160) y siguiendo a Solodow interpretan este tipo de intromisiones como un elemento unificador del poema. Sin embargo, no advierten que *ego … vidi* introduce un anacronismo que remite a la Roma del momento[5]. No obstante, sí señalan la existencia de anacronismos obvios o velados en 3.112 *auguris* (122), 1.174 *Penates* (147 *ad* 538-40), 3.556 *pictis intextum vestibus aurum* (154), 3.583 *plebe* (168) y 3.588 *census* (170-1).

En algunos aspectos el texto editado por G-Z es conservador. Mantienen, por ejemplo, los ac. pl. en *–is* de los vv. 588 *salientis*, 599 *levis*, 601 *recentis*, 676 *obstantis*; y retoman en el v. 671 la lectura de los mss., *coepit*[6], y en este mismo verso y en el siguiente, la puntuación *… flecti. / incipit …*[7] Otras veces G-Z aceptaron conjeturas: vv. 643 *ore susurro*, 678 *posse*[1]; *vid. infra*.

[2] Me gustaría señalar que en cuanto a la puntuación el texto es muy similar al de la serie LOEB: *Ovid. Metamorphoses. Books I-VIII*. With an english translation by F. J. Miller, revised by G. P. Goold, Cambridge (MA)-London 1977.

[3] *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses* recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit R. J. Tarrant, Oxonii 2004.

[4] Para una explicación más detallada, véase Á. Suárez del Río, *Edición crítica y comentario textual del libro III de las* Metamorfosis *de Ovidio* (Tesis), Huelva 2015, 394.

[5] Véase W. S. Anderson, *Ovid's Metamorphoses, Book 1-5*, Norman-London 1997, 395.

[6] Ya N. Heinsius (*Operum P. Ovidii Nas. editio nova*, Amstelodami 1659, 72[n]) hizo la siguiente advertencia acerca de este pasaje: "(…) *nigrescere coepit*. male. quia *incipit* mox sequitur".

[7] Dicha puntuación remonta a R. Merkel. Véase su comentario al lugar en *P. Ovidius Naso* ex iterataa R. Merkelii recognitione. Tom. II: *Metamorphoses*. Lipsiae 1890, xi; y las dificultades aducidas por Sh. Bailey ("Ovidiana", *CQ* 4, 1954, 166-7) para hacer depender *dixit* de *incipit*.

Debido a que la obra está destinada a lectores con escasa experiencia en la lengua latina, el comentario (115-221) hace hincapié en el análisis morfológico y sintáctico del texto y con frecuencia ofrece la traducción de los términos u oraciones latinas. Pero en ocasiones la explicación se vuelve demasiado reiterativa por señalar continuamente los elementos que une un determinado *–que* o un *et*. En el caso de *–que*, bastaría con explicar su funcionamiento la primera vez que aparece (v. 512), en aquellos casos en los que tiene implicaciones estilísticas (vv. 523, 529-30, 609, 698), y con señalar su cantidad vocálica en el v. 530. Respecto a esta línea G-Z dicen: "Note that the *–que* after *uulgus* scans long by position before the two consonants of the following word" (137). Creo que sería muy productivo que los autores citasen aquí el trabajo de C. Weber, "The Dionysus in Aeneas" (*CPh* 97, 2002, 322-43), que sí se encuentra entre la bibliografía que manejaron (245). Pues Weber relacionó los neologismos y las licencias métricas con la poesía dedicada a Baco e ilustró tal afirmación con varios versos de la literatura latina. Entre ellos se encuentra *met.* 3.530[8]. *Et*, por su parte, sería suficiente comentarlo si no actuase como una mera conjunción copulativa.

En el comentario G-Z no olvidan aludir a diferentes versiones mitográficas que pueden estar detrás de esta fábula (véase, e.g., 140 *ad* 531-2, 145 *ad* 536-7) y señalar los paralelismos con otras obras. Por razones obvias comparan a menudo la versión ovidiana con la euripidea y con el *h. Hom. Bacch.* También aprovechan para señalan posibles similitudes con la *Od.* (168 *ad* 582-3, 2º párrafo; 177 *ad* 600-1; 178 *ad* 603-4) y versos inspirados en la *Aen.* (*passim*). Sin embargo, a veces omiten dicha información. Por ejemplo, la escena de los sirvientes llevando a Acetes ante Penteo posiblemente haya sido modelada sobre el momento en el que Sinón es conducido ante Príamo: Verg. *Aen.* 2.557-8 *ecce manus iuvenem interea post terga revinctum / pastores magno ad regem clamore trahebant*. Sería pertinente, pues, citar este episodio en el comentario el v. 575 *tradunt manibus post terga ligatis*, pero nada se dice al respecto. En el comentario a los vv. 554-6 podrían recordar el pasaje en que Yarbas, después de haber sido rechazado por Dido, habla de Eneas en los siguientes términos: *et nunc ille Paris cum semiuiro comitatu, / Maeonia mentum mitra crinemque madentem / subnexus, rapto potitur* (Verg. *Aen.* 4.215-17), pero tampoco encotramos ninguna referencia a estos versos. Se limitan a citar *Aen.* 12.99-100 *crinis / vibratos calido ferro murraque madentis* (153).

[8] Véase C. Weber, "The Dionysus in Aeneas", *CPh* 97, 2002, 327, y también *Ovidio. Metamorfosi*. II (Libri III-IV) a cura di A. Barchiesi, Milano 2007, 215. G-Z relacionan otra licencia métrica, el verso hipermétrico, con lo báquico (232). Volviendo sobre el v. 530, según J. Wills (*Repetition in Latin Poetry*, Oxford 1996, 383-4) este y el precedente fueron creados a imitación de Verg. *Aen.* 4.145-6 *instauratque choros, mixtique altaria circum / Cretesque Dryopesque fremunt pictique Agathyrsi*, lo que también podría justificar el alargamiento de *–que* en el texto ovidiano.

También me gustaría señalar cierta falta de coherencia entre el comentario y el apartado de la introducción dedicado a las fuentes ("Sources and Intertexts", 39-45), donde G-Z afirman que "[i]n certain respects his version of the horrific event bears closer resemblance to that of a poem included (probably wrongly) in te Theocritean corpus as *Idyll* 26" (41). Sobre este supuesto paralelismo no vuelven en ningún momento de la obra.

En algunos lugares creo que G-Z se exceden en la interpretación del texto. En el v. 634, por ejemplo, editaron *Proreus*, pero en el comentario (189-90) plantean la posibilidad de entender *proreus*, "used of a ship's 'lookout' or bow officer" e implicando una segunda mención de Melanto, presentado como *prorae tutela* en el v. 617. Creo que tal propuesta interpretativa debe ser desechada por dos motivos: *Proreus* ya está documentado como nombre propio en Hom. *Od.* 8.113 (Πρῳρεύς) y es evidente que desde la Antigüedad los escribas lo entendieron como el nombre de uno de los marineros. De hecho, un número considerable de amanuenses alteraron esta *lectio* y escribieron *Proteus* o *Protheus*, confundiendo así a este personaje con un vate (cf. Verg. *georg.* 4.387-8) que tiene la capacidad de adoptar diferentes apariencias (cf. Ov. *met.* 8.731-7). Hasta el momento Ovidio ha presentado e introducido de forma clara a algunos miembros de la tripulación. Parece raro que ahora, diecisiete versos después de la aparición de Melanto, vuelva a aludir a él de un modo tan oscuro. G-Z incluso manifiestan que en el episodio de los marineros tirrenos "speaking names have a tendency to misspeak" (183). Por ejemplo, manifiestan que aunque *Alcimedon* es un compuesto de ἀλκή y μέδων muy probablemente esté aplicado a un simple remero y que *Epopeus* es una adaptación de ἐπωπεύς, lo que lo convierte en un nombre poco apropiado para referirse al contramaestre (184). Este es el argumento en el que G-Z se basan para interpretar finalmente *Proreus* como "a 'speaking name' that misspeaks, by referring to a different figure's nautical role" (189-90). Tal vez podrían haber omitido la reflexión previa sobre *proreus* en lugar de *Proreus*.

Tampoco creo que G-Z estén acertados en el comentario a los vv. 642-3. Allí editaron *maxima nutu / pars mihi significat, pars quid velit ore susurro* y en la nota al lugar dicen: "Although the manuscript reading *ore* creates a neat balance of ablative complements (*nutu … ore*), it is otherwise somewhat lacking in point, and many editors prefer the variant *aure* (a poetic shortening of *in aure*; in prose we would expect *in aurem*)" (192). En esta ocasión G-Z simplificaron tanto la información sobre la transmisión manuscrita y editorial que se podría decir que engañan al lector. En el v. 642 la vulgata es *aure susurrat* y *ore susurro*, una conjetura de Slater[9].

[9] D. A. Slater, *Towards a Text of the* Metamorphosis *of Ovid*, Oxford 1927, *ad loc.* Su propuesta surge a partir de la conjetura formulada previamente por W. H. Roscher ("Zu Ovidius *Metamorphosen* III 643", *NJbb* 101, 1870, 216), *ore susurrat*. Sin embargo, *ore* se encuentra al menos en el ms. Ambrosianus H 65 sup (s. XII[2]), f. 13[v].

En cambio, en el comentario a los vv. 690-1 hablan de *accensis aris*, una lectura documentada en los codd.[10], como si fuese una conjetura: "Hence some editions have substituted the conjecture *accensis aris* for *accedere sacris*" (206). También son poco exhaustivos en el comentario a *iam non posse manus, iam pinnas posse vocari* (v. 678) y a *dereptis* (v. 724), donde no dicen nada acerca de que tanto el primer *posse* como *dereptis* son conjeturas de Housman[11]. Asimismo esperaría algún tipo de aclaración respecto a *pavidum gelidoque trementem* (v. 688)[12].

Completan la obra dos apéndices: uno dedicado a nociones básicas sobre métrica (225-33) y otro a figuras estilísticas (235-40). El último de ellos es presentado con las siguientes palabras: "This list contains the major rhetorical and syntactic figures identified and discussed in the Commentary"; pero en realidad la lista está incompleta. En diversos lugares hablan de la metonimia (142 *ad v.* 532 *aera*; 147 *ad* 540 *Marte*; 170 *ad* 587 *calamo*; 172 *ad* 593 *regimen*; 184 *ad* 598 *remis*; 185 *ad* 621 *pinum*; 189 *ad* 631 *mero*; 191 *ad* 640 *lintea*; 211 *ad* 703 *aere canoro*) y de la sinécdoque (121 *ad* 510 *Achaidas*; 168 *ad* 583 *Maeonia*; 172 *ad* 593 *carinae* -también en 178 *ad* 604, 191 *ad* 639-; 173 *ad* 595 *Taygeten*; 174 *ad* 596 *puppibus* -también en 196 *ad* 660-), pero estas figuras retóricas no están recogidas en el apéndice. Tampoco aparece allí lo que G-Z en el comentario a *acrior aetas* (147 *ad* 540-42) y a *tutela* (184 *ad* 617-18) denominan "abstract-for-concrete" y que no deja de ser un tipo de metonimia. Entre las figuras retóricas citadas en el apéndice está el homoioteleuton (237), aunque no se menciona en ningún otro momento del libro.

Durante la lectura de la obra he detectado algunos errores gráficos: 89, el perfecto de *exsurgo, -ere, surrexi* debería ir precedido de un guión; 93, debería ser eliminado el guión que precede a *pepuli* en *pello, -ere, -pepuli, pulsus*; 99 y 107, tal vez se debería indicar, como se hace con las otras palabras de esta misma clase, que *iamdudum* y *protinus* son adverbios; 182, en el apartado de "Study Questions" se lee *legatis* en lugar de *ligatis*; 198, l. 3, *ramus* debería ser *remus* (como se lee en la l. 10); 206, l. 2 *trementem* debería

[10] Véase, e.g., Tarrant, *P. Ovidi Nasonis…*, *app. ad loc.*; Suárez del Río, *Edición crítica…*, 464.

[11] La conjetura al v. 678 fue anotada por G. M. Edwards (en I. P. Postgate, *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, Londini 1905, I, 419, *app. ad loc.*). Posiblemente A. E. Housman se la transmitió a Postgate *per litteras* (*Corpus…*, xviii). Para *dereptis*, véase Housman, "Emendations in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *TCPhS* 3, 1890, en J. Diggle, F. R. D. Goodyear, *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, Cambridge 2004 (1ª ed. 1974), I, 165.

[12] Se trata de una conjetura de M. L. Havet, que fue aceptada por P. Lejay (véase Lejay, *Morceaux Choisis des Métamorphoses d'Ovide avec une introduction et des notes*, Paris 1894, 69). Así se presenta el texto en las obras de A. A. R. Henderson, *Ovid. Metamorphoses III*, London 2001 (1979[7]) y de J. Godwin, *Ovid. Metamorphoses III. An Extract: 511-733*, London (etc.) 2017. Aunque ningún comentarista ni editor la menciona, esta variante ya está en el ms. Gothanus Bibl. Ducalis II 58 (s. XIII), f. 30[r].

ser *trementi*. Más insignificantes son las siguientes erratas: 173, 4º párrafo, l. 5, Luc. 8. 852 > Luc. 8.852; 191, l. 4, Zissos 2008. 152 > Zissos 2008, 152; 219, última línea, sons > son's. En ciertas ocasiones olvidaron marcar con un asterisco las figuras retóricas, e.g., "hyperbole" (131 *ad* 521-3), "hyperbaton" (153 *ad* 553), "alliteration" (174 *ad* 596) y "*captatio benevolentiae*" (179 *ad* 605-7).

Durante la lectura de la obra he descubierto una serie de incongruencias. Por ejemplo, G-Z en el v. 683 escribieron *adspergine* (102), pero en la tabla de léxico (103) y en el comentario (204) se lee *aspergine*. En el v. 690 editaron *Dianque*, decantándose por la desinencia griega conservada también en el comentario al lugar (205-6). Sin embargo, en el apartado de "Study Questions" se lee *Diam* (104). En el v. 676 editaron *obstantis*, pero en el comentario (202) encontramos *obstantes*. También me llama la atención la falta de coherencia en la cita de los nombres propios de autores. A veces simplemente ponen las siglas (52, l. 2, E. R. Dodds), otras veces escriben el nombre completo (52, ll. 7-8, Bernd Seidensticker; 62, 3º párrafo, l. 1, Philip Hardie), y en ciertas ocasiones solo el apellido (63, 3º párrafo, l. 6, Vernant).

A pesar de estos pequeños errores y de algunas imprecisiones del comentario, creo que G-Z han creado una obra muy completa y muy útil para cualquiera que quiera disfrutar de la fábula de Penteo. Se podría decir que el resultado es un buen manual o una excelente guía para los estudiantes que se acercan a este truculento episodio de las *met*.

Ángela Suárez del Río
G.I. "Nicolaus Heinsius"
Universidad de Huelva
angela.suarez@dfint.uhu.es

Jürgen Paul Schwindt, *Thaumatographia oder Zur Kritik der philologischen Vernunft. Vorspiel: die Jagd des Aktaion (Ovid, Metamorphosen 3, 131-259)*, Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften, NF, 150. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2016. 174 pp. € 44.00, ISBN 978-3-8253-6550-9.

El presente libro es filológico en doble sentido. Por un lado, porque se dedica, en su mayor parte, a la interpretación textual del episodio de Acteón (pp. 21-162), en la versión que nos ofrece Ovidio en las *Metamorfosis* (3.131-259). Por otro, porque teoriza acerca del concepto de filología, sobre todo en la "Reflexión previa" (Vorüberlegung, pp. 9-20). De hecho, el fundamento principal de la interpretación textual mencionada es precisamente la teoría de que los textos antiguos, aún antes del surgimiento de la ciencia filológica o, una vez nacida, al margen de ella, pueden, a la vez que se van desplegando, contener reflexiones, comentarios e interpretaciones acerca de sí mismos, es decir, que pueden ejercer sobre sí mismos una especie de actividad filológica *avant la lettre*. De manera que, en términos generales, podríamos afirmar que nos encontramos aquí, en doble acción filológica, con la interpretación textual que el profesor Schwindt, catedrático de literatura latina de la Universidad de Heidelberg, realiza sobre la interpretación textual que el propio texto ovidiano, si aceptamos el punto de vista del estudioso, realizaría, a su vez, sobre sí mismo.

La "Reflexión previa" resulta de difícil lectura debido no solo al complejo tema que en ella se trata (la teoría de la filología), sino también al estilo denso, nada condescendiente con el lector. No obstante, una vez superados tales escollos, la propuesta del profesor Schwindt resulta muy sugerente y logra transmitir una nueva concepción de la filología: la investigación de la "filología de la literatura" (Philologie der Literatur, p. 11), como él la denomina, y cuya tesis principal acabamos de resumir en el párrafo anterior. Enfrentada a esta nueva perspectiva de la filología se hallaría la "filología de los filólogos" (Philologie der Philologen, pp. 10-11), la filología, digamos, estandarizada, que se nutre de la tradición más clásica y que, en opinión del autor, ha dejado de ponerse en cuestión a sí misma y, en consecuencia, se ha distanciado del texto literario y ha pasado por alto que "ya los textos más antiguos de la tradición europea ponían continuamente en práctica el espectáculo de interpretarse a sí mismos" (p. 11).

El método de investigación empleado para rastrear la visión "filológica" que de sí mismo ofrece el texto ovidiano es, según el término empleado por el propio autor y que da en parte título al libro, la *thaumatographia*. Con

arreglo a la explicación que de ella ofrece (pp. 17-18), la *thaumatographia* (o atopología) no tendría que ver con la habitual acepción, en sentido estricto, de "redacción escrita, colección de hechos admirables o maravillosos", que remite al generalizado gusto de los antiguos por los *mirabilia* (recogidos incluso en el género de la paradoxografía) o a los posteriores "libros de maravillas" de época medieval (Marco Polo, Juan de Mandeville, etc.), en los que se busca dejar noticia escrita de los hechos que causaron asombro durante un viaje a tierras extrañas, o a posteriores tratados, pertenecientes entre otros al ámbito de las ciencias naturales, como *Thaumatographia naturalis* (1632), obra del naturalista polaco Jan Jonston. La *thaumatographia* sería más bien una ciencia del texto, dedicada no a explicar, para su mejor comprensión global, los hechos asombrosos (*tháumata*), extraños o paradójicos (*átopa*), sino a ofrecer un tratamiento de aquellos pasajes textuales que, en razón de su naturaleza asombrosa, extraña o paradójica, se resisten a la interpretación y que, gracias a ello, no sólo nos proporcionan información sobre las corrientes y tensiones intratextuales, sino que también nos revelan cómo el texto ha llegado a elaborar la visión interpretativa sobre sí mismo.

La concepción de la filología adquiere así una vertiente epistemológica, ya que, en definitiva, se trataría de un método de conocimiento. En esta misma dirección apunta otra de las partes del título: el ingenioso remedo de la conocida obra de Kant (*Crítica de la razón filológica / Crítica de la razón pura: Kritik der philologischen Vernunft / Kritik der reinen Vernunft*) liga la filología a la filosofía y parece asemejar la tarea que el autor se ha propuesto a la tarea kantiana. Si aceptamos esta circunstancia e intentamos profundizar en dicha conexión kantiana, podríamos aventurarnos a afirmar que, de la misma manera que Kant se propone establecer, mediante el autocuestionamiento de la razón humana, el alcance de esta para el conocimiento de la metafísica ("la razón pura"), también el profesor Schwindt parece tener la voluntad de establecer, mediante el autocuestionamiento de la razón del filólogo, el alcance de esta para el conocimiento de los textos ("la razón filológica"), y no nos resistimos a apuntar, a vuelapluma, que tal vez la empresa de aprehender la filología pueda resultar, salvando las distancias, tan verdaderamente complicada como la de aprehender la metafísica.

Con todo, el autor se muestra bastante parco en sus explicaciones teóricas hasta el punto de que estas resultan, en nuestra opinión, en exceso someras, incluso acaso insuficientes, por no decir que, como en el caso de la imitación del título de Kant, permanecen en la simple mención, sin que a partir de ahí se desarrolle una verdadera argumentación. Por ello, tal vez se haga preciso recurrir, según él mismo nos invita (p. 10, n. 4; p. 17, n. 13), a otras contribuciones suyas previas. En efecto, el interés del autor por la teoría de la filología no es nuevo, sino que constituye uno de sus principales campos de investigación, al que ha dedicado numerosos esfuerzos, entre otros la edición del volumen colectivo *Was ist eine philologische Frage? Beiträge zur Erkun-*

dung einer theoretischen Einstellung, Frankfurt 2009, cuya introducción (pp. 11-20), obra del propio Schwindt, se adentra ya en el concepto teórico de filología resultando, por tanto, un instructivo complemento del presente libro (allí, por ejemplo, se ocupa de la "cuestión de la filología" [die Frage der Philologie], en la tradición de August Böckh, el gran estudioso de la filología, profesor también en Heidelberg, a comienzos del siglo XIX; allí destaca un pasaje de la *Odisea*, el del sueño de Penélope, como otro buen ejemplo de autointerpretación filológica en un texto antiguo). Merece la pena que asimismo citemos un par de artículos en los que da ya cuenta del método de la *thaumatographia*: "*Dislocatio temporis*. Struktur und Ereignis in Horaz' Lyrik" (en *Temporalität und Form. Konfigurationen ästhetischen und historischen Bewußtseins. Autoren-Kolloquium mit Karl Heinz Bohrer*, editado por W. Lange, J. P. Schwindt y K. Westerwelle, Heidelberg 2004, pp. 77-93) y "Thaumatographia, or What is a Theme?" (en *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture*, editado por P. Hardie, Oxford 2009, pp. 145-62).

La interpretación del mito ovidiano de Acteón bajo el punto de vista que venimos de explicar adopta la forma del comentario, de un largo y minucioso comentario (142 páginas dedicadas a analizar verso a verso con precisión de entomólogo), en el que solo unos epígrafes, gráficamente destacados en negrita, interrumpen el flujo analítico del autor para señalar la cuestión o cuestiones concretas en que se va a centrar en cada momento, sin que ello afecte a la muy lograda impresión de totalidad (se agradecen las diez láminas en color y blanco y negro que acompañan al volumen, reproducciones de obras artísticas de diferentes autores como François Boucher o Cy Twombly, que representan algunas de las escenas del mito de Acteón comentadas en el libro y que ayudan a la comprensión de las interpretaciones textuales). El comentario es, en general, brillante, en ocasiones deslumbrante, colmado de perspicaces análisis y de agudas consideraciones, sobre todo, como es lógico, en referencia a la intención filológica contenida en el texto, pero en absoluto limitadas a ello, sino que abarcan otros muchos aspectos, como por ejemplo la teología, la poética o los géneros literarios (la relación del texto con la épica, la elegía, el drama). El lector disfruta de la especial sagacidad del autor para establecer asociaciones, ya de semejanza, ya de contraste (la divinidad y el hombre, el hombre y el animal, el adentro y el afuera, el encubrimiento y el descubrimiento, etc.), para rastrear paradojas o inversiones (el cazador cazado: Acteón vuelto presa) a lo largo del episodio y extraer de todo ello, bajo la orientación filológica que le interesa, hallazgos tan sobresalientes como a veces sorprendentes que va reuniendo y engarzando uno a uno, como preciosas cuentas, hasta conseguir componer su particular collar de la filología. Alcanza, en suma, lo que no es poca cosa, a ofrecernos una mirada nueva, original y refrescante acerca de un episodio sobre el que pesan gravemente numerosas lecturas anteriores de relevantes estudiosos.

Para empezar, podríamos señalar el motivo que ha llevado al profesor Schwindt a escoger como objeto de su análisis el episodio de la caza de Acteón: según sus propias palabras, se trata de "una escena primigenia de la filología" (eine Urszene der Philologie, p. 158). El núcleo de la historia se distinguiría por un carácter sustancialmente filológico ya que contendría una lucha por la supervivencia de la palabra, un combate entre el lenguaje y el silencio: la diosa Diana, tras haber sido contemplada desnuda por Acteón, le impone a este, por tal sacrilegio, la metamorfosis en ciervo a fin de que, privado de la palabra humana, no pueda contar lo que ha visto; sin embargo, este mandamiento divino de silencio es desafiado por el texto ovidiano, que presta su palabra a Acteón y relata, revela lo que este no ha podido relatar por sí mismo. Hasta el punto de que, en 3.229-31 (*...clamare libebat, / 'Actaeon ego sum, dominum cognoscite vestrum!' / verba animo desunt; resonat latratibus aether*), la narración, tomando partido por Acteón, se convierte en hermeneuta suyo e, imaginándolas, hace expresas las palabras que él, incapaz de hablar, desearía pronunciar. He aquí un primer ejemplo de que su discurso es, pues, interpretativo, en suma, filológico. Acteón, además, vendría a ser, por las razones que acabamos de aducir, algo así como el héroe fundacional de la filología.

Pero no acaban ahí, ni mucho menos, los testimonios de la presencia de la filología en nuestro texto: la *expositio* del relato presentaría una disposición filológica, es decir, oscilaría entre varios y diferentes registros (la empatía y la subjetividad, la objetividad narrativa, la descripción del espacio y del tiempo) dando así lugar a una primera cuestión filológica (pp. 22-31), según la cual el propio texto se estaría preguntando, estaría reflexionando sobre cómo exponer una materia como la que aquí se trata, cuáles deben ser el tono y el estilo apropiados a ella, cuál la forma que ha de adoptar. De ahí deriva el autor una serie de denominaciones de la filología que relacionan a esta con ciertos elementos que, en principio, parecen chocantes en tal relación pero que, a la postre, resultan muy expresivos como, por ejemplo, la "filología de las emociones" (Affektenphilologie, p. 24) o la "filología del destino" (Schicksalsphilologie, p. 27) o la "filología del sol" (Sonnenphilologie, p. 31). La filología de las emociones tendría que ver con la empatía y la compasión mostradas por el narrador hacia los personajes, y no estaría muy lejos de lo que Brooks Otis, en su ya clásico estudio *Virgil: a study in civilized poetry*, Oxford 1963, dio en llamar el "estilo subjetivo" de los versos virgilianos. La filología del destino se referiría a la aplicación, mediante una *quaestio* (*met.* 3.142: *quod enim scelus error habebat?*), de la teoría aristotélica sobre el error y la culpa al caso de Acteón, con el triunfo del error sobre la culpa. La filología del sol iría encaminada al establecimiento del tiempo en que se desarrolla la acción (el mediodía, cuando el sol está en lo alto) y al hecho de que sea precisamente en ese momento cuando los personajes entran a considerar el tema de la fortuna (así Acteón en 3.149: *fortunamque dies habuit satis*)

y cuando toman las decisiones más determinantes que conducen al desenlace de los acontecimientos.

Además de la *expositio*, también la autoorganización del texto sería, para el autor, filología (p. 80), ya que ello comporta un componente hermenéutico. La forma en que un texto se organiza a sí mismo revela la preocupación del texto por sí mismo (*cura sui*), una reflexión sobre sí mismo, una búsqueda de sentido, actuando así, por tanto, como un comentario, una interpretación de la historia que narra. Hasta el punto de que el relato de Acteón vendría a ser una "historia primigenia de la hermenéutica" (Urgeschichte der Hermeneutik, p. 79), en armonía con la etiqueta anterior de "escena primigenia de la filología".

Otra de las manifestaciones de la filología serían los comentarios que apuntan más allá del pasaje concreto en el que aparecen, a modo de anticipos de lo que vendrá después: por ejemplo (pp. 37-38), el adjetivo *perlucidus* (*met.* 3.161) aplicado a la fuente que hay en la gruta y en la que se bañará Diana apunta, por el hecho de que en lo más escondido del bosque haya un manantial de agua clara y cristalina, al instante posterior en que, allí mismo, Diana será descubierta por Acteón en toda su resplandeciente desnudez divina. Un procedimiento semejante es lo que el autor llama Philologie der Nacherzählung (p. 38), que podríamos parafrasear como la filología derivada de una narración que retoma ciertos elementos de una narración anterior y que se ve, además, influida por esta: tal es el caso de la historia de Acteón en relación con la historia de Cadmo, que precede a aquella inmediatamente en el orden estructural de las *Metamorfosis* (3.1-130); de este modo, las andanzas del abuelo actuarían como trasfondo de las andanzas del nieto, dando relieve a estas e influyendo en su estructura (con elementos que se repiten como la gruta con agua en su interior o el tema del extravío, si bien la significación se volvería distinta de uno a otro episodio).

Los nombres desempeñan también un papel importante en el asunto de la filología: tanto el de Acteón (p. 102) como el de sus perros (p. 88). El catálogo de los perros (*met.* 3.209-25) contiene una intención filológica porque no se limita a hacer mención del nombre de los animales, sino que los comenta, los parafrasea. Por su parte, la mención del nombre de Acteón resulta muy significativa por el hecho de que se ahorra y reserva hasta el justo instante narrativo en que el héroe es transformado en ciervo, es decir, cuando pierde la capacidad del habla. Su nombramiento se convierte así en triunfo de la narración frente al fracaso de Acteón.

Sería largo enumerar cada uno de los numerosos hallazgos que en su minucioso rastreo de la "filología de la literatura" ha llevado a cabo el autor. Basten los ejemplos que acabamos de comentar para hacerse una idea cabal de su propósito. No nos resistimos, sin embargo, a entrar a considerar una última cuestión derivada del punto de vista que adopta su estudio: la rica reflexión sobre el lenguaje y el silencio. En concreto, nos parece de particular interés

la idea de que la palabra supone un desafío al poder divino de Diana, una amenaza capaz de menoscabar el orden teológico del mundo, mientras que el silencio aparece, en consecuencia, como la imposición de dicho orden (esa es la razón de que Acteón se vea privado del lenguaje), que, por cierto, acaba por transgredir la propia narración ovidiana, la palabra del poeta. Se trata de una concepción, nos gustaría añadir, cuya raíz se encuentra en la religión romana y que nos sale al paso también en autores como, por ejemplo, Virgilio: el silencio impuesto a Acteón se asemeja al que era preceptivo guardar en ciertas ceremonias religiosas (los misterios, por ejemplo) y la palabra con la que el héroe podría haber relatado lo que vio podría haber sido como una transgresión del preceptivo silencio ceremonial; el silencio que, por ejemplo, guarda Eneas ante las súplicas de Dido de que no la abandone (*Aen*. 4.437-49) puede ser asimismo interpretado como una muestra de obediencia al mandato de los hados, es decir al orden divino, que le ha impuesto al héroe troyano abandonar a Dido y dirigirse a Italia, mientras que las palabras de la reina cartaginesa, con su intención de convencerlo para que permanezca junto a ella en Cartago, desafían, al menos en un primer momento, ese mandato divino, los *fata Iovis*, la palabra, en este caso, del dios Júpiter.

A la vista del profundo calado metodológico de la teoría que aquí se quiere alumbrar, así como de su pretensión de alcance general, la impresión última que tiene el lector es que quizá sería oportuno un mayor desarrollo de dicha teoría, brillante y radical como es, que tal vez no alcance con el análisis de un único texto, sino que sería aconsejable recurrir a otros y quizá establecer un método comparativo entre ellos. En todo caso, el autor parece ser consciente de esta circunstancia, puesto que ya en el título denomina "preludio" (Vorspiel) a esta monografía suya, dándonos a entender, creemos, que se trata solamente de la antesala de futuras aportaciones. Desde luego, aguardamos con sumo interés que así sea. Mientras tanto, querríamos dejar constancia de un apunte final: con este libro, con el comentario y la interpretación en él contenidos, el profesor Schwindt viene, en definitiva, a inscribirse en la dimensión filológica que él mismo analiza; traza un línea que parte de la incapacidad de hablar de Acteón en el plano del mito, una línea que pasa por el relato ovidiano que da voz al héroe y quebranta la imposición de silencio de Diana en el plano de la filología del texto antiguo, una línea, en fin, que acaba en su propia actividad de filólogo del siglo XXI en el plano de la ciencia filológica de la modernidad, la cual, si seguimos el ejemplo de la transgresión del relato ovidiano, tiene por delante, incuestionablemente, la tarea de aprender a cuestionarse a sí misma, a transgredir, por su parte, el orden filológico estandarizado, la filología de los filólogos.

Antonio Mauriz Martínez
antmauriz@hotmail.com

H. Malaspina, *Lucius Annaeus Seneca, De clementia libri duo*, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2016, xxxviii+44 pp., ISBN 978-3-11-026257- 5.

Esta edición del *de clementia* es una versión actualizada y adaptada a las normas de editorial Teubner de la edición de 2001 en Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso (cf. M. Winterbottom, Bryn Mawr, 2002), recogida de nuevo en U.T.E.T, esta vez con traducción en el año 2009 (Cf. C. Codoñer, Bryn Mawr, 2010).

En la segunda edición de 2009, no provista de aparato crítico, en la Introducción (Nota crítica) y en las nutridas notas que acompañan el texto, Malaspina proporcionaba abundante información sobre la transmisión manuscrita, acompañada del *stemma* resultante. Ofrecía una lista de las ediciones, desde la *princeps* de 1478 a la última en aquel momento (Büchner 1970) y discutía los pasajes más controvertidos poniendo a contribución lecturas de códices, así como ediciones a partir de Erasmo. Las decisiones adoptadas, pues, siempre contaban con las razones que habían llevado al editor a aceptarlas. La tendencia en el proceso de fijación del texto era conservadora, de modo que el número de pasajes corruptos era alto, algo nada extraño dado el estado en que nos ha llegado el texto.

La actual edición, cuya introducción está escrita en un correcto latín, de acuerdo con la tradición teubneriana, viene a ser una remodelación abreviada de la edición de 2009. Consta de un breve apartado que aborda los problemas relativos a su carácter completo o incompleto, la ocasión e intención de Séneca al escribir esta obra y las consecuencias que sobre su transmisión pudo tener.

El siguiente apartado está dedicado a la transmisión manuscrita. Incluye la descripción de los dos códices básicos: *Nazarianus* (*N*) y *Reginensis* (*R*) y una exposición sobre la relación entre ambos, dejando en suspenso la posible existencia de un códice intermedio. Tras una breve descripción de los *recentiores* añade el *stemma* que, salvo una pequeñísima diferencia, coincide con el de 2009.

Por lo que respecta al texto, sigue la tendencia conservadora ya mencionada, incrementada en tres pasajes: 1.20.2 faueat †et ut appareat, non† minorem; 2.2.2 non ut *** blandum, lectura sobre la que ya en 2009 expresaba sus dudas y 2.6.1 Adice quod sapiens †ac† prouidet.

En la frase Ciuitatis autem mores magis corrigit parcitas animaduersionum *edd.* paritas *N* parcitas *R* opta por una conjetura de Reeve: *raritas*, perfectamente asumible; y también podría pensarse en un *paucitas*.

El aparato crítico es muy nutrido y ofrece, siempre que se considera necesario, las lecturas de los editores o estudiosos encaminadas a sanar el

texto. El único inconveniente que puede derivar de ello es la posible falta de homogeneidad en la aplicación de ese principio. Es decir, en algunos casos, una lectura sustentada por un códice, sea *N* o *R* o un manuscrito tardío, va seguida del editor que la adoptó, por ejemplo: p. 28, **17** sed *N Hosius*: et *R*; o p. 8, **15** pinnae *NR φ Haase*. Esto lleva a pensar que el primero en postular *pinnae* es Haase, pero no es así, puesto que ya Pinciano defiende esa lectura. Lo mismo sucede cuando la lectura transmitida por editores posteriores, que han utilizado manuscritos no identificados, dan la lectura correcta. Por ejemplo, en **22** aut ut ς^{G} ς^{F} : aut *N*, es decir Gruter y Fickert, siendo así que es lectura presente en las *Castigationes* de Pinciano.

En una ocasión pienso que debiera corregirse el texto, precisamente tomando la conjetura de Hernán Núñez de Guzman, el "Pinciano". En 2.4.1 la lectura hasta ahora aceptada mayoritariamente es:

ut Busiris ille et Procrustes et piratae, qui captos uerberant et in ignem uiuos imponunt.

ut Busiris R^{c} (*ss.*) *QC1C2C3* : utusuris $NR^{1}C$: ut osyris ψ : ut Sinis ς^{G} *Gruter*^{An}

es decir, Gruter (1595).

El Pinciano dice así: Vt Busiris ille et Procustes] *Exemplar Academiae*: Osiris ille et Proscustes. *Exemplar Franciscanum*. Siris ille et Procustes. Lego *Scinis* ille et Procrustes ex Plutarco, Ouidio et plerisque aliis. Lectura que encaja perfectamente en pareja con Procrustes.

Es evidente que se está refiriendo a estos dos versos de Ovidio *Her*. 2.68-70, leídos en un ejemplar con la grafía alternativa a *Sinis*: Cum fuerit Sciron lectus toruusque *Procrustes*/ Et *Sinis* et tauri mixtaque forma viri. La lectura *Siris* del ejemplar *Franciscanum* (¿) le ha sugerido de inmediato lo leído en un ejemplar de Ovidio o Plutarco con la grafía *Scinis*. Creo que las *Castigationes* del Pinciano merecen una revisión, porque varias de sus sugerencias pueden ser útiles.

En resumen, una edición, destinada a los especialistas y, por tanto, reducida a sus elementos esenciales. Como resultado de años de investigación del *de clementia,* esta edición garantiza que la selección de datos se ha operado sobre un conocimiento en profundidad de los problemas y de las soluciones que les han dado los cientos de investigadores que se han ocupado de esta obra.

CARMEN CODOÑER
Universidad de Salamanca
codo@usal.es

Beth Severy-Hoven, *The Satyrica of Petronius: an intermediate reader with commentary and guided review*, Oklahoma series in classical culture, 50, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014, pp. 312, ISBN 978-08-06144-38-2.

The *Satyrica of Petronius* is widely read in universities and schools around the globe. One reason for its enduring popularity might be that it includes descriptions of the strange and foreign social culture of the early Roman Empire and mocks still-contemporary fields like education, corruption, and politics. But when today's readers embark on the journey with Encolpius and his friends, they face four main challenges: the *Satyrica*'s unusual prosimetric format; its complex textual transmission; the author's wide range of register, which moves from Classical prose to mimicking colloquial and vulgar Latin; and finally, its intertextuality. All four challenges are puzzling enough for scholars, let alone learners of the Latin language, and it is therefore unsurprising that Severy-Hoven identified a need for another in-classroom introduction to Petronius' work.

The book is not meant to be read by a Petronius scholar, but to be used by the "overworked intermediate-level Latin instructor" and "the literally and culturally curious twenty-first-century undergraduate Latin student". The dedication of the book, "*discipulis meis*", and the two prefaces, one for students and one for instructors, further underline the function of the book as a teaching aid. The author specifies that the book is intended for intermediate-level Latin students who are reading Petronius for the first time. This makes Severy-Hoven's text the third book currently available for instructors teaching Anglophone intermediate Latin students using passages from the *Satyrica*. The others are Gilbert Lawall's *Petronius: Selections from the Satyricon* (1995, 3rd revised edition) and M. G. Balme's *The Millionaire's Dinner Party* (1973). Her up-to-date didactic approach to Latin language acquisition and her writing in modern accessible language, however, set her work apart from the two alternatives and will be welcomed by students. The book certainly delivers on being a teaching aid for the intermediate-level Latin instructor. It is a *satura*, a selection and composition of passages, wordlists, further Latin readings, and exercises that certainly save Latin instructors some work. Unsurprisingly, the book was very well received by those instructors and won the 2015 Pedagogy Book Prize from the Classical Association of the Middle West and South.

Yet, given both of those earlier books had a strong focus on the *cena Trimalchionis*, my main criticism of Severy-Hoven's book is that she missed

an opportunity to address this narrow focus sufficiently. In fact, compared to Lawall's attempt to select passages appropriate for teaching, Severy-Hoven's selection seems like a lateral step. The title of Severy-Hoven's book, with which she suggests that the selected passages give an almost complete picture of the *Satyrica*, is therefore unfortunately chosen. Severy-Hoven intended to provide a "substantive introduction to the novel" and wanted to "create a more complete and more authentic textbook" of the *Satyrica* and in my opinion she did not fully deliver on this task.

In what follows I will try to show how the structure, selection of Latin passages, and grammatical exercises stay true to those goals in a broad sense and comment where they have missed the mark. It should be said that occasionally missing the mark is not a huge downfall for a book that is written for in-classroom use. A good instructor will see those shortcomings as an opportunity to provide additional information or competing explanations and even use them to encourage their students to research topics further and deeper.

The structure of the book is straightforward: in a 54-page introduction Severy-Hoven discusses the text itself (4-8), the author (9-11), the narrative structure (11-13), the historical and cultural context (14-30), the language (31-32), literary engagements (33-45), and the *Satyrica*'s reception (46-41). The introduction is followed by a selection of passages (55-106), a very brief commentary that is often closer to a vocabulary list (107-70), supplementary Latin readings (p. 171-78), and a very diligently prepared guided review, that is a grammatical *repetitorium* for use in-class and a thesaurus of homework tasks (179-256). Especially due to this guided review the book delivers on its promise to be a teaching aid.

The strong points of the introduction lie in its comprehensive nature, in the description of the historical and cultural context, and in its accessible use of language. The description of the transmission of the text, however, is lacking some precision: for instance, the author states that all manuscript families are based on a text that had been consciously made fragmentary through a selection process, while this can only be said with certainty for the text transmitted in the O family and through the florilegia. Most passages the author discusses in her work are transmitted through the codex Par. Lat. 7989 of the H family. That said, Severy-Hoven's description will give students a feeling for the fragmentary transmission of the text and while other reviewers may find this enough, I find the turbulent history of the text so intriguing that I have to disclose my own bias here. One disappointing aspect, though, is the fact that Severy-Hoven attests Petronius a preference for prose over verse (38). Given all surviving poems of Petronius, the interconnectedness of prose and verse in the *Satyrica* (see, for instance, in §108 where we find the finite verb of the prose sentence within the verse), and the very fragmentary state of the text, this is a highly contestable statement. The strength and the

concision of the other parts of the introduction, however, fully outweigh those two cases of imprecision and both points could be addressed in-class by an instructor.

In what follows Severy-Hoven presents a diligently prepared selection of Latin passages that she combines with grammatical exercises and explanations. A real weak point of the selection of passages, however, is that it emphasizes the *cena Trimalchionis* too much. Although the *cena* is roughly only one third of the surviving text of Petronius' *Satyrica*, around three quarters of the discussed readings in the book are taken from Trimalchio's feast, and four out of the five supplementary readings. Given that most English literature focuses on the *cena Trimalchionis*, this is not surprising. Although there is a companion to Petronius[1] and an edition with commentarial notes[2], as well as a handbook[3] and attempts at reconstructing the plot[4], a full-scale commentary in English on the sections before and after the *cena* had been a research desideratum until the recent publication of Schmeling's commentary late in 2011 (it had been announced by Schmeling in 1977) and my PhD thesis in 2013.[5] But in order to de-bias the reading of Petronius, I suggest that one must fight against its reduction to the *cena*: topics like the criticism of the education system and its systematic need to lure paying students by offering what they like best not but what may be most useful to them (§1-5), along with the unhealthy influence of money, betrayal, and counter-betrayal on the legal system (§12-15), are still very much up-to-date. Severy-Hoven's selection of passages also ignores the prosimetric nature of Petronius narrative: the only poem that is discussed is the one in which Encolpius scolds his member, which of course is a neat complementary to the last chapter in which the letter exchange between Encolpius and Circe features. Given the relatively easy structure of Petronius' poem (a full stop roughly every two lines), I think it is a missed opportunity not to ease the students into Latin verse with the *Satyrica*. I acknowledge that Severy-Hoven may have simply catered to the specific demands of intermediate Latin language education, but given that she intended to "create a more complete and more authentic textbook" of the *Satyrica*, she could have expanded this narrow, albeit traditional, focus of teaching Petronius.

The passages that are discussed, however, are diligently prepared and a

[1] E. Courtney, *A Companion to Petronius*, Oxford 2001.

[2] M. S. Smith, *Cena Trimalchionis*, Oxford 1975.

[3] I. Repath and J. Prag, *Petronius: A Handbook*, Chichester 2009.

[4] For instance, Courtney's *Companion* and G. Jensson, *The Recollections of Encolpius*, Groningen 2004.

[5] G. Schmeling, *A Commentary on the Satyrica of Petronius*, Oxford 2011, and T. Köntges, *Petronius' Satyrica: A Commentary of Its Transmission, Pre-plot Fragments, and Chapters 1-15: a Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Otago*, Dunedin 2013.

true aid to the instructor and the intermediate Latin reader. Severy-Hoven's talent in leading instructor and student to teaching points and take-away information is remarkable. The Latin composition exercises in the post-reading activities are challenging enough to engage students in a deeper understanding of the Latin language and even prepare them for prose composition courses (if they are still offered). Her presentation of strategies of how to read Latin in chapter three is particularly strong and I'd recommend it for any first reading class, be it the *Satyrica* or *De Bello Gallico*. That said, coming from a Digital Classics background, I believe that she underutilizes the current digital state of the art. Her points about arch composition (198-200) could be wonderfully addressed in Treebanking, a digital method to mark-up morpho-syntactical dependencies. An open source application, Arethusa, is available in the Perseids collaborative editing environment and has been used widely at Tufts University for teaching Latin and Ancient Greek.[6]

To summarize, Severy-Hoven's book is a very good teaching aid for the over-worked Latin instructor and a good first reading course. It is not a comprehensive introduction to the *Satyrica*, because it ignores too much scholarship regarding its transmission, the poems, and the reconstruction of the plot and focuses too strongly on the *cena Trimalchionis*. I think one of our duties as language instructors is to help students overcome bias in accessing Latin literature and attempt to introduce students as comprehensively as possible to a new author, rather than just provide an introduction that is *quasi papavere et sesamo sparsa*. This is especially so when faced, as with the *Satyrica*, with an already highly biased transmission of the text. That said, the passages that are discussed are very diligently prepared and an excellent help. The book definitely fulfills its mission of being a teaching aid, one of the author's goals, mentioned in the introduction. It is also up-to-date with paper-based Latin language learning, although I hope that readers of this review are encouraged to engage with new teaching tools offered at Perseids. Overall, I'd recommend the book for classroom-use. A good instructor will be able to address its shortcomings and will be relieved to have a good basis and preparation for the passages discussed.

Thomas Köntges
University of Leipzig
Thomas.koentges@uni-leipzig.de

[6] See *Perseids: A Collaborative Editing Environment for Source Documents in Classics*, http://www.perseids.org.

Gesine Manuwald, *Valerius Flaccus*, *Argonautica*, *Book III* (*edition and commentary*), *Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015, x+286 pp., ISBN 978-1-107-69726-3.

El año 1980 marca un punto determinante en los estudios del texto de las *Argonáuticas* de Valerio Flaco. En ese año Ehlers publica para Teubner una edición basada en una nueva revisión de los manuscritos, en la que modifica la importancia y ordenamiento del *stemma* que se manejaba hasta entonces. Poco tiempo después, Rupprecht (Stolz, Mitterfels 1987), Caviglia (BUR, Milán 1999), Soubiran (Peeters, Lovaina 2002) y Dräger (Lang, Frankfurt 2003) editan y traducen el poema; Spaltenstein (Latomus, Bruselas 2002, 2004 y 2005) hace un comentario completo de la obra, el primero después del de Langen (Calvary, Berlín 1896); Liberman (Les Belles Lettres, París 1997 y 2002) edita, traduce y comenta todo el poema, y establece un texto de referencia para los investigadores posteriores. Se publican también comentarios a cada uno de los libros: comentan el libro 1 Kleywegt (Brill, Leiden 2005), Galli (De Gruyter, Berlín 2007) y Zissos (Oxford University Press, Oxford 2008); el 2, Smith (Oxford 1987) y Poortvliet (VU Univ. Press, Ámsterdam 1991); el 4, Korn (Olms, Hildesheim 1989, vv. 1-343), Campanini (La Nuova Italia, Florencia 1996, vv. 99-198) y Murgatroyd (Brill, Leiden 2009); el 5, Wijsman (Brill, Leiden 1996); el 6, Fucecchi (ETS, Pisa 1997, vv. 427-760; y 2006, vv. 1-426), Wijsman (Brill, Leiden 2000) y Baier (Beck, Múnich 2001); el 7, Taliercio (GEI, Roma 1992), Stadler (Olms, Hildesheim 1993) y Perutelli (Le Monnier, Florencia 1997); y el 8, Pellucchi (Olms, Hildesheim 2012) y Lazzarini (ETS, Pisa 2012, vv. 1-287). Finalmente, en el año 2015 Cambridge University Press publica el primer comentario al libro 3, sin precedentes en ninguna lengua, elaborado por la profesora Gesine Manuwald.

De acuerdo con el propósito de la colección *Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics*, esta nueva edición y comentario cumple cabalmente la función de proporcionar material adecuado para el estudiante que se acerca al texto de las *Argonáuticas*, que agradecerá las abundantes citas de paralelismos y bibliografía secundaria que proporciona la investigadora a lo largo del comentario, así como la ayuda para la comprensión de pasajes difíciles a través de paráfrasis y traducciones. El texto ha sido editado a partir de las variantes recogidas en los aparatos críticos de Ehlers y de Liberman, con referencias ocasionales a Courtney (Teubner, Leipzig 1970) y a Langen; la información procurada en el aparato crítico se restringe, según establecen las normas de la colección, a *loci difficiles*, algunos de los cuales son discutidos en las correspondientes notas del comentario.

La introducción cuenta con cuatro apartados: 1. "The poet", 2. "The poem", 3. "Book 3" y 4. "Text and transmission". En el primero son sintetizados los escasos datos que tenemos acerca de la persona de *Gaius Valerius Flaccus*, nombre que nos transmiten los manuscritos conservados, junto con otros dos *cognomina* que no pueden ser atribuidos con certeza al poeta. Se trata también de manera sucinta la teoría según la cual el poeta perteneció al colegio de los *quindecimviri sacris faciundis*, originada a partir de los versos 1.5-7 del proemio, en los que se menciona "un trípode que comparte los conocimientos de la sacerdotisa cumana en la casa del poeta"; Manuwald piensa que no se debe confundir esta presentación con su biografía, y que tal invocación podría ser tan sólo una manera de referirse a la inspiración poética. Con respecto a la datación del poema, apoya el consenso general según el cual fue compuesto durante los años 70 del siglo I d. C., basado en la invocación que el poeta hace al emperador Vespasiano (1.7-18). En cuanto a la extensión, piensa que originalmente Valerio pretendió escribir su obra —cuyo texto se interrumpe abruptamente en 8.467— en ocho libros, el doble de los cuatro que componen las *Argonáutica*s de Apolonio de Rodas.

Aborda Manuwald de manera sintética la tradición del mito argonáutico (apartado 2.1), y analiza la intertextualidad del poema (apartado 2.6). Explica cómo Valerio añade o suprime episodios con respecto a Apolonio de Rodas, cómo procura a su relato una trascendencia universal al introducir el designio de Júpiter y cómo combina motivos poéticos o estilos narrativos de Homero y de Virgilio, sus principales modelos, mediante un proceso que la autora denomina "combinatorial imitation", efectuado a menudo en una escena o incluso en una sola línea.

De gran utilidad es el análisis estructural de los contenidos del libro 3 (apartado 3.1). Establece Manuwald que este está compuesto por dos grandes secciones, el episodio de Cízico (1-461) y el episodio de Hilas (481-740), conectadas por un breve interludio que describe la competencia de remos (462-480) y a su vez divididas respectivamente en nueve y seis subsecciones, que encuentran correspondencia en la minuciosa organización de las notas que integran el comentario.

El tema del papel que desempeñan los dioses en los acontecimientos humanos interesa mucho a Manuwald (2.5 *Gods, fate and humans*). Observa que Valerio reintroduce en su epopeya el aparato divino tradicional, después de que Lucano lo abandonó en su *Farsalia,* pero con una particularidad fundamental: no existe la comunicación entre las esferas divina y humana, como existía en la *Eneida*. Júpiter es el dios supremo, y en los vv. 1.531-560 establece un designio divino con repercusiones históricas universales: mediante sucesivos enfrentamientos bélicos se producirá un traslado de la hegemonía mundial, primero de Asia a Grecia, y después a otro pueblo (se entiende que a Roma, pero no se especifica). El lector sabe, pues, que el viaje de los ar-

gonautas forma parte de la providencia divina, mientras que los personajes permanecen ignorantes de este hecho.

En el libro 3, el problema de la responsabilidad humana se plantea expresamente a propósito del episodio de Cízico (3.1-461), cuando los argonautas, tras la matanza que llevan a cabo sin percatarse de que combatían con sus amigos, son afectados por un terrible remordimiento que les impide continuar el viaje. Ante tal estado, Jasón se acerca a Mopso para preguntar la causa del mal que sufren, y el sacerdote le responde que no es lícito acabar con la vida de alguien antes de que cumpla el tiempo preestablecido por el hado, de acuerdo con la doctrina estoica. Incurrir en tal ilicitud provoca sentimientos de ira y dolor en las almas de las víctimas, que, con el permiso de Plutón, regresan del inframundo a castigar a sus agresores; sin embargo, los homicidas que no tuvieron la intención de cometer el homicidio son castigados por sus propios remordimientos. La incoherencia que han observado también otros investigadores consiste en que Mopso realiza el rito de purificación a pesar de que en su discurso identifica a sus compañeros como aquellos homicidas que no tuvieron la intención de matar, y que por tanto sufrirían únicamente el castigo impuesto por su propia mente. Manuwald trata de resolver esta incoherencia analizando el grado de responsabilidad de los argonautas, objetivamente culpables de haber cometido un acto que puede considerarse ilícito según la doctrina estoica, pero al mismo tiempo inocentes, en la medida en que han actuado por desconocimiento. Dado que el sacerdote realiza de todos modos el rito, piensa la autora que el segundo grupo también sufre la persecución de los manes, aunque, al parecer, sin el acompañamiento de una Furia. Creemos, sin embargo que falta un elemento para comprender de manera más completa esta situación. Porque Manuwald, que reconoce ampliamente la influencia de Virgilio en las *Argonáuticas*, no le presta toda la atención debida a la influencia de Lucano.

Puede reconocerse en el pasaje del rito de purificación la presencia de un intertexto de la *Farsalia* (7.764-780) en el que se describe el remordimiento que atormenta a los soldados de César tras haber tomado el campamento pompeyano. El combate, señala Lucano, ha sido un crimen (*quae fossa, quis agger | sustineat pretium belli scelerumque petentis*, 7.749-750; *saevum scelus*, 7.766) y, por lo tanto, los soldados son culpables (*quanta fuerint mercede nocentes*, 7.751; *inque toris fratrum posuerunt membra nocentes*, 7.763). Pasan la noche en el campamento enemigo, y son atormentados por un terrible remordimiento cuya causa se presenta inicialmente como interna: el trauma de la batalla los inquieta en sus sueños; están conscientes de que tal combate representa un crimen, y su mente revuelta no puede tranquilizarse (*quos agitat,* 764). Es tan grave la perturbación que sufren los hombres de César que el poeta introduce como probable una causa externa de esta situación a través de una oración potencial (*putem,* 768) que sugiere que los tormentos sufridos por los soldados podrían ser provocados, dadas las

circunstancias, por los manes de sus enemigos que regresan como apariciones tras su muerte. Lucano establece una relación entre el inframundo —representado metonímicamente por el miedo estigio (*Stygia formidine,* 770)— y el mundo de los vivos (*superam ... noctem,* 770). Los manes regresarían con el objetivo de castigar a sus homicidas, y se especifica que este castigo está justificado, pues, a causa del crimen cometido, los soldados lo merecen (*meritis,* 771); en el verso 772 (*sibilaque et flammas infert sopor*), se hace una alusión a las Furias; se especifica luego que la sombra de cada ciudadano muerto (*umbra perempti | civis*, 772-773) atormenta con su aparición al soldado que lo mató (*sua quemque premit terroris imago,* 773); describe cuáles son las apariciones que cada uno de ellos sufre durante la noche: se presentan almas de viejos, de jóvenes, de familiares, y los atormentan. Lucano utiliza una vez más el verbo *agitare* (775) para mostrar la condición de la mente de la tropa, y la de César; luego, a través de un símil, menciona de nuevo y de manera directa a las Euménides, y el castigo que infligen a Orestes antes de ser purificado (*purgatus*, 777); por último, compara los desórdenes mentales sufridos por los hombres con los furores que experimentaron Penteo y su madre Ágave (*cum fureret, Pentheus aut, cum desisset, Agave*, 780). El paralelismo con la situación que viven los argonautas de Valerio es, en nuestra opinión, evidente. Tomando en cuenta la presencia de este intertexto lucaneo en el pasaje del rito de purificación, el lector tiene los elementos necesarios para entender los manes descritos por Mopso como una representación de los remordimientos que sufren los argonautas, similar a la que se muestra en el libro 7 de la *Farsalia*. Esta ambigua confluencia de la motivación humana o psicológica con la motivación sobrenatural, que tiende a presentar la segunda como metáfora o encarnación poética de la primera, muestra hasta qué punto la restauración del aparato divino en Valerio Flaco resulta afectada por los problemas planteados por Lucano, que la hacen ver más compleja de lo que podría parecer si nos limitáramos a leer las *Argonáuticas* a la luz de los intertextos virgilianos.

El volumen se completa con una bibliografía exhaustiva y actualizada, y un breve índice de nombres y materias que hace echar de menos uno completo de pasajes de autores antiguos. Es, no obstante, en su conjunto una buena herramienta para quien pretenda adentrarse en la lectura y estudio de esta parte de las *Argonáuticas*, y viene a corregir al fin el abandono que, frente al amplio panorama de comentarios recientes a libros sueltos del poema de Flaco, había sufrido el libro 3.

Cristian Jonatan Estrada Cortés
cristian.estrada1387@gmail.com

Fuensanta Garrido Domené, *Los teóricos menores de la música griega. Euclides el Geómatra, Nicómaco de Gerasa y Gaudencio el filósofo,* Barcelona: Editorial Cerix, 2016, 517 pp., ISBN 978-84-608-7915-2.

El trabajo que presenta Fuensanta Garrido es fruto de una corriente de investigación que, aunque floreciente en Europa y EEUU hace algunos años (prueba de ello es que hay toda una revista dedicada al tema, *Greek and Roman Musical Studies*), ha aportado estudios y traducciones sobre todo en las Universidades de Murcia, Granada y Oviedo: la música griega antigua. Se trata este de un campo a menudo muy especializado por su carácter técnico, pero que en algunas de sus obras traza líneas muy interesantes en conexión con la poética (por ejemplo, el caso de Filodemo de Gadara), la filosofía (los fragmentos de Diógenes de Babilonia, o ciertos *problemata* del Ps.Aristóteles), e incluso con ciertas opciones epistemológicas (como Ptolomeo y su discusión sobre el conocimiento en música). Como en todas las áreas de la literatura helénica, hay nombres mayores y menores. Entre los primeros están, naturalmente, Aristóxeno o Aristides Quintiliano, pero los segundos no son menos interesantes a pesar de su carácter fragmentario o epitomizador. Garrido Domené ofrece una selección de estos «menores», quizás los mejor representados y con contenido más rico.

El trabajo de esta profesora comienza por una «Introducción general» (págs. 11-18) en la que se plantean los problemas y cuestiones principales sobre los autores elegidos. Su exposición es de una claridad que hay que agradecer. La autora insiste en la novedad de su trabajo en lengua castellana, y acentúa la dependencia de los textos traducidos de las dos escuelas principales de música griega en la Antigüedad, la aristoxénica y la pitagórica. Sigue una «Lista de abreviaturas» (págs. 19-22) y a continuación el primero de los autores, Euclides el Geómetra (págs. 23-84), seguido de Nicómaco de Gerasa (págs. 85-342; con mucho, el que más páginas ocupa del volumen) y Gaudencio el Filósofo (págs. 343-460). El volumen se cierra con un «Epílogo» (págs. 461-462) a manera de una conclusión y valoración de la novedad (a nuestro juicio, innecesaria aquí), y un utilísimo «Índice de términos matemáticos, musicales y astronómicos» (págs. 463-498) trilingüe, al utilizar Garrido Domené las versiones latinas utilizadas por Meibom en su traducción de 1652. Decimos utilísimo porque no sólo ofrece la opción de este eminente filólogo, sino ofrece la posibilidad de comparar «el distinto matiz que cada voz puede adoptar en cada contexto», como explica la autora (pág.12) al mismo tiempo que arroja luz sobre las traducciones que leeremos de los términos en autores latinos (los gramáticos, Vitruvio, Calcidio y otros). Preterido como pocos, los

terminitechnici de la música griega son un campo léxico sumamente difícil de traducir (por sus inevitables equívocos con el sistema musical actual) y se imbrica además con los de la filosofía o la retórica. El volumen se cierra con un «Índice onomástico» (págs. 499-500) y con un apartado bibliográfico organizado según los autores estudiados (págs. 501-516). Por lo demás, en cada sección dedicada a un autor hay una introducción a los problemas de su obra musical, la traducción de la(s) misma(s) y un comentario. Realmente esta es la gran aportación del volumen, sobre todo en lo que respecta a Gaudencio (pues disponíamos ya de un magnífico comentario de A. Barbera al texto euclidiano y de F. Levin a Nicómaco; la misma Garrido Domené dedicó su tesis –publicada por la Universidad de Murcia– a este autor). En los comentarios se discute bastante con las interpretaciones de la crítica moderna de cuestiones técnicas; y en cada cita textual de un pasaje griego se acompaña (quizás innecesariamente) de la traducción latina de Meibom. El trabajo supera ampliamente al dedicado en los años noventa por L. Zanoncelli a los autores griegos de música editados por Jan.

En conclusión, el volumen preparado por Garrido Domené es imprescindible para el acercamiento a los autores a que se consagra. No obstante, en algunos lugares da la impresión de que la crítica de fuentes no es lo suficientemente exhaustiva (por ejemplo, cuando en pág. 276 comenta la comparación nicomaquea entre los finales de registro vocal humano con el βυκανισμὸς καὶ βηχία, leyéndose tales comparaciones en otros autores de música pero sobre todo procediendo de una línea de pensamiento sobre la *imitatio* que parte de la *República* y el *Crátilo* platónicos y llega hasta Dión Casio con Homero de fondo), o la insuficiente por simplificadora división de la música griega antigua entre aristoxénicos y pitagóricos. Este es, ciertamente, el planteamiento de la «Introducción general», pero el panorama de la música griega era más complejo (con acercamientos también estoicos, y epicúreos, y con autores también «menores» aquí obviados, como Dídimo o Teofrasto que ofrecieron divisiones tetracordiales propias o una alternativa a la teoría de la propagación del sonido). Quizás se echa en falta una justificación del criterio seguido para la selección de autores (dado que todos están contenidos en la edición de Carl von Jan, que editó asimismo a Cleónides y a Baquio, además de textos de *excerpta* con pasajes únicos en su contenido). Es evidente que Nicómaco es central, pero quizás es más coherente su juntura con un Cleónides o con un Baquio que con un texto muy anterior como la *Sectiocanonis*, que pertenece más que a la división (solo tardía) entre aristoxénicos y pitagóricos, al universo matemático desarrollado con la axiomática griega.

En suma, estamos ante un trabajo muy notable, que aporta a la bibliografía y la investigación en castellano un material sumamente importante en la historia del *quadrivium*. La presentación del volumen es impecable, sin problemas con la impresión de los textos griegos y con ejemplos en notación musical así como diagramas muy bien elaborados. Un libro que no sólo llena

una laguna en la investigación, sino que será muy útil para los musicólogos que estudian la historia de las ideas y los sistemas musicales.

Concepción López Rodríguez
Universidad de Granada
clopez@ugr.es

J. A. Stover, *A New Work by Apuleius. The Lost Third Book of the* De Platone. *Edited and Translated with an Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, xi+216 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-873574-8.

1. Il volume contiene l'*editio princeps*, tradotta e commentata, di un *Summarium librorum Platonis* che R. Klibansky scoprì nel ms dei *philosophica* apuleiani Vat. Reg. Lat. 1572 (R, sec. XIII^{m}) e presentò per la prima volta nel 1949 alla British Academy quale adattamento latino tardo-antico di una perduta epitome greca del II secolo. Nel ricco saggio introduttivo J. A. Stover assume come punto di partenza la netta valorizzazione di R proposta dal predecessore (si veda in particolare R. Klibansky, F. Regen, *Die Handschriften der philosophischen Werke des Apuleius. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte*, Göttingen 1993, 110-11 e 158-68), ma al suo giudizio sulla natura e sulla datazione del testo tramandato dal codice oppone le tesi seguenti: *a*) il *Summarium* risale esso stesso, senza intermediari, al contesto medio-platonico del II secolo, cui l'avvicinano le caratteristiche del genere filosofico-letterario (*abbreviatio*, dossografia, ma soprattutto isagoge) e della struttura (tripartizione del *corpus* platonico in sei dialoghi socratici, nelle *Leggi*, con inclusione dell'*Epinomis*, e in sei dialoghi pitagorico-parmenidei); *b*) condivide con i *philosophica* apuleiani non soltanto l'ambito medio-platonico e la trasmissione, ma anche l'autore, viste le cogenti affinità testuali che lo legano al *De Platone*; *c*) di quest'opera colma una grave lacuna, ovvero la mancanza di una delle tre parti della filosofia che Apuleio promette di trattare in *Plat.* 189, mentre nei libri giunti fino a noi ne compaiono soltanto due; *d*) posto che quasi tutti i *placita* del *De Platone* trovano fondamento nel *Summarium* (che cita e riassume i corrispondenti luoghi platonici di *Rp.*, *Euthyph.*, *Menex.*, *Ap.*, *Crit.*, *Phaed.*, *Leg.*, *Epin.*, *Epist.*, *Parm.*, *Soph.*, *Pol.*, *Tim.*, *Criti.*), quest'ultimo si configura come un repertorio di fonti, verisimilmente allestito da Apuleio in preparazione del *De Platone* e poi da lui stesso accorpato all'opera come terzo libro, allo scopo di fornire una completa introduzione a Platone secondo la tripartizione tipica dell'εἰσαγωγή (*vita*, *dogmata*, *libri*).

Poiché questa tesi così originale, avanzata da Stover con pugnace vigore argomentativo, si fonda in gran parte sull'*auctoritas* di R, soprattutto di questo codice mi occuperò nella presente recensione, con particolare riguardo ai capitoli I e IV del volume (*Manuscripts and Transmission* e *The* Expositio *and the Apuleian Corpus*).

2. Iniziamo con i due titoli che figurano in testa all'edizione: *Apulei Madaurensis De Platone et eius dogmate liber tertius* e *De Platonis*

pluribus libris compendiosa expositio. Nessuno dei due è tramandato da R, dove la fine di *Plat*. II e l'inizio di *Mund*. sono indicati con *Apulei madaurensis de habitudine platonis liber secundus explicit. Incipit liber tertius feliciter*, e al f. 77ra, subito dopo la fine di *Mund*., inizia senza *incipit* il *Summarium* (unico segno di distinzione è l'a capo), che si chiude senza *explicit* al f. 86rb. In R, dunque, l'espressione *liber tertius* è riferita erroneamente al *De mundo*, in continuità col quale si trova il *Summarium*. Tuttavia, argomenta Stover, le quattro righe iniziali del *Summarium* sono trasmesse anche da un manoscritto del secolo XIV affine a R, ovvero Marc. Lat. VI, 81 (Z), che come R le colloca con un semplice a capo subito di seguito a *Mund*., ma a differenza di R segnala la fine del frammento con *Explicit apuleus de dogmate platonis liber tercius*. Da Z dunque Stover desume il primo titolo dell'edizione, pur ammettendo che (p. 7) "the evidence suggests that the copyst intended that title for the *Mundo*" (nei titoli correnti di Z, infatti, *Mund*. compare come *apuleus de dogmate platonis liber tertius*).

Il secondo titolo che l'editore attribuisce al *Summarium* è tratto dal ms Neapol. IV.G.55, vergato nel 1377 dal dotto giurista *leonardus Iud*^{c} *de quinto de Verona* (C. Cipolla, *Notizie intorno a Leonardo da Quinto, giudice e letterato veronese del secolo XIV*, Verona 1885). Qui il passaggio da *Plat*. II a *Mund*. è così segnalato: *Explicit de origine et vita platonis et de eius pluribus libris compendiosa expositione. Incipit quaedam compendiosa philosophia et quasi cosmographia apulei platonici madaurensis*. Secondo Stover questo particolare *explicit*, insieme con quello di *Plat*. I (condiviso con altri codici) *Explicit liber Apulei de dogmate et vita Platonis*, rinvia a una "complete isagoge to Plato" (*vita*, *dogmata* e *libri*) che era già presente nell'archetipo secondo il giusto ordine *Plat*. I, *Plat*. II, *Expositio* (ω), ma in uno stadio successivo fu disturbata dall'anteposizione di *Mund*. all'*Expositio* (ω^1), e infine subì la caduta dell'*Expositio* per danni materiali (ω^2). Da ω^1 fece ancora in tempo a copiarla φ, lontano antenato di RZ, mentre nell'ormai mutilo ω^2 non riuscirono più a trovarla i capostipiti degli altri due rami di tradizione α e δ.

Questa suggestiva ricostruzione della trasmissione del testo potrebbe trovare qualche appiglio non tanto nella *subscriptio* del Neapol. IV.G.55 (il proto-umanista Leonardo da Quinto, che interpola e contamina il testo con grande abilità, sarebbe stato perfettamente in grado di coniare in prima persona la formula *de eius pluribus libris compendiosa expositione*, ben cogliendo la natura *compendiosa* di *Plat*. come coglie quella di *Mund*.), quanto piuttosto nell'effettivo disordine con cui i codici trasmettono i *philosophica* apuleiani e l'*Asclepius*. Non tutti i manoscritti contengono la raccolta completa dei quattro opuscoli; la successione di questi varia da famiglia a famiglia e all'interno della stessa famiglia; *Plat*. I manca della parte finale e nella maggior parte dei codici si salda senza *explicit* né *incipit* a *Plat*. II; a sua volta *Plat*. II termina senza *explicit* o con *explicit* che lo numerano

ora come *liber primus* ora *secundus*; di conseguenza *Mund.* si presenta quale *liber tertius* (come in RZ) o manca del tutto di *incipit*, e così via.

Ma ciò che più conta è verificare la plausibilità del giudizio di Stover su R quale esponente di un terzo ramo di tradizione autonomo e meno corrotto di αδ, in quanto esemplato da una precedente *facies* dell'archetipo. Tale ipotesi stemmatica 'degrada' codici molto più antichi di R, come i rappresentanti del ramo α B (Bruxell. 10054-56, sec. IX) e VM (i 'figli' di μ, saltuariamente contaminato con δ, Vat. Lat. 3385, sec. X-XI, e Monac. Clm 621, sec. XI-XII), e come i rappresentanti del ramo δ F (Laur. San Marco 284-I, sec. XI^2, abilmente interpolato) e NPL (Leid. Voss. Lat. Q 10, sec. XI^1; Paris. Lat. 6634, sec. XI^m; Laur. plut. 76, 36, sec. XII, discendenti per vie diverse dallo stesso antigrafo ν). Esplicita è la contrapposizione con C. Moreschini, che nella sua stampa teubneriana dei *philosophica* apuleiani (1991), pur inserendo per la prima volta R fra i codici utili alla *constitutio textus*, lo considerava esponente della *docta recensio* γ, contaminata fra δ e α, "quae tamen haud vetustissima esse apparet". La *confutatio* di Stover, già svolta con maggiori dettagli in un precedente articolo ("Apuleius and the Codex Reginensis", *ExCl* 19, 2015, 5-21), si fonda qui sul rapido esame della testimonianza di R in *Socr.*, *Plat.*, *Mund.* e *Ascl.* Dopo aver accennato ai molti e gravi nonsensi del codice, inconciliabili a suo parere con l'ipotesi della "learned recension", egli ne esemplifica varianti disgiuntive da α e da δ; varianti congiuntive con B; lezioni esatte condivise con manoscritti diversi da BVM e NPL; lezioni esatte sue singolari, già stampate da Moreschini, e altre di cui rivendica egli per primo l'esattezza. In conclusione, poiché il materiale genuino tramandato da R prova che il codice "presents an earlier and somewhat less corrupt stage of the textual family", si dovrà ammettere che l'*Expositio* in esso contenuta "was composed in antiquity and was a part of the Apuleian philosophical corpus at a time preceding the archetype of the other Apuleius manuscripts" (p. 18).

3. La collazione da me svolta di R, in vista dell'edizione di *Socr.*, *Plat.* e *Mund.* per gli Oxford Classical Texts, può in parte spiegare il divario fra i giudizi di Moreschini e di Stover sulla testimonianza del codice. R è certo scritto da un copista *indoctus*, responsabile di macroscopici errori, ma ha alle spalle un antenato bifronte (φ), che a volte riproduce con fedeltà la *facies* dell'archetipo e a volte invece la innova, riversando nel testo interventi atti a rabberciare luoghi corrotti; a glossare la lezione tràdita con sinonimi, spesso ma non sempre *faciliores*; a chiarificare in vario modo la sintassi (trasposizioni, esplicitazione di sottintesi o supposti tali, aggiunta o espunzione o mutamento di preposizioni, congiunzioni e pronomi, modifica di modi e tempi verbali e di preverbi). È bene soffermarsi su alcuni esempi della duplice natura di φ, citando anzitutto R ma anche i due apografi Zz, data la loro importanza per la storia e per la *constitutio textus* dei *philosophica* apuleiani: Z, descritto da R ma fortemente scorciato e interpolato, fu corretto e parzialmente integrato, sulla base di un codice affine a F, da una mano

del sec. XV = Z^2; da Z + Z^2 fu descritto nel sec. XV z (Marc. Lat. Z.467, posseduto da Bessarione), modello a sua volta in *Plat.* e *Mund.* dell'*editio princeps* del 1469 di Giovanni Andrea Bussi.

Non c'è dubbio che in *Mund.* 348, citato da Stover alle pp. 14-15, la lezione di φ *omnes iaticum* per *omne Asiaticum* (la congettura è di Lipsius) rinvia a ω con maggiore precisione di *omnes atticum* di B e di *omne atticum* di δ (da *Mund.* 318 viene meno M e da 343 a 359 manca anche V, la cui testimonianza terminerà definitivamente al § 361). Più difficile è stabilire se derivino da ω, o siano invece il frutto di interventi successivi, alcune *duplices lectiones* riprodotte da R e rintracciabili anche, intatte o semplificate, in Zz e nella *princeps*: *Plat.* 235 *beatitas* αδ: *beatudinitas* φ pr. (da *beatitudo* + *beatitas*); 236 *usuram* αδ: *usûra* R (da *usum* + *usuram*), *usum* Zz pr.; 240 *voluptati* αδ: *voluptatiis* R (da *voluptati* + *is*), *voluptatis* Zz pr.; 251 *cupitorem* Iuntina II: *cupitorum* BM (om. V), *cupitorum ê* RZ (da *cupitorum* + *em*), *cupiturum* ν, *cupidum* Fz pr.; 251 *boni* Rohde: *bonis* αδ, *bonis bonus* R, *bonus bonis* Z, *bonus* Pz pr.

Ma non risalgono certamente a ω glosse e varianti come le seguenti: *Socr. Prol.* 110 *indulsit* αδ: *dedit* φ; *pepererat* αδ: *praeceperat* R, *praeriperat* Zz; *Socr.* 130 *ut Vergilianus Ascanius* αδ: *ut ait Vergilianus Ascanius* φ; 152 *placato* αδ: *placido* φ; 167 *secundo* αF: *secundum* NPL, *secundum ipsum* φ pr.; 171 *horridi* αδ: *horrendi* φ; 172 *equos mercamur* αδ: *equos quos mercamur* φ; 175 *tu…* † *ingeris* αδ: *tu qui te ingeris* φ pr.; *Plat.* 192 *substantiam… corporum* αδ: *substantiam… corpoream* φ pr.; 201 *agere* αδ: *facere* φ pr.; 204 *nominamus* αδ: *vocamus* φ pr.; 206 *naviter* αδ: *graviter* φ pr.; 207 *praestabilius* αδ: *praestantius* φ pr.; 209 *mitescentibus* αδ: *madescentibus* φ pr.; 216 *nuncupare* αδ: *dicere* φ pr.; 231 *hanc* αδ: *hanc rem* φ pr.; 235 *fugitanda* αδ: *fugienda* φ pr.; 241 *non* † *necessarias cupidines sunt* α: *non necessaria cupidine sunt* δ, *non necessarias cupidines acuunt* φ pr.; *Mund.* 290 *immobilem* δ: *mobilem* B, *nobilem* VM, *incontingibilem* φ pr.

Esempi di questo genere sminuiscono in *Socr.* 133 l'*auctoritas* della variante di φ *inter homines caelicolasque* (αδ hanno la lezione lacunosa *inter caelicolasque*), anteposta da Stover a *inter terricolas caelicolasque* di B^2. Anche *homines*, come *terricolas*, ha l'aspetto di un'abile congettura sollecitata dal contesto, e non di un'integrazione ad opera del correttore dell'archetipo "ignored independently by α and δ" (p. 16). Al capostipite φ risaliranno anche alcuni supplementi di R che sembrano note di lettura marginali trascinate in linea dal copista. Si veda in *Socr.* 143 l'aggiunta di *nonne vides* davanti a *nonne audis quid super tonitru Lucretius facundissime disserat* (subito dopo compaiono i versi 6.96-98 del *De rerum natura*). Giustamente Stover osserva che *nonne vides* non è dittografia involontaria, perché in Lucr. 6.813 ricorre *nonne vides audisve*, ma forza poi il ragionamento, postulando che questa 'citazione' (particolarmente

dotta, considerata la tradizione piuttosto ristretta di Lucrezio, ma superflua, a mio parere, nell'economia del testo) si trovasse già nell'archetipo e sia stata omessa "in α and δ by a simple two-word *saut du même au même*" (p. 17). Analogamente in *Plat.* 183-184 *pubescentis primitias labore atque amore studendi imbutas refert*, R avrà reperito a margine del modello l'aggiunta sua esclusiva *maioribus annis polit*[*ic*]*as* (l'atetesi di *ic* è di Stover alle pp. 18-19 dell'articolo citato), che riformula le parole successive *et in viro harum incrementa virtutum et ceterarum convenisse testatur* prelevando il sofisticato *politas* da *Plat.* 188 (sul perfezionamento ad opera di Platone delle precedenti *impolitae sententiae* filosofiche).

Tuttavia, anche se R non testimonia con assoluta fedeltà il testo dell'archetipo, ne trasmette senza dubbio un buon numero di lezioni, in parte erronee e in parte esatte, schierandosi ora con αδ ora con α ora con δ, oppure contrapponendosi a entrambi i rami. Soffermiamoci sulle lezioni esatte di R (o di RZz) contro errore in αδ. Occorre anzitutto precisare che esse sono spesso condivise con CH (Cantabr. Corpus Christi College 71, sec. XII, e Lond. Harl. 3969, sec. XIV, che tramandano il testo di N rielaborandolo in profondità; H in particolare è erede della massiccia *emendatio* di William di Malmesbury) oppure con esponenti della famiglia contaminata γ quali AG (Paris. Lat. 8624 e Guelferb. Gud. 168, sec. XII) e affini, o ancora con l'interpolato F o con correttori di B. Sulla natura di queste buone scritture, quasi sempre necessitate dal contesto, è prudente sospendere il giudizio, perché potrebbero essere state autonomamente congetturate da copisti diversi o essersi propagate da un codice agli altri per quella "endemic contamination" (p. 53) che pervade la tradizione dei *philosophica* fin dagli stadi più alti. Limitiamoci pertanto alle lezioni esclusive di R (o di RZz) che Stover cita come esatte a p. 14.

Escluderei dal computo *Plat.* 210 *auris* (del solo R) e 227 *domitas* (di RZz pr.), che sembrano non tanto rispecchiare l'archetipo quanto piuttosto rimaneggiarne gli errori, come ho argomentato in due articoli di qualche anno fa ("Il *De Platone* di Apuleio: lezioni e correzioni tràdite", *BSL* 42.2, 2012, 570-7, 571-2; "La parola-segnale nel cod. Laur. plut. 76.36 (L) di Apuleio filosofo", *Lexis* 31, 2013, 347-57, 353-4). Non sono del tutto esenti dal sospetto di ritocco congetturale, più o meno pressantemente suggerito dal contesto, neppure *Socr.* 117 *largius* R: *longius* cett.; *Plat.* 184 *de lucta* RZz pr.: *de luctata* cett.; *Mund.* 301 *sinus* R: *sinul* B (*sinum* B^2), *simul* cett. Resta una lezione con forte sentore di genuinità, che Moreschini per primo rivendicò a R, mentre in precedenza era considerata brillante congettura di Salmasius: *Socr. Prol.* 107 *extimas horas* (pro *oras*) R: *existimas oras* Z, *aestimas oras* z, *exoptimas* (*h*)*oras* BNPCH, *ex optimis oris* Z^2FLγ, om. VM. Sembra qui verisimile che l'archetipo avesse *exo*˙*timas*, per erronea anticipazione e successiva espunzione della lettera *o* di *oras*; φ comprese la correzione, mentre αδ mutarono *exotimas* in *exoptimas* (poi normalizzato da singoli codici in *ex optimis*).

A questo esempio va aggiunto almeno *Mund.* 372, dove R riproduce in modo completo un verso greco che in tutti gli altri manoscritti risulta invece gravemente lacunoso. Sulla base del Περὶ κόσμου pseudo-aristotelico, fonte del *De mundo*, Moreschini stampa così il quarto verso di Orph. *Fragm.* 21a Kern: Ζεὺς ἄρσην γένετο, Ζεὺς ἄμβροτος ἔπλετο νύμφη. Il codice più vicino a questa *constitutio* è R, con ZeYCaρCHNTeNeTaZeYCambρOTONTHHρeΦeNRINΦU contro ZεYCaρCHNTρεΦεNYMΦH di B e ZeYCaρCHNTPeΦeNYMΦe *vel sim.* di δ (l'intera citazione orfica è omessa da Zz, mentre MV sono venuti meno, come si è detto, rispettivamente da *Mund.* 318 e 361). M. Stefani, in un articolo in corso di stampa ("Il contributo del ms. Vat. Reg. Lat. 1572 (R) alla *constitutio textus* di Apul., *mund.*, 369 e 372", *RCCM* 59.2, 2017, 343-56), propone di accogliere la lezione di R, ritoccandola così: Ζεὺς ἄρσην γένετο, Ζεὺς ἄμβροτος ἔτραφε νύμφη. Qualunque sia il giudizio su questa proposta, certo è che il copista di φ, del tutto digiuno di greco, ha scrupolosamente esemplato dall'archetipo, pur senza capirla, una sequenza di lettere che sia α sia δ hanno omesso, forse per salto da uguale a uguale compiuto autonomamente o forse perché non hanno individuato la pericope eNeTaZeYCambρOTONTHH, già omessa da ω e poi integrata a margine in modo poco evidente.

4. L'esame fin qui svolto di R sembra sostanzialmente convalidare l'ipotesi di stemma tripartito sostenuta da Stover, nella scia di Klibansky. Prima però di accoglierla in via definitiva occorre riflettere sugli innumerevoli errori congiuntivi di BR contro altrettante lezioni esatte o quasi-esatte di δμ. Per parte loro Zz (mancanti di lunghi passi soprattutto in *Mund.*) a volte conservano traccia della scrittura di φ, insieme con R, ma più spesso ne correggono i nonsensi, schierandosi così con δμ. Stover cita soltanto due scritture congiuntive fra B e R (*Plat.* 221 *instinctae ad* Thomas: *instincta eadem* BR, *instinctae eadem* δμ; 236 *quippe a communi* δμ: *quippe ea communi* BRZ) e si limita a concludere che "Hence in no sense does R (or B for the matter) offer a *docta recensio*, but instead an insight into an earlier stage of the text" (p. 14). Per misurare appieno l'entità del consenso fra i due codici, occorre considerare altre loro *falsae lectiones* particolarmente significative (le desumo da *Plat.* II e *Mund.*, che ne offrono in abbondanza, come aveva già osservato Moreschini): *Plat.* 222 *est et putatur* δμ: *est eputatur* BR, *putatur* Z, *esse putatur* B^2z pr.; 225 *etiam imperitare* B^2δμ: *etiam peritare* BR, *etiam imperare* Zz pr.; 229 *dicit ac* B^2δμZz pr.: *diciat ac* B, *dicat ac* R; 237 *incommodi adipiscatur* B^2δMZz pr.: *incommodi piscatur* BR, *incommodi apiscatur* VM^2; 251 *amator est* δμZz pr.: *amatoris est* BR; 260 *puerperiaque* δμ: *puerperiatque* BR, om. Zz pr.; *Mund.* 293 *martis* δμZz pr.: *mentis* BR; 304 *nili asiae* B^2δμ: *nilia side* B, *nilia site* R, om. Zz pr.; 319 *meta venit* δV: *metabenit* BR, om. Zz pr. (ex 318 *ad superna* deest M); 330 post *directis angulis* iterant *mobiles* (*mobis* B, *mobilis* B^2) *epiclete*

(*epiglete* R) *graece* (*gre* R) *appellantur sed qui subsiliunt* (*subliunt* R) *excutientes onera et recuperantes* (*recuperantis* R) *directis angulis* BR (ad anteced. *acutis angulis* rediit librarius exemplaris); 340 *mersam* δVZz pr.: *mensam* BR; 341 *pullulat et* δVZz pr.: *pullalat et* B, *pulla latet* R; 346 *quale sit istud intellege* δ: *quale sitis ut intellegi* BR, *ut intellegi possit* Zz pr. (ex 343 *quanto* usque ad 359 *commoditates* deest V); 358 *obvia nisi* δ pr.: *obviam si* BRZz; 361 *deus* δ: *de eius* BR, om. Zz pr.; 364 *tremoribus* δ: *tremor ibat* BR, om. Zz pr.; 374 *qui audiet* δZz pr.: *qui* om. BR.

A prima vista, il consenso di BR contro δ in scritture tanto probanti suggerirebbe di collocare entrambi i codici nello stesso ramo α, ritornando così al tradizionale stemma bipartito. Ciò però contrasta con la presenza di *rectae lectiones singulares* in R contro Bδ e in B contro Rδ. Insieme con le prime, esemplificate poco sopra, è bene prendere in considerazione anche le seconde, più numerose a mio parere di quelle già stampate dagli editori moderni (P. Thomas, 1908, e J. Beaujeu, 1973, oltre a Moreschini). Fra queste ultime basti qui citare: *Socr. Prol.* 109 *lapidem* B: *illic pedem* RZ, *pedem* z, *alipedem* Z^2 cett.; 110 *alis persequax oculis perspicax* B: *ales* (om. N pr.) *oculis perspicax* (*persequax* F) cett.; *Socr.* 120 *aeterno* B: *aeternos* cett.; 123 *fini* B: *fine* B^2 cett.; 133 *daemonas* B: *daemones* cett.; 137 *volventia* B: *volantia* B^2 cett.; 149 *effigiae* B: *effigies* B^2 cett.; 158 *claritus* B: *clarius* B^2 cett.; 173 *sit et* B: *sit* cett.; 175 *in senectute* B: *in senectutem* B^2 cett.; *Plat.* 184 *adimantus* B: *adamantus* (vel *-es* vel *-os*) cett.; 197 *aeri* B: *aere* cett.; 205 *sint* B: *sunt* B^2 cett.; 218 *diditur* B: *dividitur* B^2 cett.; *Mund.* 289 *aristotelen* B: *aristotelem* cett.; 364 *audimus* B: *audivimus* cett.

Più numerosi ancora sono i luoghi in cui soltanto B conserva tracce importanti della *vera lectio*, oscurate in tutti gli altri manoscritti. Tra questi *vestigia veritatis* esclusivi di B sono stati da tempo individuati *Socr.* 187 *eas modo* Thomas app.: *eammodo* B, *tantummodo* B^2 cett.; *Plat.* 206 *caelitus* B^2: *caelestus* B, *caelestis* δμ, *a celestibus* RZz pr., *caelestibus a* F; 213 *n<e> esculenta… [ne] exhaustis* Thomas: *nesculenta… ne exhaustis* B, *ne esculenta… ne* (*neque* z pr.) *exhaustis* B^2Fz pr., *esculenta… ne exhaustis* cett.; 217 *ratio* Thomas: *patio* B, *passio* B^2, *potio* δμ, *portio* FRZz pr.; 244 *eo* Rohde: *co* B, *quo* B^2 cett.; 251 *stultus* Thomas: *istut* B, *istud* B^2 cett.; *Mund.* 362 *finitimus* Vulcanius: *fimus* B, *infimus* cett. Di altri casi, costituiti soprattutto dal meccanico inglobamento nel testo di antiche glosse e *duplices lectiones* (*lectio falsa* + *emendata* o *lectio recta* + *varia*), mi sono occupata in anni recenti, con proposte quali *Socr.* 120 *tunc <vero> progressus* [*tunc vero*] [*amens*] *tum autem regressus* (*tunc progressus tunc vero amens tum autem regressus* B, *tunc progressus tunc vero regressus* cett.); *Plat.* 180 *ei Ariston…* [*ariston ei*] (*ei ariston… ariston ei* B, *ei ariston… ariston* B^2 cett.); 193 [*primum deum*] *deum* (*primum deum deum* B, *primum deum* cett.); 215 *exh<aur>ire* (*exhire* B, *exire* B^2 cett.).

Ora, se si riflette sul complesso intreccio dei dati qui raccolti, si è indotti a sospettare con Stover che l'archetipo dei *philosophica* apuleiani sia effettivamente 'mobile', ma in un senso diverso da quello che egli immagina. Non è infatti suffragata dalla paradosi l'ipotesi che φ rifletta la *facies* primitiva di ω e che invece αδ lo esemplino in uno stadio successivo e più corrotto. Descriverei piuttosto così i rapporti fra l'archetipo e i tre rami che ne discendono: α, ovvero B, trasmette la *facies* più antica di ω, già affollata di glosse e *duplices lectiones*; allo stadio successivo (ω^1) si collocano φδ, che scelgono di volta in volta se riprodurre il primitivo testo ω oppure i nuovi interventi eseguiti su di esso (sia buoni, come la correzione di errori e l'integrazione di parole omesse, sia cattivi, come la semplificazione erronea di *duplices lectiones*, l'addomesticamento di nonsensi, la normalizzazione di grafie rare, la banalizzazione di lezioni *difficiliores*). Naturalmente, poi, ciascuno dei tre capostipiti αφδ si distingue dagli altri per le modalità di copia: α si astiene del tutto dall'intervenire in proprio, tanto che in B permane non di rado la *scriptio continua* di ω (le linee divisorie fra le parole sono di mani successive); φ appare a intermittenza *indoctus* (quando commette errori ingenui nella *divisio* o nella decifrazione delle *duplices lectiones*) e *doctus* (quando escogita o recepisce da altro codice abili interpolazioni lessicali e sintattiche); δ manifesta qua e là volontà e capacità di produrre un testo 'leggibile', sebbene sia meno infedele al modello di quanto comunemente si pensa (forse perché non si distingue a sufficienza tra ν e il sofisticato F).

5. Con la proposta stemmatica qui avanzata, mal si concilia l'ipotesi di Stover sulla presenza dell'*Expositio* già in ω, poiché si dovrebbe ammettere che per qualche misteriosa ragione essa sia sfuggita, nonostante le notevoli dimensioni (dieci fogli circa in R), sia a B sia a δ. È improbabile anche che sia stata aggiunta in ω^1 e che abbia scelto di trascriverla soltanto φ, e non anche δ, pur capace di valutare come e più di φ la natura dei testi contenuti nell'antigrafo. Si può piuttosto immaginare che φ l'abbia desunta dalla stessa copiosa fonte da cui desume glosse e varianti: una fonte dotta (come dotto è l'ambiente della Francia settentrionale in cui fu vergato R), perfettamente in grado di comprendere l'utilità dell'*Expositio*. Essa infatti consente di rintracciare negli originali di Platone molte sue *sententiae*, che invece Apuleio presenta nel *De Platone* con espressioni costantemente generiche (*Plato arbitratur*, *ait*, *vult*, *putat*, *iubet*, *censebat*, *dicebat*, *ducebat*, *memoravit*, *posuit* etc.), senza mai citare le opere da cui provengono.

Che ciononostante sia stato proprio Apuleio, come sostiene Stover, a comporre l'*Expositio*, prelevando da Platone e traducendo in latino i passi che gli servivano per allestire il suo manuale, è ipotesi tanto affascinante quanto indimostrabile. Potrebbe trattarsi di materiale non preparatorio, ma successivo al *De Platone*: un colto e appassionato lettore dell'opuscolo ne avrebbe scrupolosamente cercato in Platone le fonti, alla stessa stregua dei moderni *viri docti*, allargando poi l'indagine ad altre opere platoniche (non

tutte quelle riassunte nell'*Expositio* si trovano in Apuleio filosofo, come ha osservato Moreschini recensendo il volume di Stover in *BMCR*, 31.3.2017). Non ci sono a mio parere elementi sufficienti per datare l'*excerptio* al II secolo, come propone Stover, o invece al IV, come riteneva Klibansky, anche se viene naturale propendere per l'epoca tardo-antica, considerata la grande attenzione di cui godettero allora le opere apuleiane, sia quelle filosofiche, ampiamente citate da Agostino, sia l'*Apologia* e le *Metamorfosi*, accuratamente emendate nel 395 a Roma e nel 397 a Costantinopoli dall'allievo di retorica Gaio Crispo Sallustio.

In ogni caso, l'aria di scuola si respira a ogni rigo dell'*Expositio*: nel martellante monotono succedersi delle formule che introducono i δόγματα (*Placet illi*, *in quarto placet illi*, *in septimo aeque placet illi*, *improbat deinde*, *adfirmat deinde*, *quaerit deinde*, *docet alioqui*, *praeterea ostendit*, *definit post hoc* etc.); nella pedestre diligenza con cui li si preleva libro dopo libro, passo dopo passo, con inevitabili ripetizioni e sovrapposizioni degli argomenti; nel disinteresse per quelle peculiarità strutturali e stilistiche che caratterizzano invece il *De Platone*, nonostante la sobrietà intrinseca a un manuale didattico (*variatio* sintattica e lessicale, *iuncturae* sapienti, coesistenza di diversi registri, frequente ricorso al linguaggio figurato, come ha recentemente messo in luce E. Dal Chiele, *Apuleio. De Platone et eius dogmate. Vita e pensiero di Platone. Testo, traduzione, introduzione e commento*, Bologna 2016). Più in generale, questi appunti veloci e inconditi estrapolati dai dialoghi platonici sembrano l'esatto contrario dell' "authoritative and self-confident discourse" che secondo S. Harrison (*Apuleius. A Latin Sophist*, Oxford 2000, 202) Apuleio costruisce nel *De Platone*, non solo tacendo ogni riferimento alle opere del filosofo greco, ma anche evitando spesso di attribuirgli in modo esplicito l'una o l'altra *sententia*, così da identificarsi implicitamente con lui e autopromuovere se stesso quale autentico *philosophus Platonicus*.

Eppure, argomenta Stover nel terzo capitolo, sulla scorta di molti esempi e di una complessa "computational analysis", l'*Expositio* "has compelling textual affinities" col *De Platone*; "Some of them are a happy confluence of doctrine and expression; others are too close to exclude a direct relationship" (p. 31); "The two texts consistently use the same terminology and phrasing in transmitting the same philosophical claims" (p. 33). Proprio così, viene spontaneo rispondergli, proprio come ci si aspetta da un dotto lettore che confronta i passi del *De Platone* con i loro corrispondenti negli originali greci, e traduce questi ultimi utilizzando massicciamente il lessico del manuale latino, tanto da apparire qua e là apuleiano come e più di Apuleio.

Quanto poi all'ipotesi avanzata da Stover che Apuleio avrebbe dapprima composto l'*Expositio* in preparazione al *De Platone*, e successivamente l'avrebbe unita ai due primi libri per fornire una completa isagoge al filosofo greco (*vita*, *dogmata*, *libri*), essa non trova riscontro in *Plat.* 189. Qui

l'autore sembra davvero promettere, oltre alla fisica e all'etica, "a third book", che sarà però dedicato alla *intellegendi ac loquendi ratio* o *rationalis philosophia* (logica e retorica): *Quae autem consulta, quae δόγματα Graece licet dici, ad utilitatem hominum vivendique et intellegendi ac loquendi rationem extulerit, hinc ordiemur. Nam quoniam tres partes philosophiae congruere inter se primus obtinuit, nos quoque separatim dicemus de singulis a naturali philosophia facientes exordium*. Che questo terzo libro fosse originariamente collocato dopo il primo e sia caduto insieme con la parte finale di quello, o vada identificato col Περὶ ἑρμηνείας, o non sia mai stato scritto, come plausibilmente suppone Harrison, certo è comunque che esso non corrisponde affatto all'*Expositio* tramandata da R.

Ma al di là della paternità del testo e delle specifiche vicende della sua trasmissione, dobbiamo essere davvero grati a Stover per averne curato l'*editio princeps*, offrendoci con essa un tassello importante per la ricezione di Platone e di Apuleio e per la storia del platonismo in Occidente. Senza entrare qui nel merito dei singoli emendamenti da lui proposti per corruttele numerose e gravi, mi limiterò a osservare, a conferma dell'antichità dell'*Expositio*, che alcune delle parole espunte o segnalate con la *crux* sembrano rinviare a *duplices lectiones* del tutto analoghe a quelle che compaiono nella tradizione dei *philosophica* apuleiani. Più in generale, la prudente e acuta costituzione del testo, limpidamente impaginato e tradotto, il rigore dell'apparato e la ricchezza del commento, dedicato a notazioni critico-testuali e stilistiche e alla citazione per esteso dei passi platonici di riferimento, fanno dell'edizione uno strumento di lavoro utilissimo a filologi, filosofi e storici della tradizione classica. E la valorizzazione di R come autorevole testimone dell'archetipo è contributo imprescindibile per lo stemma e per la *constitutio textus* dei *philosophica* di Apuleio.

Giuseppina Magnaldi
Università degli Studi di Torino
giuseppina.magnaldi@unito.it

Juan Martos, *Apuleyo de Madauros, Apología o Discurso sobre la magia en defensa propia, Floridas, [Prologo de El dios de Sócrates],* introducción, traducción y notas, Alma Mater, Colección de autores Griegos y Latinos, Madrid: CSIC, 2015, 257 pp., ISBN 978-84-00-09943-5.

Classical philology is quite an international field of studies, dominated by the use of English, but with French, German, and Italian as commonly accepted languages as well. Publications in Spanish, on the other hand, seem to receive far less attention. This may be due to historical reasons, but seems partly caused by the relatively self-centered culture within Spanish academic studies of classics. However this may be, it is a pity, not only because Spanish is one of the major languages in the world, but also given the quality of some of the publications produced on the Iberian peninsula.

A case in point is a new edition of works by Apuleius, edited and translated by Juan Martos from the university of Sevilla. Professor Martos is a specialist of Apuleius, who already published a splendid two volume edition of Apuleius' novel *Metamorphoses* in 2003.[1] Now, more than ten years later, there is a sequel volume, comprising Apuleius' rhetorical works *Apology* (a full length speech in defense against a charge of magical practices) and *Florida* (a collection of epideictic fragments). The new book has been published in the same collection *Alma mater*, and matches the former two volumes in size, binding, and beautiful green cloth. Together they look splendid.

Much of what has been said about Martos' edition of the *Metamorphoses* is equally applicable to the new volume. There is a sound introduction, based on a full command of secondary literature. The Latin texts, printed on the left pages, are carefully edited and presented with a good critical apparatus on the bottom of the page. In general, Martos has continued his cautious and 'traditional' approach of Apuleian manuscripts, with much respect for the readings of the most important manuscript F, even where these may seem somewhat difficult or peculiar, and with as few emendations as possible. The accompanying right pages (carrying the same numbers as the left pages, as in the previous volumes; the total number of actual pages of the book nearly doubles the amount indicated by the page numbers) are used for a correct and readable Spanish translation and accompanying footnotes, 514 ones for the

[1] Juan Martos, *Apuleyo, Las metamorfosis o el asno de oro. Introducción, texto latino, traducción y notas. Vol. I (libros 1-3)*; Madrid: CSIC, 2003, 226 pp. ISBN 978-84-00-08188-1. I reviewed the book in: BMCR 2004.12.14; *vol. II (libros 4-11).* Madrid: CSIC, 2003, 456 pp., ISBN: 978-84-00-08189-8

Apology and 200 more for the *Florida*. Although the notes do not amount to a running commentary, they present more than merely essential reading help: they are somewhere in between.

The much discussed section known as the Prologue to *De Deo Socratis,* one of Apuleius' philosophical works, has been added to this volume. Although Martos does not go as far as some other scholars, who allege that the section belongs to the *Florida* and has somehow become detached from it in the long process of textual transmission,[2] he neither reserves the passage for a separate volume comprising Apuleius' philosophical treatises (one may hope that Martos will actually publish a third and final piece of work on these Apuleian texts in the near future). Personally, I think that the passages in question, counting hardly more than a few pages of Latin, tend to be overrated and overvalued by such special attention. They had best been left where they traditionally belong, in *De deo Socratis*.

One or two other points. One of the virtues of the general introduction is that Martos pays attention to the reception of Apuleius, notably in Spanish literature and arts, which has brought to light some details that are not widely known. For instance, I had never even heard of a screen version of Apuleius' novel *Metamorphoses* (with important parts of the story based on the *Apology*), produced in 1970 and directed by Sergio Spina (see http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0154169/). The movie (spoken in Italian) is available on YouTube. The film is surely not a major work of art, and looks actually outdated in several aspects, but as a curious item in Apuleian reception, it is certainly worthwhile.

Although the volume comprises nearly everything a reader could wish (introduction, Latin texts, Spanish translations, ample documentation and bibliography), there is hardly any serious help in the form of indexes. Merely a succinct list of names without further explanations has been added (pp. 245-257). But here too, Martos has consistently maintained the line pursued in the previous volumes. On the whole, the new book offers much that is of great value.

The intended audience of the translation is one of non specialists (p. LV), but given the scope and quality of the material included by Martos, this claim does not do full justice to the merits of this publication, which seems to be well suited for Apuleian scholars as well. It remains dubious, however, if the Spanish publication will reach a large audience outside the Spanish speaking world,[3] but evidently, Martos is not to blame for this.

Perhaps the Spanish scientific board that has financed the volume should

[2] The recent Loeb edition of the *Apology, Florida*, and *De deo Socratis* by Christopher Jones (Loeb 534, published in 2017) has included the passages in question effectively as a final part of the *Florida*.

[3] The new Loeb volume, mentioned in note 2, is more likely to draw the international public's attention, although it is evidently much less the result of fundamental research.

consider investing an amount of money in a promotion campaign for Spanish academic publications, or, preferably, create an online platform where such publications could become readily and freely available for an international audience. Surely, such an online platform would help in advancing Spanish publications, bringing them to the front line in academic discussions, and facilitating their immediate use by scholars and students alike.

Vincent Hunink
Radboud University Nijmegen (NL)
v.hunink@let.ru.nl

Stephen Harrison (ed.), *Characterisation in Apuleius' Metamorphoses: nine studies,* Pierides, 5, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015, xvii+190 pp., ISBN 978-1-4438-7533-2.

Im hier anzuzeigenden Werk werden neun Einzelessays arrivierter Apuleius-Forscher zur „Characterisation in Apuleius´ *Metamorphoses*" vorgelegt, die hinsichtlich ihrer thematischen Aufgliederung in einander ergänzende Teilgebiete den Anspruch erheben, die wichtigsten Abschnitte des Werkes vollständig abzudecken, andererseits sich aber naturgemäß zu keiner geschlossenen Gesamtinterpretation zusammenfügen.

In der Einleitung von Stephen Harrison wird ein Forschungsüberblick vorgelegt, der zunächst auf die intertextuelle Beziehung zu anderen Autoren und Gattungen der antiken Literatur fokussiert (xiv ff.). Das bekannte aristotelische Diktum (poet. 1450 a) über die Prävalenz des Plots über den Charakter wird in seiner allgemeinen Gültigkeit schon für den Bereich der attischen Tragödie bestritten (xv); ferner wird ein weiterer Gemeinplatz in solchen Studien, nämlich die autorbedingte Einheitlichkeit der Sprache verschiedener Figuren, berührt (xvi); den Schluß der Einleitung macht eine Erläuterung der Abgrenzung der neun Einzelstudien (xvii).

Die Charakteristik des Lucius wird in drei Phasen zerlegt: vor und nach seiner Vereselung sowie nach seiner Rückverwandlung. Harrison übernimmt die erste Phase; er handelt über die „postponed revelation" der Erzählerfigur (4), dann über Adel (5) und Gelehrsamkeit (6) der Hauptfigur sowie über autobiographische Bezüge zum Verfasser Apuleius (7). Ein wichtiges Kriterium, welches Lucius mit dem erwünschten Leser seiner Geschichten verbindet, ist seine Akzeptanz von Zaubergeschichten (7 ff.). Die von Harrison bemühten intertextuellen Berührungen wirken teilweise etwas schwach. So beschränkt sich die Gemeinsamkeit des in Thessalien ankommenden Lucius mit Telemach in der homerischen Telemachie (11) im wesentlichen darauf, daß seine älteren Gastgeber in ihm äußerliche Züge eines Elternteils wiederfinden. Lucius begrüßt Photis wie Odysseus Nausikaa mit einem μακαρισμός ihres potenziellen Partners (12), was allein ebenfalls wenig signifikant ist. Zu Milos Selbstvergleich mit der Bewirtung des Theseus durch Hekale (I 23, 6; S. 13) fügt Harrison noch die Einladung des Aeneas durch Euander hinzu – obwohl Milo das Motiv der „Würde" ganz anders verwendet, nämlich so, daß Lucius dem Haus durch seine Aufnahme eine Ehrung verschafft (*maiorem domum dignatione tua feceris*), während Euander Aeneas auffordert, er solle sich der göttlichen Präsenz des Hercules in der Unterkunft würdig fühlen (*te quoque dignum/ Finge deo*, Aen. VIII 364 f.); genaugenommen zeigt sich Milo

in dieser Äußerung gegenüber seinem Gast noch ehrerbietiger als Euander, wohingegen Harrison vom „low life environment of the novel" und „Lucius´ low character" (13) spricht, also solche exaltierte Ehrerbietung wohl eher als Ironie ansieht. Auch im Resüme von Harrison kommt Lucius nicht gut weg, er ist vor seiner Verwandlung ein „Esel im Wartestand" („ass in waiting", 14), was nach dem Gesamtkapitel, insbesondere den Ausführungen über Lucius´ Adel und seine Bildung sowie den autobiographischen Entsprechungen zu Apuleius, etwas überraschend kommt.

Stefan Tilg übernimmt den vereselten Lucius. Als „central joke" (15) wird richtig das Zusammentreffen von äußerlicher Eselgestalt und fortbestehendem menschlichen Bewußtsein herausgestellt, eine Konstellation, die entsprechend regelmäßig bei den verwandelten Figuren in Ovids *Metamorphosen* begegnet. Tilg hebt die ebenfalls fortbestehende Vorliebe des Esels für menschliche Nahrung hervor (19); demgegenüber wird der Sexualtrieb des Esels eher minimalisiert (19 f.), zumal in der berüchtigten Esel-Frau-Szene die Initiative bei der ernormen Lust der Frau liege (20 – ich möchte eher so formulieren, daß die topische Geilheit des Esels hier nur die Folie bildet, um die Lüsternheit einer Frau herauszustellen, gegenüber der sich selbst ein Esel ziert, wohingegen Tilg dem vereselten Lucius geradezu eine moralische bzw. asketische Haltung gegenüber der Sexualität zuschreibt, S. 21). Aus dem mit der Vereselung verbundenen Sprachverlust des Lucius leitet Tilg (22 f.) „the paradox that he is telling the story of somoeone who could not speak at the time of the events" ab – ein Problem, das sich eigentlich erledigt, wenn man das Fortbestehen des menschlichen Bewußtseins und die schließlich erfolgende Rückverwandlung bedenkt. Unzweifelhaft richtig ist, daß Lucius als menschlich beseelter Esel den „privileged standpoint" eines unerkannten Beobachters hat (24), wie Tilg im Anschluß an Bakhtin feststellt.

Wytse Keulen beschäftigt sich mit dem rückverwandelten Lucius. Daß dieser sogleich nach der Rückverwandlung seine Blöße bedeckt (32), sieht Keulen als symbolisch für den neuen *pudor* des Lucius, der zugleich mit der Eselgestalt auch seine sexuelle Schamlosigkeit (33) verliert – eine Eigenschaft, welche Tilg dem vereselten Lucius im Widerspruch hierzu gerade abspricht. Diese „neue Schamhaftigkeit" unterscheidet den Lucius des Apuleius vom Lukios des griechischen Eselsromans, der sich nach seiner Rückverwandlung sogleich wieder zu der lüsternen Dame begibt, mit welcher er zuvor als Esel Geschlechtsverkehr hatte (34 – das Grundproblem der Anlage des Bandes zeigt sich u.a. auch darin, daß der Vergleich mit dem erschließbaren griechischen Vorbild in einigen Beiträgen thematisiert wird, in anderen nahezu unberücksichtigt bleibt). Keulen sucht im Verhalten des Lucius nach seiner Rückverwandlung und insbesondere bei der kultischen Initiation Züge zu finden, die ihm schon vor seiner Verwandlung eigneten, etwa Ungeduld (35), Neugier (38) und Zögerlichkeit (39 f.). Isis tritt ihm wie zuvor Photis als eine anziehende „Venus-like figure" (42) entgegen, wobei der veneröse

Charakter der Isis recht unbefriedigend mit der mehrfachen Verwendung des eher sakralen Attributs *venerabilis* vom Isiskult untermauert wird (44). In Keulens Zusammenfassung (54 f.) spielen dann auch wieder autobiographische Parallelen zwischen Lucius und Apuleius eine Rolle.

Im vierten Kapitel wendet sich Regine May der Photis, der Geliebten des Lucius, zu, die nach der Verwandlung weitgehend von der Bildfläche verschwindet (59). Sie vergleicht Photis mit ihrem griechischen Pendant Palaistra (60) und kommt zu dem Ergebnis, daß in der lateinischen Version das Verhältnis erotischer (und elegischer) ausgestaltet wird (62 ff.), wie bereits Judith Hindermann in ihrer Untersuchung über den „elegischen Esel"[1] gezeigt hat. Die Namen *Lucius* und *Photis* werden beide vom Begriff „Licht" abgeleitet, was aber zu keiner ganz schlüssigen Deutung führt (61, vgl. 63 f.). Unzweifelhaft richtig ist die wichtige Erkenntnis, daß trotz allem die Erotik der Magie als Mittel zum Zweck untergeordnet bleibt (69). Photis wird letztlich verstanden als Anti-Isis bzw. als irdische Antizipation der Isis (wesentlich differenzierter als Keulen 42, der in beiden venus-ähnliche Figuren sah); die Magie der Photis sind eben „die falschen Mysterien" (70 f.).

Stavros Frangoulidis thematisiert Lucius´ „Ziehtante" Byrrhaena, deren Funktion für Lucius in Warnung und Richtungsweisung, insbesondere im Versuch, Lucius vor der verderblichen Wirkung der Magie zu schützen, gesehen wird (76); wenn er Byrrhaenas Gastfreundschaft anstatt derjenigen Milos angenommen hätte, so wäre ihm das gesamte Schicksal der Verwandlung erspart geblieben (77 vgl. 88).

Luca Graverini beschäftigt sich mit den Räubern, welche Lucius und Charite entführen, sowie mit der Alten, die das „Märchen" von Amor und Psyche zur Beruhigung der festgehaltenen Charite erzählt. In der Charakteristik der Räuberfiguren werden epische Züge festgestellt, die nach Graverini jedoch nicht auf bloße Epenparodie reduziert werden sollten (99). Bezüglich der Binnenerzählerin wird die Parallelität zwischen Binnenerzählung und Gesamtroman, also auch zwischen der Alten und Lucius als Erzählerfiguren hervorgehoben (101). Die Alte ist im griechischen Onos „secondary character", wird bei Apuleius hingegen zu einem „embodiment of a metaphorical expression (sc. *fabulae aniles*)" (102). Ihre Trunkenheit wird mit der dichterischen Raserei eines Erzählers in Verbindung gebracht (103).

Lara Nicolini behandelt die Geschichte über Charite und Tlepolemus. Sie charakterisiert die Darbietung dieser Geschichte bei Apuleius gut als „Erzählzyklos" (105); der von Lucius teilweise miterlebte erste Teil des Zyklos ist eine „small-scale version of a Greek novel", der zweite Teil, von welchem Lucius nur noch indirekt berichtet wird, das „unexpected tragic end" (106

[1] Judith Hindermann, *Der elegische Esel. Apuleius' Metamorphosen und Ovids Ars amatoria*, Frankfurt am Main 2009.

vgl. 122). Mit dieser richtigen erzähltechnischen Beobachtung verbindet sich teilweise eine gewisse analytische Betrachtungsweise, welche eine im Text noch faßbare Heterogenität beider Teile herauszuarbeiten versucht (108; der zweite Teil fehlt völlig im griechischen *Onos*). Man könnte Nicolinis Betrachtungen über den Erzählzyklus noch in der Richtung ergänzen, daß Charite in der tröstlichen Erzählung der Alten über Amor und Psyche die zauberhafte Überhöhung eines herkömmlichen Liebesromans (mit Katabasis und Vergöttlichung am Ende statt einfacher Wiedervereinigung), in ihrem eigenen Leben jedoch das Versagen des herkömmlichen Romanschemas vorgeführt bekommt (das Happy-End ist nur scheinbar, danach tritt eine tragische Katastrophe ein, die mit dem Tod aller Beteiligten endet). Die intertextuelle Verbindung zwischen Charite und der vergilischen Dido (112 f.) wird vielleicht etwas überbewertet (die Anspielung auf Aen. IV 656, S. 113, ist natürlich unbestreitbar) zuungunsten von Einflüssen der griechischen Tragödie[2]; mit Dido verbinden Charite eigentlich nur Fama und Raserei, zwei Motive, die bei Vergil zudem nicht einmal direkt miteinander verknüpft sind.

Costas und Stelios Panayotakis sind mit den menschlichen Charakteren in der Geschichte von Amor und Psyche befaßt. Die Ausführungen spitzen sich naturgemäß auf Psyche zu: Deren Parallelitäten mit der Figur des Lucius werden von letzterem nicht erkannt (134). Psyche entwickelt sich von einer naiven *virgo* (137) mit den Zügen der *simplicitas* und *curiositas* (139 ff.), deren innere Zerrissenheit in Anbetracht der Ratschläge der bösen Schwestern mit dichterischen Entscheidungsmonologen in Verbindung gebracht wird (142), zu einer konsequenten Rächerin an ihren Schwestern (138); diese Rache wird mit Recht neben die spätere eigene Rache der Zuhörerin Charite am Mörder ihres Gatten Tlepolemus gestellt (143).

Schließlich thematisiert Danielle van Mal-Maeder die göttlichen Figuren der *Metamorphosen*, insbesondere die Götter in der Amor-und-Psyche-Erzählung sowie Isis und Osiris im Schlußbuch. Letzere werden „exalted", erstere „debunked" (164). Etwa Venus in der „Märchenerzählung" wird von der erzählenden *delira et temulenta … anicula* auf das Niveau einer Komödienfigur hinabgezogen (148), die ihren eigenen Sohn Cupido über die Maßen abwertet (152 f.). Diese komödienhafte Perspektive drängt vielleicht die in geringerem Maße von Mal-Maeder geübte epische Sichtweise (Venus als Pendant der feindlichen vergilischen Juno [150], Amor dagegen als positive Figur, so daß sich für die leidende Psyche geradezu eine typisch-epische polare Götterebene ergibt) allzusehr in den Hintergrund. Im Schlußbuch begegnen Isis und Osiris anders als die olympischen Götter in der Binnenerzählung ausschließlich in Träumen und Epiphanien (159). Isis

[2] Vgl. Verf., Die Rache der Charite bei Apuleius als kumulative Imitation der euripideischen Hekabe und des sophokleischen Ödipus, Athenaeum n.s. 1 (2010) 255 – 258; dazu die „metatragische" Stelle IV 26, 2 *specta denique scaenam meae calamitatis* (bei Nicolini S. 116)

wird als ein gütiges Gegenbild zur Venus der Binnenerzählung gesehen (161); sie erscheint geradezu als „the true Venus" (165) – in Übereinstimmung mit May, die ebenfalls Isis als Überwinderin der irdisch-erotischen Mysterien des Werkanfangs ansieht, wohingegen Keulen Isis selbst eher als venus-ähnliche Figur betrachtet (s.o.).

Im ganzen erreichen die einzelnen Beträge, wie in Anbetracht der sämtlich in der Apuleius-Forschung profilierten Verfasser nicht anders zu erwarten, ein hohes Niveau. Bestehen bleiben jedoch die oben gelegentlich thematisierten sachlichen und methodischen Widersprüchlichkeiten zwischen den Einzelessays und das Bedenken, ob eine einheitliche Monographie nicht dem Thema „characterisation", dessen Beurteilung in enger Verbindung zur Gesamtinterpretation der *Metamorphosen* steht, angemessener gewesen wäre.

Thomas Gärtner
Universität zu Köln
th-gaertner@gmx.de

Barrie Fleet, *Plotinus. Ennead IV, 7: on the immortality of the soul. The Enneads of Plotinus with philosophical commentaries*. Las Vegas, Zurich, Athènes, Parmenides Publishing, 2016, 1 vol. 12,5x19, 341 pp., ISBN 978-1-930972-95-7 ; -96-4.

La question de l'âme est sans aucun doute la question la plus importante du système plotinien. Le fait que le traité 7 de la quatrième *Ennéade* apparaisse si tôt dans l'écriture de la doctrine (il est deuxième selon l'ordre chronologique) atteste assez combien il est philosophiquement urgent de défendre une conception de l'âme immortelle et incorporelle, contre tous ceux, stoïciens en tête, qui se trompent sur sa nature et n'hésitent pas à en faire une réalité corporelle (les chap. 3 à 8[3] du traité sont tous consacrés à une longue et minutieuse réfutation de la psychologie stoïcienne). La traduction et le commentaire exigent des compétences doxographiques, que possède Barrie Fleet. Ce dernier publie ici un second volume (après IV, 8 [6]) dans la collection des « *Enneads* of Plotinus » que dirigent depuis Dublin John Dillon et Andrew Smith, aux éditions Parmenides.

Le volume compte environ 300 pages : une courte introduction, un plan détaillé, puis un commentaire abondant et parfois juxtalinéaire.

Barrie Fleet maîtrise parfaitement son sujet. Sa traduction suit le texte de l'*editio minor* de P. Henry et H.-R. Schwyzer, de façon très fidèle. Le résultat est élégant et ne s'éloigne que peu du texte. Fleet s'est appuyé sur les traductions anglaises d'A. H. Armstrong et de S. MacKenna ; il mentionne également la traduction française d'E. Bréhier, à laquelle il adresse quelques critiques. C'est une peine qu'il aurait pu s'éviter en consultant les traductions françaises publiées sous la responsabilité de L. Brisson et de l'un des deux *reviewers*, J.-F. Pradeau (citées en bibliographie). À quoi bon, par exemple, souligner qu'au chapitre 8[4] Bréhier traduisait *ta empsukha* par « âme » et non par « animé » il y a près d'un siècle ? Fleet se montre toutefois et très systématiquement prudent lorsqu'il s'engage sur des terrains disputés, qu'il s'agisse de traduction ou d'interprétation. Fleet choisit le plus souvent de présenter les différentes traductions et le terme ou l'expression qui justifie la multiplicité des interprétations. Par exemple, pour la ligne 9 du chapitre 11, où le grec est ambigu, il donne les traductions de Bréhier, de MacKenna, d'Armstrong et cette fois, celle de Brisson et de Pradeau. Et Fleet laisse le lecteur se faire une opinion.

Le commentaire qui accompagne la traduction est très érudit. Le traité 2 (IV, 7) défend l'immortalité et l'incorporéité de l'âme contre les doctrines aristotéliciennes, épicuriennes et surtout stoïciennes. Fleet se livre donc à un

véritable travail, non seulement d'identification des textes concernés par la critique de Plotin, mais également de développement et de commentaire de ces textes, sans s'en tenir aux critiques que leur adresse Plotin. La structure du commentaire est identique dans tous les ouvrages de la collection : un résumé des chapitres, puis un commentaire de détail qui s'arrête sur les lignes, expressions ou mots qui ont besoin d'être expliqués. Le traité 2 étant relativement long, Fleet a choisi de découper également chaque chapitre en alinéas d'une dizaine de lignes et de résumer ces alinéas avant d'en proposer un commentaire détaillé. Mais le commentaire finit par avoir les défauts de ses qualités : le fait de se concentrer sur le détail peut finalement donner un aspect fragmenté qui rend la lecture et la compréhension globale du commentaire difficiles, d'autant plus que l'explication du texte se réfère à la numérotation grecque des lignes qui n'est pas celle de la traduction en anglais. Il aurait peut-être été préférable, au vu de la taille du texte, de répartir autrement le commentaire et les notes. Tous les traducteurs de Plotin butent sur cette difficulté, il est vrai. Fleet livre également un commentaire détaillé des auteurs, notamment stoïciens, qui sont visés par la critique de Plotin. Plusieurs indices favorisent la consultation du volume. La bibliographie à la fin de l'ouvrage est véritablement révélatrice de la masse de documents (textes d'auteurs, articles, ouvrages généraux) qui ont été mobilisés dans le commentaire. Tout ce qu'il y a de plus essentiel à la compréhension du septième traité de la quatrième *Ennéade* est présent. On comprend donc pourquoi cette nouvelle traduction de Plotin, qui a pourtant été souvent travaillé en langue anglaise, est loin d'être superflue. Le remarquable travail d'Armstrong (Loeb Classical Library, 1966-1988) reste bien sûr aride pour un lecteur peu averti. Les éditeurs Dillon et Smith ont opté pour des commentaires très développés. L'introduction générale de Fleet au chapitre 10 en donne un bon exemple : présentation de l'argument de Plotin, mais également commentaire de la *Métaphysique* d'Aristote (1072b18 sq.), présentation du rapport entre âme et intellection dans les dialogues de Platon et rappel des commentaires afférents de D.J. O'Meara (*Plotinus : an Introduction to the Enneads*, Oxford University Press, 1993) et Armstrong (*Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy, Supplementary Volume*, Oxford University Press, 1991). Le tout de façon claire. Dans le compte-rendu de la traduction commentée que Fleet avait donnée dans cette même collection du traité 6 (IV, 8), D.M. Hutchinson regrettait ceci: "« The commentary tends to explain Plotinus' views by tracing them vertically back to Plato instead of horizontally across the *Enneads*, and it tends to over-emphasize the sources of Plotinus' thinking and under-emphasize Plotinus' own originality ». (*Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 23 novembre 2012). Cette réserve peut de nouveau être adressée à cette traduction du traité 2. Ici et en l'occurrence, aux références platoniciennes s'ajoutent les références stoïciennes et péripatéticiennes. Pour n'en donner qu'un exemple, considérons le ch. 6, où Plotin reproche aux stoïciens d'admettre qu'il existe

une forme de corporéité des impressions et des souvenirs, comme un sceau imprimé dans la cire. Fleet d'éclairer alors la cible de la critique, en évoquant Aristote, Plutarque, Sextus Empiricus, Chrysippe et bien sûr Platon. Plotin est un peu l'absent de ces remarques, lui qui pourtant consacrera un exposé d'ampleur à la question de la mémoire, qui traverse le vaste (triple) traité *Sur les difficultés relatives à l'âme* (traités 27 à 29). Il est parfois dommage que le point de vue, le projet et la stratégie argumentative de Plotin s'effacent devant les cibles de sa critique doxographique. L'exercice doxographique, dans les traités plotiniens, est toujours une étape préalable à l'élaboration d'un problème platonicien et à sa résolution doctrinale. Voilà qui est parfois manqué ici. En suivant les règles d'une collection qui publie les traités les uns séparément des autres, Fleet n'a pas choisi de s'engager sur la place relative du traité 2. Relative bien sûr au traité 4 (IV, 2), dont tout montre qu'il pourtant est la poursuite du traité 2, auquel il donne sa conclusion thétique, en l'espèce de la définition de l'âme dont le stoïcisme interdisait la saisie. Poursuivant les derniers chapitres du traité 2, le traité 4 expliquera, avec l'autorité du *Timée*, comment l'âme est indivisible, incorruptible et immortelle.

Camille Guigon
Jean-François Pradeau
Université de Lyon 3
jean-francois.pradeau@univ-lyon3.fr

Eric. D. Perl, Plotinus. *Ennead V, 1: On the Three Primary Levels of Reality. The Enneads of Plotinus with philosophical commentaries*. Las Vegas, Zurich, Athènes, Parmenides publishing, 2015, 1 vol. 12,5x19, 228 pp., ISBN 978-1-930972-91-9 ; -92-6.

Dans la même collection que le précédent ouvrage, Perl livre donc une traduction commentée du synoptique et synthétique traité 10 (V, 1) de Plotin. La traduction de Perl est très proche du texte grec (P. Henry et H.R. Schwyzer, *editio maior*), qu'il discute sur quelques points. Par exemple, ch. 5, ligne 3, comme F. Fronterotta dans sa traduction française du traité 10, où Perl préfère ζήτει au ζῇ ἀει défendu par Armstrong et l'*editio minor* de Henry et Schwyzer. Le texte grec de ce traité n'est toutefois pas, loin s'en faut, le plus difficile des *Ennéades*. Perl en propose donc une traduction à la fois accessible et très juste. Souhaiter se rapprocher le plus possible du texte grec peut avoir quelques effets fâcheux sur la lecture. On le voit notamment au début du chapitre 7, où la multiplication du pronom « it » (« In that by its return towards it, it sees ; and the seeing itself is intellect »), fait que le lecteur s'y perd et finit par se demander qui fait quoi ou qui est désigné de l'Intellect ou de l'Un dans ce jeu de renvois.

Heureusement, la traduction s'accompagne d'un commentaire qui permet, entre autres, de dissiper cette sorte d'ambiguïtés. Le commentaire est composé à chaque fois de manière similaire : d'abord un résumé du chapitre, puis une explication ligne par ligne, qui se concentre sur les mots et expressions importants, difficiles ou litigieux. Le commentaire de Perl est très informé et de bonne qualité. Les résumés au début de chapitre aident le lecteur auquel on offre d'emblée une vue d'ensemble de l'argument. L'intérêt de ce commentaire, par différence d'avec celui que Fleet donne de IV, 7, tient à la façon dont Perl s'efforce très judicieusement de rapporter ce qu'expose ce traité à l'ensemble de l'œuvre plotinienne. Mieux encore, Perl a également fait l'effort de donner les références des auteurs qui précèdent Plotin et sont susceptibles de l'avoir influencé (ceux dont la *Vie de Plotin* nous apprend qu'il les lisait et les discutait au début de ses cours). Perl se contente le plus souvent de signaler les références pertinentes ; il les discute peu. Ainsi et par exemple, dans le commentaire de la fameuse métaphore de l'âme comme discours prononcé de l'intellect, Perl rappelle que le lien entre ce qui est pensé et son expression existe déjà chez les stoïciens (en *SVF* 2.135), dans le traité *De l'interprétation* d'Aristote (1.16a3) et dans le *Sophiste* de Platon (263 e3-5). Mais il ne développe que la référence platonicienne. De la même manière, Perl indique bon nombre de renvois aux autres traités, sans expliquer toujours

ce qui est en jeu. Par exemple, dans le commentaire de la ligne 7 du chapitre 4, l'auteur rappelle que la vie de l'Intellect consiste dans sa propre activité d'appréhension et il renvoie aux *Ennéades* V, 3 [49], 5 ; III, 7 [45], 3 et VI, 7 [38] 15 et 17, sans plus de détail. Ces textes sont éclairants. D'autant plus que leur contenu n'est pas totalement similaire : V, 3, 5 reprend ce qui est dit par Platon dans le *Sophiste* 248 e (référence qui apparaît également dans le commentaire de Perl) : l'être absolu doit forcément posséder vie, intelligence et âme. L'intelligible est un acte qui a la vie par lui-même. III, 7, 3 explique que tous les membres ou éléments du monde intelligible peuvent être ramenés à une totalité unique douée du même mouvement et de la même vie. VI, 7, 15 décrit simplement la supériorité de la vie intelligible sur celle sensible et le chapitre 17, plus pertinent dans le contexte, décrit comment la vie illimitée de l'Intellect reçoit une forme et une détermination lorsqu'il vient à contempler l'Un. Ces différents passages étant donc particulièrement riches, ils auraient mérité, quitte à être cités, un développement plus abouti. D'autres commentaires de la même édition (comme celui du traité IV, 8 par B. Fleet) ne se privent pas de déployer plus largement leurs références.

Voilà qui ne remet pas en cause la qualité de la traduction et du commentaire de Perl. L'auteur a bien documenté son travail, d'une part en s'appuyant sur les traductions les plus pertinentes de Plotin en anglais, français, espagnol et allemand, mais également et d'autre part, sur les études qui ont été consacrées au traité 10. La bibliographie, fort utile, est complète.

L'*Ennéade* V, 1 est un traité qui exige que son traducteur fasse des choix. Perl justifie les siens et les compare à ceux, en langue anglaise, d'Armstrong ou de MacKenna. En revanche, au chapitre 4, il opte pour une traduction inédite, dont on ne trouve l'équivalent chez aucun autre traducteur. La phrase dit « γίνεται οὖν τὰ πρῶτα νοῦς, ὄν, ἑτερότης, ταὐτότης » (l.34-35). Que ce soit chez Igal, Fronterotta, Harder, MacKenna, Armstrong, ou Atkinson, on retrouve toujours une traduction littérale du type : « sont premiers l'Intellect, l'être, la différence et l'identité ». Perl traduit par « Thus intellect becomes these first: being, difference, sameness ». Selon lui, l'Intellect devient un certain nombre de réalités, tout en restant la réalité de référence. L'Intellect aurait une primauté, qui expliquerait qu'il ne se trouve pas au même niveau que l'être, l'identité et la différence, qui pour leur part qualifient à chaque fois un certain rapport à l'Un. L'interprétation de Perl est, à tout le moins, contestable. Après tout, le texte de Plotin est clair ici : il présente comme premières certaines réalités sans que l'Intellect soit particulièrement distingué. Il est premier avec les autres. Par ailleurs, il y a une simultanéité non pas temporelle, mais logique et ontologique entre les différents aspects de l'Intellect. C'est parce qu'il contemple l'Un et prend conscience de son origine que non seulement l'Intellect devient intellect mais également être. On devrait donc plutôt comprendre que ce n'est pas l'Intellect qui est antérieur « chronologiquement », mais bien plutôt cette vie illimitée qui est issue de la

surabondance de l'Un. Cette simultanéité des réalités est donc bien affirmée et souhaitée par Plotin. Comme l'affirme V, 3 [49] : « là-bas, l'être total, l'être véritable, est à la fois être, intellect et vivant parfait, dans la mesure où il est tous les vivants ensemble » (*Traité 49*, 5, 31-35, trad. F. Fronterotta, GF Flammarion, Paris, 2009). Ces débats sont ouverts ; il est manifeste que le travail de Perl, comme celui de Fleet, vont y contribuer.

Camille Guigon
Jean-François Pradeau
Université de Lyon 3
jean-francois.pradeau@univ-lyon3.fr

Paola Paolucci, *Pentadius Ovidian poet: music, myth and love*. Anthologiarum Latinarum Parerga, 5, Hildesheim: Weidmann, 2016, xiv+132 pp., ISBN 978-3-615-00422-9.

Los pocos versos que pueden atribuirse con alguna certeza al poeta Pentadio son los transmitidos, entre otros testimonios manuscritos relevantes, por el conocido *Codex Salmasianus*, un ejemplar de aproximadamente finales del siglo VIII o principios del IX que fue propiedad del filólogo galo del siglo XVII Claude de Saumase antes de acabar recalando –y tras pasar por las manos de Nicolás Heinsius– en la actual Biblioteca Nacional de Francia bajo la signatura *Parisinus Latinus 10138*. En este importante ejemplar para el conocimiento de lo que se ha dado en llamar *Antología Latina* nos encontramos con la atribución a Pentadio de seis composiciones de diferente extensión, aunque todas ellas breves: dos elegías (una dedicada a la variabilidad de la fortuna –según se ejemplifica en el poema a través de casos tomados del mito– y otra a la llegada de la primavera) y cuatro epigramas (dos de los cuales tienen por destinatario a Narciso, un tercero a una mujer denominada Crisócome y un cuarto de factura netamente misógina). Este es todo el material que con seguridad puede considerarse genuinamente obra de este poeta de raro ingenio e incierta cronología que para nosotros es poco más que un nombre, pues otras composiciones a él atribuidas que transmiten los demás manuscritos, o bien comparten autoría con otros poetas o bien han sido asignadas a nuestro autor por los antiguos editores y comentaristas de su texto sin ningún tipo de garantía o seguridad.

El libro que reseñamos, obra de la especialista en poesía latina tardía y profesora de la Università degli Studi di Perugia, Paola Paolucci, se centra precisamente y con exclusividad en esas seis composiciones de atribución segura a Pentadio, dejando a un lado el resto de composiciones de dudosa autoría. A decir verdad, el estudio que nos ocupa, como señala la propia Paolucci, es una mezcla de comentario crítico al texto del poeta y de exégesis literaria en torno a los poemas y al propio autor (p. xiii: "the literary exegesis and textual criticism of Pentadius's poems, in this essay, shal thus go hand in hand"), siendo lo primero un adelanto de lo que pretende ser en el futuro una edición fiable del texto y, lo segundo, un estudio general sobre la poesía de Pentadio que clarifique y ponga al día lo mucho que se ha dicho acerca de su cronología e identidad y a propósito del valor literario de sus poemas.

En cuanto a la estructura del libro, hay que decir que Paolucci ha organizado su ensayo en torno a tres temas o motivos que revelan a las claras la innegable filiación ovidiana de la poesía de nuestro poeta y que la autora pone

continuamente de manifiesto en los comentarios literarios con que se acompaña la discusión textual. Estos tres capítulos centrales de su estudio están encabezados (además de las palabras previas del Prefacio y de la Introducción que sirven de justificación del trabajo que ha llevado a cabo) por un capítulo inicial dedicado a desvelar la identidad y cronología de Pentadio ("Pentadius. Who was he?", pp. 1-16). La autora rebate la identificación del poeta con el destinatario del epítome de las *Divinae Institutiones* de Lactancio (lo que situaría a nuestro autor, por tanto, poco después del año 320) y, basándose en argumentos léxicos y de contenido (aparte de nuevos datos no barajados hasta ahora), lo sitúa con cierta concreción a principios del siglo V, en el contexto de la lucha contra el pelagianismo, y lo identifica con el Pentadio que se menciona en una carta del Papa Inocencio I del año 416 dirigida a los obispos del Consejo de Cartago.

El primero de los capítulos que se dedican específicamente al texto de Pentadio lleva por título "Music: the Epanaleptic Couplet and the Poem *De adventu veris*" (pp. 17-27). Comienza este apartado remarcándose la presencia de Ovidio en los versos del poeta salmasiano en el uso de los versos ecoicos o epanalépticos, técnica poética usada esporádicamente por el sulmonés y que en nuestro autor se convierte en habitual y recurrente (sólo uno de los epigramas dedicados a Narciso, el de Crisócome y el de contenido misógino escapan a este recurso). El poema en concreto que se analiza, textual y literariamente, en esta sección es el dedicado a la llegada de la primavera, un texto con notables precedentes en la poesía latina, cuajado de elementos que proceden de Catulo, Lucrecio, Virgilio, Horacio, Ovidio y el *Pervigilium Veneris*, y que bien responde al encabezamiento del capítulo ("Music") por ofrecer a lo largo de sus siete dísticos un marco armónico ("harmonic frame", p. 22) en el que se funden la forma métrica elegida por el poeta, ya ciertamente musical, y algunos de los elementos que identifican la llegada de la primavera, tan circular como el tipo de estrofa empleada, y que Pentadio incluye por su efecto sonoro en la composición (el eco de los mugidos del ganado, el canto del ruiseñor, el ruido del agua desatada que se precipita por los torrentes, etc). Aquí, al igual que ocurre en el resto de capítulos, se alterna el comentario literario (estilístico, de contenido y de fuentes) con la exégesis crítica al texto, haciéndose alguna que otra propuesta que pretende devolver la autoridad a los testimonios manuscritos frente a las conjeturas de editores anteriores. Es el caso, por ejemplo, de la restitución de la lectura *equis* del v. 2 que transmiten varios manuscritos, incluido el *Salmasianus*, frente a la conjetura *aquis* que hiciera Pierre Pithou para el pentámetro del primer dístico (vv. 1-2): *Sentio fugit hiems; Zephyrisque animantibus orbem / iam tepet Eurus equis. Sentio fugit hiems*. Los argumentos esgrimidos por Paolucci para justificar la bondad del texto transmitido se basan fundamentalmente en el paralelo de la expresión empleada por Pentadio con el texto virgiliano de *Aen.* 2.417-418: *…laetus Eois / Eurus equis.*

El segundo apartado ("Myth: the Elegy *De fortuna* and the Epigrams of Narcissus", pp. 29-67) aborda la presencia del tema mítico, de procedencia ovidiana, en tres composiciones que tienen precisamente ese mismo denominador común. En efecto, la elegía sobre la volubilidad de la fortuna se asienta, siempre –en consonancia con el contenido– bajo la forma métrica de los versos ecoicos, en una cadena de ejemplos míticos que demuestran cómo el azar puede cambiar el sentido de las cosas (Procne y Filomela, Medea, Orfeo y Eurídice, Píramo y Tisbe, Dédalo e Ícaro, etc). Ovidio es, según Paolucci, la fuente mitográfica de la que Pentadio toma fundamentalmente la información y la intertextualidad ovidiana, además del testimonio de otras fuentes, es la base de que se sirve para defender las lecturas transmitidas y no aceptadas por algunos editores y cuyo comentario jalona la exégesis literaria que ofrece de todos u cada uno de los dísticos de esta elegía. Los otros dos poemas objeto de estudio en este apartado son los dedicados a Narciso: uno es el compuesto en versos ecoicos y, el otro, es un breve epigrama que se centra en la flor que resulta de la metamorfosis del joven. El comentario de ambos sigue la tónica de lo dicho hasta ahora: valoración estilística y relaciones intertextuales de las composiciones, y comentario crítico al texto con propuestas concretas que buscan, casi siempre, la restitución de las lecturas transmitidas por los manuscritos. Es el caso, por ejemplo, de la enmienda que propone al v. 3 del primero de los poemas (*Se puer ipse videt, patrem dum quaerit in amne*) y que pasa sencillamente por confirmar que la lectura que en realidad ofrecen los manuscritos (el *Salmasianus* y el *Vossianus*) es *amnem* y no *amne*. Esta constatación evita forzar el sentido del pasaje y, tomando a *patrem* como aposición a *amnem*, la versión del mito viene a corresponderse por completo con la fuente ovidiana de *Metamorfosis*.

El tercer apartado ("Love: The Epigram on *Chrysocome*, the Epigram *De femina* and a Ovidian *sphragís*", pp. 69-76) trata con brevedad del resto de las composiciones atribuidas a Pentadio en el códice de Saumase. Destaca Paolucci que estos dos epigramas poco tienen que ver con la ideología amorosa del sulmonés, uno por mendaz y, el otro, por misógino. Tras repasar las atribuciones a otros autores (Cicerón y Petronio, principalmente) del epigrama *De femina* que se leen en algunos manuscritos o llevaron a cabo determinados editores y comentaristas, la autora concluye con que lo mejor es considerar junto a los testimonios manuscritos más antiguos que son obra de Pentadio. Este breve capítulo se inicia, pues, con el análisis literario y textual del epigrama sobre Crisócome, para el que Paolucci determina como fuente el episodio de Claudia Quinta contenido en el libro IV de los *Fastos* de Ovidio, y luego hace lo propio con el misógino *De femina*, del que analiza algunas cuestiones textuales en las que están divididos los manuscritos y para el que, a pesar de su poco ovidianismo, encuentra también algunos puntos de contacto con los versos del de Sulmona.

Las conclusiones del estudio se recogen en pp. 77-79 y sirven para subrayar aspectos sobre los que la autora del estudio ha ido incidiendo a lo largo de su trabajo: primero, que la edición de Pentadio que realizará tras esta primera aproximación sólo contendrá los seis poemas atribuidos a él en los más importantes manuscritos; segundo, que el modelo principal, desde el punto de vista de la métrica y del contenido (mítico y amoroso), es Ovidio; y, tercero, que la cronología del poeta, a tenor de los nuevos datos aportados, se corresponde con la época de la difusión del pelagianismo en el Norte de África, es decir, comienzos del siglo V.

Para terminar, el libro se cierra con una completísima bibliografía (ediciones de Pentadio y otros autores, y estudios, pp. 81-103) y dos índices: uno de pasajes citados (pp. 105-122) y otro de nombres y materias (pp. 123-129), además del índice general de la obra. En suma, estamos ante una primera aproximación a una futura edición de los poemas de Pentadio, más respetuosa con la tradición manuscrita que con el ingenio de editores anteriores y que cuenta ya, no obstante, con los cimientos apropiados (los comentarios críticos ofrecidos aquí y la exégesis literaria en que se apoyan) para ocupar un puesto relevante entre las ediciones parciales de los poetas contenidos en la *Antologia Latina* que se están publicando en los últimos años.

Juan Luis Arcaz Pozo
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
arcaz@filol.ucm.es

Valéry Berlincourt, Lavinia Galli Milić and Damien Nelis (edd.). *Lucan and Claudian: Context and Intertext*. Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften, 151, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2016. x+322 pp., € 40.00, ISBN 978-3-8253-6549-3.

Le présent ouvrage est constitué des actes d'un colloque international qui s'est tenu en novembre 2012 à la Fondation Hardt, « Lucain et Claudien face à face. Une poésie politique entre épopée, histoire et panégyrique ». Le colloque s'inscrit dans les recherches qui ont été menées entre 2010 et 2013 à l'Université de Genève : étudier, non pas l'influence de Lucain sur Claudien, mais la pratique intertextuelle de ces deux auteurs, en combinant le meilleur de la *Quellenforschung* et les travaux les plus récents sur les allusions locales. L'invitation au colloque n'incitait toutefois pas à aborder directement cette question, mais proposait des angles d'attaque relativement généraux : la place de ces deux poètes dans la tradition épique latine, l'épopée comme instrument de louange ou de blâme, le rapport entre épopée et histoire, entre narration et discours, etc. Il est particulièrement intéressant de constater que la problématique intertextuelle a été naturellement envisagée *via* ces différentes thématiques.

Dans « Lucain et Claudien : une poésie politique entre épopée, histoire et panégyrique », J.L. Charlet revient sur l'influence de Lucain sur Claudien, pour mieux comprendre la place de ces deux auteurs dans la tradition épique latine. Après avoir revu, corrigé et complété les analyses de R.T. Bruère et d'E.M. Olechowska, Charlet rappelle la place de l'épopée historique, qui distingue radicalement les Romains des Grecs. Lucain s'inscrit dans cette tradition en se signalant par son refus du merveilleux mythologique, auxquels ses successeurs reviendront. Alors que Lucain évoque, dans une perspective philosophique, une guerre antérieure de plus d'un siècle, Claudien se livre au commentaire, nécessairement fragmentaire, de l'actualité politique. Charlet rappelle l'évolution de ses poèmes jusqu'à l'expression d'une vision personnelle de Rome. Si l'œuvre de Lucain mérite pleinement d'être définie comme épopée historique, celle de Claudien peut être perçue, dans une perspective politique, comme une fresque épique – ce qui ne doit pas masquer la diversité générique de ses œuvres.

Dans « *Victrix causa deis placuit* : Claudian und das entgötterte Epos », F. Felgentreu revient sur la très débattue présence des dieux païens dans l'œuvre de Claudien, poète officiel à la cour – chrétienne – de Milan. Si Lucain se démarque dans la tradition épique par son renoncement à l'appareil divin, la présence des dieux chez Claudien ne doit pas masquer la proximité entre

les deux auteurs. Felgentreu démontre ainsi qu'en mettant en scène des dieux désormais privés de toute dimension religieuse, réduits à être un élément du décor, Claudien va encore plus loin que Lucain dans le processus de dédivinisation de l'épopée. Après avoir rappelé l'état de la recherche quant aux convictions personnelles de Claudien, Felgentreu fonde sa démonstration sur l'étude de l'épithalame pour le mariage d'Honorius et de Marie, où les dieux ont une fonction ornementale. Rappelons toutefois que ce poème n'est sans doute pas le plus représentatif de l'œuvre de Claudien pour étudier la place des dieux dans ses poèmes. Felgentreu conclut en reprenant le terme rhétorique d'*endoxon* pour qualifier cette présence des dieux, privée de valeur religieuse, et que tout lecteur peut, par conséquent, accepter.

Claudia Schindler revient sur la présence des figures républicaines chez Lucain et Claudien, dans une étude intitulée « Republikanische Ideale ? Zur Darstellung und Funktion altrömischer Heldengestalten bei Lucan und Claudian. » Ces figures sont présentes dans des récits historiques, des comparaisons, ou dans des jugements – en faveur du héros républicain ou du personnage dont il est rapproché. Lucain établit un lien causal entre la République et la guerre civile. Corrélativement, il établit que les qualités des héros républicains ne tiennent pas à leur personne mais à l'époque elle-même. Claudien démonte également les figures héroïques républicaines, mais d'une tout autre façon : elles servent de faire-valoir dans l'éloge du destinataire. Au contraire de ce que l'on pouvait observer chez Lucain, la personnalité l'emporte sur les circonstances historiques, et fonde la vertu du héros. Chez Claudien, la personnalité, loin d'être déterminé par le contexte, oriente l'histoire : le destinataire de son panégyrique fait progresser l'histoire de Rome.

« Peut-on considérer la *Pharsale* comme une "épopée tragique" ? » : telle est la question posée par F. Ripoll, qui revient sur cette expression aussi fréquente qu'imprécise, en envisageant trois thèmes successifs : le statut du narrateur, le Destin et l'héroïsme. Le narrateur assume une position complexe, entre coryphée, contemporain affligé des événements qu'il rapporte, et *uates* contemporain du temps de la rédaction, figure elle-même dédoublée entre commentateur désespéré et auteur porteur d'une espérance. De la même façon, l'image anthropomorphique d'un Destin malveillant ne doit pas masquer totalement l'antinéronien providentialiste qu'est le poète. Enfin, Ripoll montre comment la stratégie discursive de Lucain repose sur la juxtaposition de héros tragiques (Pompée, César) et d'un héros épique (Caton). Ces différentes tensions trouvent leur origine et justification dans le décalage entre ce que le poète *veut faire* et ce qu'il *peut (ou ne peut pas) dire*. Dans cette perspective, les éléments tragiques sont subordonnés à un propos politique, appelant à un renouveau de l'esprit civique.

Fabrice Galtier propose une étude de « L'*imago* de Caton dans le livre 2 de la *Pharsale* ». Lucain hérite d'une tradition, forgée entre autres par Sénèque, qui fait primer la dimension morale de la figure catonienne sur sa dimension

politique. Cette vision est à l'œuvre dans le portrait que dresse Brutus du héros d'Utique. Le discours de Caton lui-même modifie cette vision et récuse le modèle sapiental : se dessine une figure, non pas refermée sur sa sagesse, mais liée au destin de Rome, décidée à agir pour la cité et à s'engager dans la guerre civile. L'évocation de ses noces avec Marcia puis l'éloge de sa rigueur morale l'érigent en figure mémorielle : avant même le terme de sa vie, son personnage est célébré dans les termes de l'éloge funèbre, qui le figent de son vivant et le définissent comme héros républicain.

Florence Garambois-Vasquez est l'auteur d'une étude sur « L'éloge de Stilicon dans la poésie de Claudien. » Cet éloge repose notamment sur deux vertus habituellement célébrées par la philosophie et la rhétorique antiques : la *temperantia* et la *continentia*. Un tel éloge permet au poète de peindre Stilicon en héritier de Théodose. Faire du régent le successeur légitime de Théodose passe également par un processus de romanisation : d'où l'insistance du poète sur le symbole de la trabée. Stilicon est également érigé en héros luttant contre les forces du mal et œuvrant au maintien de l'unité de l'empire.

Dans « Manilius et l'éloge de Néron (Lucan. 1, 33-66) : quelques considérations intertextuelles sur le *proemium* du *Bellum civile* », Lavinia Galli Milić montre comment les intertextes virgiliens et maniliens permettent à Lucain, en s'appuyant sur les liens entre épopée et philosophie, histoire et cosmologie, de souligner la portée cosmique de guerres civiles dont la répétition et la durée fondent une vision particulièrement sombre.

Roger Rees est l'auteur de « Ghosts of Authors Past in Claudians' *De Bello Gildonico* ». Il relit ce poème de Claudien à la lumière des panégyriques latins des IIIe et IVe siècles (souvent négligés dans les études claudianéennes, au profit du seul Ménandre), mais aussi de Lucain. Rees réévalue donc l'influence des panégyristes latins sur Claudien. Combiner la double influence des panégyriques et de l'épopée lucanienne permet de nuancer la présentation des personnages : Mascezel est marginalisé, la guerre contre Gildon n'est pas une guerre civile mais une défense nationale, Arcadius n'est guère entreprenant, Honorius enthousiaste mais naïf – seule l'image de Stilicon ne se trouve pas écornée.

« Aspetti della presenza di Lucano nella poesia esametrica di Claudiano », de Paolo Esposito entreprend de définir le *modus operandi* de Claudien, héritier de Lucain, plutôt que d'énumérer les *loci similes*. L'auteur propose donc quelques rapprochements de textes ponctuels, qui illustrent le procédé de l'*exemplum*, la reprise avec amplification et contamination, la reprise d'un *topos*, la reformulation d'un paradoxe, la reprise avec renversement, la simple évocation, et la reprise d'une *junctura* permettant de convoquer le souvenir d'un texte plus large.

Bruno Bureau revient sur la « Présence/absence de Lucain dans les deux livres du *Contre Rufin* ». Pour ce faire, il définit, à travers le commentaire de Servius, l'image qu'avaient de Lucain les auteurs des IVe et Ve siècles : celle d'un

poète épique à coloration philosophique, qui rejette l'appareil mythologique de la poésie épique, pour adopter de préférence le caractère non mythique du discours historique. La présence de Lucain est beaucoup plus directe au livre 2 du *Contre Rufin*, livre historique, que dans le livre 1 qui propose une mise en scène mythologique de la réalité. Dans le livre 1, Claudien ancre ainsi le phénomène Rufin dans l'histoire romaine, et dépasse le statut de poésie de circonstance qu'a son œuvre en lui octroyant une forme de pérennité et d'universalité. Le soubassement lucanien que Claudien donne à la narration dans le livre 2 lui permet de justifier sur le terrain historique, et non plus mythologique, son héros, Stilicon, pourtant déclaré *hostis publicus*.

Dans « Lucain et le souhait de domination de la déesse Roma (Claud. *Ol. Prob.* 160-163) », Valéry Berlincourt revient sur les vers dans lesquels Rome exprime son ambition de dominer le monde. Berlincourt étudie la reprise de ce *topos* par Claudien, et plus particulièrement son emploi du nom *Araxes*, à la lumière de l'intertextualité avec Virgile (le bouclier d'Énée) et Lucain (proème notamment). Cela permet notamment de parler de guerre civile sans lier explicitement ce motif à la récente victoire de Théodose.

« Lucan in Claudian's *In Eutropium* : Rhetoric, Paradox and Exemplarity » est l'occasion pour Paul Roche d'envisager la présence de Lucain dans cette invective de Claudien sous trois angles : l'angle rhétorique, à travers la reprise de certains éléments de la *persona* lucanienne, l'angle historique, avec l'emploi d'*exempla* hérités de Lucain, et enfin en se concentrant sur la figure, si importante, de *Roma*. Lucain offre à Claudien la stature d'un narrateur engagé et partisan, qui apostrophe son lecteur et assène des *sententiae*. César et Pompée sont utilisés de façon variée, soit pour condamner Eutrope, soit pour célébrer Stilicon et Targibile. En plus d'échos virgiliens, *Roma* est modelée sur la figure lucanienne de la *Patria*. Claudien ressuscite les héros républicains, tout comme Lucain faisait appel à Sylla, Marius ou Julia. La présence de Lucain dans le *Contre Eutrope* est bien plus qu'un héritage littéraire, c'est un choix stratégique de la part de Claudien.

Dans « Eutropius, Lucan and the Ladies of Elegy », Catherine Ware propose également une lecture du *Contre Eutrope* à travers le modèle lucanien. Lorsqu'Eutrope se lamente d'avoir été abandonné par son premier maître, un certain Ptolémée, il adopte le langage des héroïnes délaissées par leur amant. Ce ton élégiaque est cohérent avec le contexte lucanien de l'œuvre : Claudien reprend des éléments aux trois grandes figures féminines du *Bellum ciuile* – Cornelia, Julia, Marcia – pour mieux dénoncer l'infidélité et la lâcheté qui caractérisent Eutrope. Claudien hérite aussi des figures élégiaques de Laïs ou Dipsas (Prop. ; Ov. *Am.*), et du personnage de la *lena*.

Neil Coffee et Chris Forstall proposent une étude intitulée « Claudian's Engagement with Lucan and his Historical and Mythological Hexameters ». Les auteurs présentent tout d'abord la méthode de travail qu'ils vont appliquer à la lecture du *De Raptu* et du *De Consulatu Stilichonis* : le logiciel Tesserae

permet d'identifier les parallèles d'au moins deux mots, entre deux textes (en tenant compte de la rareté des mots, de la distance entre eux dans le texte, etc.). Pour qu'un parallèle soit une allusion, il doit présenter un caractère marqué et être signifiant. Les auteurs peuvent ainsi situer Claudien dans la tradition d'intertextualité qui fonde l'épopée latine. Virgile est plus présent dans le poème mythologique du *De Raptu* que dans le poème historique du *De Consulatu Stilichonis*. Ce poème-ci se distingue par ses nombreuses allusions au *Bellum civile* de Lucain : la figure de César permet à Claudien, par contraste, de mettre en valeur celle de Stilicon. Le *Bellum civile* est toutefois présent de manière ponctuelle dans le *De Raptu* pour qualifier la violence de l'enlèvement. Claudien n'a donc pas les mêmes pratiques intertextuelles dans ses poèmes mythologiques et historiques.

Delphine Meunier
Institut d'Études Augustiniennes
IEA - Composante du LEM (UMR 8584, CNRS - EPHE - Paris Sorbonne)
delphimeunier@gmail.com

Francesca Romana Nocchi, *Commento agli* Epigrammata Bobiensia, Series: Texte und Kommentare 54, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2016, x+482 pp., ISBN 978-3-11-046201-2.

A cinque anni di distanza dall'agile e divulgativo studio sugli *Epigrammata Bobiensia* pubblicato assieme al compianto Luca Canali per le cure dell'editore Rubbettino (d'ora in avanti N. 2011)[1], la N. ne cura l'ampliamento e la rielaborazione con questo corposo volume dedicato, come recita il titolo, all'ampio *Commento* dei carmi (41-410), preceduti da una *Prefazione* (VII-VIII), da un'*Introduzione* (1-40) e seguiti da una *Bibliografia* (411-454), un *Index nominum et rerum notabilium* (455-461) e un *Index locorum* (462-482). Ne discende che le questioni relative alla genesi e alla natura della raccolta, all'ordinamento delle edizioni umanistiche sono sommariamente affrontate nelle varie sezioni dell'*Introduzione* (1.*Tradizione del testo e genesi della raccolta*, 3-8; 2.*Struttura della raccolta e matrice letteraria*, 9-22; 3.*La matrice retorica*, 23-29; 4.*Contesto storico-culturale della raccolta*, 30-35; 5.*Paternità dei componimenti*, 36-38) prevalentemente sulla base dei risultati di Mariotti e di Morelli[2]. Gli studi sulla Silloge hanno fatto tuttavia in questi ultimi anni numerosi e significativi progressi che consentono una più ampia delineazione della sua storia e l'A. avrebbe sicuramente potuto trarre profitto dalla lettura del volume pubblicato quest'anno da Orazio Portuese, che ha proposto una successione cronologica delle quattro liste delle opere conservate a Bobbio nella biblioteca di S.Colombano diversa rispetto a quella indicata da Morelli (SVM), anticipando cioè M a V (SMV)[3], e ha dimostrato,

[1] *Epigrammata Bobiensia*, a c. di L.Canali- Francesca Romana Nocchi, Soveria Mannelli 2011, I-XLVI, 5-137, su cui vd. la mie considerazioni in *BStudLat* 43, 2013, 184-190.

[2] S.Mariotti, "*Epigrammata Bobiensia*", *RE*, Suppl.IX 1962, coll.37-64, ora in *Scritti di filologia classica*, Roma 2000, 216-245; G.Morelli, "Le liste degli autori scoperti a Bobbio nel 1493", *RFIC* 97, 1989, 5-33; Id., "Metricologi latini di tradizione bobbiese", in M.De Nonno - P.De Paolis - L.Holtz (edd.), *Manuscripts and Tradition of Grammatical Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, Proceedings of Conference Erice, 16-23 Oct.1997, 11th Course of intern. School for the Study of written Records, II, Cassino 2000, 533-559; Id., *Caesii Bassi de metris. Atilii Fortunatiani de metris Horatianis*, Introduzione, testo critico e appendice, Hildesheim 2011.

[3] O.Portuese, *Per la storia della tradizione degli* Epigrammata Bobiensia. *Con una disamina delle Carte Campana e un testimone inedito*, Roma 2017, 20 sgg. S è la più antica lista redatta a Bobbio dal Galbiate, una cui copia è stata identificata da Morelli nell'elenco scoperto da Campana nel cod.1657 della Biblioteca Civica di Verona (ff.11r-v); di una seconda lista, redatta sempre dal Galbiate con la supervisione del Merula, nel Dicembre 1493 per informare ufficiosamente Ludovico il Moro della scoperta dei codici bobbiesi, sopravvive l'originale (M); una terza lista (V), secondo Portuese copia di M, sopravvive nel IV libro dei *Commentariorum urbanorum libri* di Raffaele Maffei; di una quarta lista, probabilmente ufficiale, per noi perdu-

anche sulla base del confronto delle quattro liste con i due inventari della biblioteca di Bobbio del sec.X e del 1461, che l'ordinamento di Q è preferibile a quello di SMV[4]. Alla luce della serrata analisi di Portuese emerge che verisimilmente il *Bobiensis deperditus*, allestito fra il VII e l'VIII secolo, oltre ad un nucleo originario comprendente la produzione di Ausonio, includeva Rutilio Namaziano, gli *Epigrammata Bobiensia*, il carme di Sulpicia, le *Mythologiae* di Fulgenzio[5]; dalle sue conclusioni risulta estremamente improbabile «l'ipotesi di un archetipo messo insieme da un editore tardoromano» prospettata dalla N. (5) perché palesemente contraddetta dall'inventario del X sec. della biblioteca di Bobbio, consultabile nella copia del Muratori, in cui è rubricato il *Bobiensis deperditus* n.610[6]. Sull'attuale ordinamento della raccolta pesa il suo carattere già mutilo verisimilmente all'atto della scoperta del Galbiate, poiché *Epigr.Bob.*1 scritto nel f.268r non ha un titolo e il f.267 è vuoto[7], ma essa non reca tracce della sua destinazione alla pratica scolastica, come ipotizza con cautela la N. (29), per l'assenza di uniformità di uno stile lineare, di espressioni stereotipate nell'inserimento di *exempla* e citazioni letterarie. Tuttavia il ruolo che nella Silloge riveste l'*ars rhetorica* emerge programmaticamente, come ho recentemente dimostrato, dalla decodificazione dei cinque *Epigrammata* dedicati ai *grammatici* (46,47,50,61,64), probabilmente disposti originariamente in successione come un gruppo unitario; la valutazione negativa di una categoria tipizzata, pedante e dai ristretti ambiti culturali, nel rivelare, attraverso la contrapposizione fra una lettura grammaticale dell'*Eneide* e una sua interpretazione retorica, tracce di un dibattito culturale dell'epoca - l'unico presente nella raccolta - consente di enucleare le modalità con cui in essa operavano le categorie retoriche nella rielaborazione dei testi poetici[8].

Come abbiamo detto sopra, la sezione più significativa del volume è rappresentata dal commento ai singoli *Epigrammata* - con esclusione dell'*Epigr.37 Sulpiciae conquestio* (40*) - introdotto da un'*Avvertenza* (6.,39) e dai *Sigla* (7.,40): il testo di ogni carme è preceduto da una doppia bibliografia, una "specifica" e una "tematica"; seguono la traduzione, in alcuni

ta, è stata identificata una copia (Q) da Morelli nel cod.XLII 1845 della Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek di Hannover, allestito dal Questenberg, alunno di Pomponio Leto, tra la fine del XV o l'inizio del XVI secolo. Una questione esposta con qualche imprecisione dalla N., la quale si limita ad osservare vagamente che «la lista del Maffei sembrerebbe ricalcare molto fedelmente quella spedita da Merula a Ludovico il Moro nel dicembre del 1493» (3, n.6).

[4] Portuese, *Per la storia della tradizione*, 25 sgg.

[5] Id., *ibid.*, 44 sgg.

[6] Id., *ibid.*, 5 e 32 sgg.; la copia è tradita dal ms. del sec.XVIII Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Archivio Muratoriano, filza 23, fasc.3a, Diss.XLIII, ff.51r-54v.

[7] Id., *ibid.*, 106 sgg., 195 sg.

[8] Rosa Maria D'Angelo, "Forme e funzioni della polemica antigrammaticale negli *Epigrammata Bobiensia*", *Paideia* 72,2017, 499-522.

casi più snella di quella proposta da Canali in N. 2011[9], e l'ampio commento. Rispetto a N. 2011 manca la sistematica apposizione dell'apparato critico in calce al testo, poiché l'A. ha preferito aggiungerlo «esclusivamente» là dove segnala «scelte testuali per le quali … si discosta dalle edizioni di Munari e di Speyer» (*Avvertenza*, 39) indicati con «*edd.* qualora vi sia accordo fra i due». Si tratta di *Epigrr.*2,3; 4,3; 7,2; 8,4 e 9; 11,1; 12,1; 18,2 e 3; 20,6; 23,2; 24,2; 29,3; 31,1; 32 *tit.*; 36,3 e 15-16; 38,3; 41 *tit.* e 3; 42,2; 44,4; 47,5 e 8; 53,7; 57,14; 59 *tit.* e 1; 61,2 e 3; 62,4; 63 *tit.*, 1 e 4; 64,2; 67,1; 70,3; 71,3 e 6, e dei versi in cui sono introdotte con *scripsi* proposte testuali dell'A.: *Epigrr.*7,1[10]; 22,3, ove sono riproposti *praevalidam* letto nel *Vat. Lat.* 2836 da Skutsch e la correzione *gaza* di Munari, ma la revisione del codice già condotta da Portuese porta a risultati paleograficamente più sicuri[11]; 26,4[12]; 30,2[13]; 31 *tit.* (su cui vd. oltre 409); 46,1 e 50,1[14]; 58,2 ove *Nymphis* è tuttavia già stato

[9] Ad esempio *Epigrr.* 6, 15, 19, 21, 55. A volte tuttavia rimane più perspicua la traduzione proposta per i *tituli* da Canali in Canali-Nocchi, *cit.*: svanisce infatti il riferimento autobiografico a Naucellio nel *tit.* del c.8 *Item aliud in imagines diversae aetatis suae* tradotto dalla N. "Un altro componimento sui ritratti in età differenti" (91, ma vd. Canali, 11: "Ancora un altro epigramma sui ritratti di diverse fasi della sua vita"); del c.9 *De aegritudine sua et aetate* reso dalla N. con "Il cedimento e la vecchiaia" (101, ma vd. Canali 13: "La sua malattia e l'età").

[10] Sul *praenomen* di Naucellio (*Iunius* o *Iulius*) non vi è alcuna certezza: rinvio a K. Smolak, "*Naucellius*", in *Metzler Lexikon antiker Autoren*, herausg. O. Schütze, Stuttgart - Weimar 1997, 468; W. Speyer, "*Naucellius*", *Der neue Pauly* VIII, Stuttgart – Weimar 2000, col.743; Id., *Naucellius und sein Kreis. Studien zu den Epigrammata Bobiensia*, München 1959, 52; A. Luceri, "Un ritratto ... d'altri tempi: Naucellio, *Epigr. Bob. 7* e una possibile eco umanistica", *Lexis* Suppl. 60, 2011, 200, per il quale *Iulius* è probabilmente corruttela del *difficilior Iunius*.

[11] O.Portuese, "ll tema del *coniugium* fra satira e parodia: *AL* 216 SB, *AL* 38 Z. (= 116 SB), *Epigr. Bob.* 22 Sp.", *AL. Rivista di studi di* Anthologia Latina 6,2015, 130-133 con riproduzione della sezione del *Vat. Lat.* 2836, f.270v, contenente il v.3 alla r.7, un contributo non indicato dalla N. in *Bibliografia*: Portuese ha dimostrato che nel cod. il segno grafico fra *si* e *validu*(*m*), piuttosto che un'abbreviazione di *prae* («il tratto ondulato che attraversa l'occhiello è piú simile ad un taglio di correzione»), si presenta come un'autocorrezione del copista che verisimilmente non ha riconosciuto nell'antigrafo prima di *validu*(*m*) una *q* con compendio (=*quam*) e l'ha tagliata con un tratto ondulato correttivo; egli restituisce pertanto così il v.3: *et si <quam> validam gaza*, eqs.

[12] Per l'integrazione <*sulcant mille*> suggerita da «Morelli *per verba*» (186) per colmare una lacuna del cod. *Vat.Lat.*2836 che in apparato, 183, viene indicata di 7-8 lettere e nel commento, 185, di 8-10 lettere, vd. oltre.

[13] La lettura *savia da: religas*, «suggerita da Alfredo Morelli (*per verba*)» (208), ha un evidente precedente nella proposta di correzione di Mariotti *apud* Munari (*Epigrammata Bobiensia*, II Roma 1955) *savia dans religas*.

[14] Sui due epigrammi rinvio al mio studio "Forme e funzioni", 502 sgg.: sulla base della valutazione di *Epigrr.* 46 e 64 come scolastica variazione retorica di analogo biasimo contro i *grammatici*, su cui si fonda la difesa del testo tradito dal *Vat.Lat.*2836 in 46,1, ne ho chiarito la genesi dell'errore; ho altresì sottolineato (507 sgg.) nell'*Epigr.* 50 il gioco di riprese stilistiche e formali (*sursum ~ sursum*, *peior ~ peior*, *descendens ~ descendisti*) e l'accentuazione rispetto al modello, *AP* XI 292 attribuito a Pallada, della contrapposizione ossimorica, particolarità che assieme alla realizzazione della doppia ἐπαναδίπλωσις (*sursum~sursum*, *descendens~descendisti*), nel mostrare l'inopportunità della correzione *deorsum* proposta in 50,1 dalla N.,

proposto nel 1959 da Speyer[15].

Il criterio crea tuttavia qualche difficoltà nella lettura di componimenti che rivelano numerose imitazioni letterarie[16], che traducono spesso un originale greco o che erano già noti attraverso le edizioni umanistiche di Ausonio: l'assenza dei *loci* paralleli, utili per risalire al rapporto dei carmi con i modelli, e la taciuta indicazione delle proposte testuali elaborate dai vari filologi, essenziale per seguire lo sviluppo critico degli studi sulla Silloge, rendono perciò spesso necessario affiancare il commento della N. all'edizione di Munari (d'ora in avanti Mun.), che ha fornito il testo di un apparato critico ed esegetico[17], e di Speyer (d'ora in avanti Sp.), cui si deve un doppio apparato che costituisce un notevole contributo allo studio sugli *Epigrammata*[18]. Tuttavia, per quanto discutibile, questo criterio è adottato in maniera singolare: se si eccettuano infatti 2,3; 4,3; 7,2; 11,1; 31,1; 36,15-16; 38,3; 41,3; 59 *tit.*; 63,4 e 70,3 ove la N. si discosta dalle edizioni di Mun. e Sp. seguendo altre proposte testuali o la tradizione del Bob., negli altri casi, diversamente da quanto indicato nella sopra ricordata *Avvertenza*, sono corredati di apparato versi che riproducono il testo che leggiamo in Mun. e/o Sp. (derivante da loro scelte o dall'adozione di proposte di altri filologi). Un criterio dunque anomalo che pone numerosi interrogativi per altri componimenti trattati nella maniera più disparata: così, ad esempio, è privo di apparato *Epigr.* 26,3 ove la N. riporta nel testo *regit*, lezione di Bob. accolta da Mun., mentre Sp. segue la proposta di Fuchs *gerit*: interventi testuali di cui si dà notizia nel commento (185). Analogamente sono privi di apparato: 40,1; 53,4; e 57,2 per i quali la N. introduce varianti grafiche assenti sia in Mun. che in Sp.: 40,1 *genetrix*[19] (*genitrix* Bob. Mun.-Sp.); 53,4 *affectum* già dell'Avanzi (*ad factum* Bob., *adfectum* Mun.-Sp.[20]); 57,2 *approbante* (ma *adprobante* nel comm., 344; *adprobante* Bob. Mun.-Sp.). Altrove, all'opposto, ci si chiede perché, nonostante il testo della N. concordi con quello di Mun. e di Sp., siano corredati di un apparato gli *Epigrr.* 47,5 ove *a matre* (con *a* integrato dall'Avanzi) si legge sia in Mun. sia in Sp. che indica graficamente l'integrazione; 47,8 ove *iurger* proposto da Mariotti

rivelano l'inadeguatezza della sua traduzione: «In basso eri peggiore, ma arrampicandoti sei ancora peggio./ Risali in basso, sei sceso perché sei salito» (308). Sulle varianti che ci consegna la tradizione umanistica di *AP* XI 292,3, che secondo Lucia Floridi, "Considerazioni in margine alla datazione di Pallada di Alessandria", *ZPE* 197, 2016, 51-69, sarebbe stata utilizzata in *Epigr.* 50,1, vd. in "Forme e funzioni" 508 sgg. il mio invito alla prudenza, derivante sia dalla cautela con cui va utilizzata una tradizione secondaria influenzata verisimilmente da letture di scuola, sia dalla probabile contaminazione fra l'epigramma di Pallada e l'orazione 34 di Temistio, la cui correlazione era certo nota agli ambienti retorici.

[15] Speyer, *Naucellius und sein Kreis*, 22 sgg.

[16] Vd. Munari, *Epigrammata Bobiensia*, 40-43.

[17] Munari, *Epigrammata Bobiensia*.

[18] W.Speyer, *Epigrammata Bobiensia*, Lipsiae 1963.

[19] Una scelta ribadita nel comm. *ad loc.*, 256.

[20] Ma vd. il travisamento nel comm. *ad loc.*, 328: «*adfectum* è correzione necessaria dell'Avanzi».

apud Mun. è accolto da Mun.- Sp.; 64,2 ove è correttamente adottata la correzione *est avidis* dell'ametrico *es aridis* di Bob. proposta da Mun., seguito da Sp. che indica graficamente l'integrazione prima di *avidis* (es<*t*>).

La N. adotta l'ovvia norma di riportare i *tituli* «del *codex unicus*, senza distinguere fra quelli dell'autore e dell'ipotetico curatore» (*Avvertenza*, 39): com'è stato ampiamente dimostrato[21], il copista li leggeva molto probabilmente nel perduto bobbiese trovato dal Galbiate, di cui è copia il *Vat. Lat.*2836; manca un criterio per gli epigrammi che nel Bob. sono privi di *titulus*. In *Epigr.* 31 è introdotto il *titulus Ad puellam Stellam* (210), che si fonda sulla forma *Ad puellam Stillam* del Bob. corretta poi dal copista in *In puerum Stillam* (Mun. *In puerum Stellam*, Sp. *Ad puellam*); un'autocorrezione che sembra ripristinare la forma originaria del *titulus*, non solo per lo stretto rapporto con il modello rappresentato da *AP* 7,670, uno pseudo epitafio attribuito a Platone assieme ad *AP* 7, 669 (il cui lemma recita εἰς Ἀστέρα τὸν μαθητὴν Πλάτωνος τοῦ φιλοσόφου)[22], ma soprattutto per il confronto con il *titulus* delle edizioni umanistiche: *In puerum Stillam* M, *In Stellam puerum* VA indice. Senza dover ricorrere per la genesi dell'errore a «ragioni di *pruderie*» (N. 212), è probabile che la forma originaria del *titulus* si sia corrotta per l'inserimento dell'epigramma in un gruppo di carmi dedicati ad una *puella* (30 *Ad puellam*; 32 *Item ad puellam* Mun., *Item ad aliam* Bob., Sp.; 33 *De amissa puella*; 34 *De puella*; 35 *Aliter de alia*).

Il commento ad ogni componimento si apre con un'introduzione generale che ne chiarisce il tema, la sua eventuale presenza nella tradizione letteraria, la sua diffusione e la sua fortuna, cui segue l'analisi formale retorico-letteraria, talvolta linguistica, ma in alcuni casi con un'eccessiva accentuazione della componente comica (*Epigrr.*22,23,24,27) e un'inversione nella considerazione del rapporto fra tradizione progymnasmatica e commedia, o diatriba stoico-cinica, dei cui *exempla* piuttosto si avvalevano le scuole di retorica. L'introduzione agli *Epigrr.*25 e 26 chiarisce l'origine filosofico-letteraria del motivo dei *genera vitae* e sottolinea la struttura retorica della trattazione bobbiese, ma resta poco approfondito il rapporto con i modelli greci rappresentati da *AP* 9,359 e 360, che, seppure ampliati dall'anonimo, non hanno costituito un semplice spunto poetico[23]; una considerazione necessaria per avanzare una plausibile integrazione in apertura di 26,4, il cui senso do-

[21] Vd. Munari, *Epigrammata Bobiensia*, 17 sg.; Mariotti, "*Epigrammata Bobiensia*", 217 sg. e cfr. Portuese, *Per la storia della tradizione*, 32 sgg.

[22] Così D.L.Page, *Further Greek Epigrams*, Cambridge 1981, 161. I due epigrammi della *Palatina* erano abbastanza letti e tradotti e, indipendentemente dal nome del loro destinatario, da Omero in poi era diffuso l'appellativo 'stella' per i giovanetti di bell'aspetto (Page, *ibid.*). L'antichità del *titulus In puerum Stillam* viene ora sostenuta da O. Portuese, "*AP* 7, 670 ~ *Epigr. Bob.* 31: tracce di una tradizione 'sommersa' della silloge bobbiese?", *Pan* n.s.6, 2017, *s.p.*

[23] Vd. Munari, *Epigrammata Bobiensia*, 39 sg.

vrebbe ricostruirsi attraverso *AP* IX 360,3 sg. ἐν δὲ θαλάσσῃ / κέρδος[24], un contesto da cui sembra troppo lontana con la sua *exaggeratio* numerica la proposta <*sulcant mille*> (scil. *rates*) basata sulla ricorrenza del nesso *mille rates* in Ovidio, un poeta spesso tenuto presente dall'*auctor* di Bobbio (186).

L'attenzione prevalente alla cifra stilistica degli *Epigrammata*, piuttosto che ad una lettura parallela della fonte greca e della rielaborazione latina, fa sfuggire spesso la possibilità di evidenziare le forme di *variatio* retorica e le modalità attraverso le quali traspare la cultura letteraria dell'anonimo *auctor*, certamente non limitata alla traduzione di un modello. Così, ad esempio, nell'*Epigr*.29 *De lepore* una lettura volta ad evidenziare che «il tema della caccia alla lepre si inserisce in una riflessione più generale sull'imprevedibilità del destino» (200) non coglie il messaggio allusivo e il sostrato culturale del componimento che dà rilievo alla categoria retorica della meraviglia e dell'assurdo. Assieme al modello costituito da *AP* IX 18 - il cui senso si precisa attraverso il precedente *AP* IX 17-, alla versione di Ausonio *Epigr*.35P = 15 Green e ad *AP* IX 371 (ritenuto fonte di *AP* IX 18), *Epigr*.29 si colloca nel solco della tradizione epigrammatica ellenistica che dall'epicedio per piccoli animali si evolve parodicamente verso tematiche che celebrano situazioni eccezionali e morti insolite; un'analisi che mi ha consentito di dimostrare come la paradossale vicenda della lepre si inserisca in realtà nella tradizione culturale connessa alla ricezione del messaggio mitologico-scientifico dell'opera di Arato, che suscitò a Roma ampio interesse testimoniato dalle numerose traduzioni, e come la descrizione dell'anonimo *auctor* discenda verisimilmente dall'utilizzazione scolastica di sfere celesti[25]. Analogamente, la citazione in 46,2 e 64,2 dell'apertura dell'*Eneide* non costituisce semplicemente una «sostituzione, consapevolmente operata» (293) dell'*incipit* dell'*Iliade* «secondo un procedimento tipico degli *Epigrammata Bobiensia* teso a romanizzare il contenuto delle traduzioni» (296), ma evidenzia l'analogo ruolo di Omero e Virgilio nell'istruzione grammaticale in Grecia e a Roma, come ci testimonia Quint. *inst*.10,1,85 sg., e conferma come la lettura dell'*Eneide* fosse profondamente radicata a Roma nell'uso scolastico[26].

Ben argomentata l'introduzione all'*Epigr*.43 *Ex sepulchro Latinae Viae*, la cui struttura contamina il genere dell'elegia sapienziale e dell'epigrafe sepolcrale, un carattere quest'ultimo confermato dalla sua presenza - rilevata dalla N., 269 - nel *Guelferbytanus Helmstadiensis* 631, f.127, indicato in *CIL* VI 5 nr.73*, 16 [e non VI 5, 14], ma di cui non è fatta menzione né nell'e-

[24] Così Speyer, *Naucellius und sein Kreis*, 111.

[25] Vd. quanto ho dimostrato in "Arte allusiva e mitologia astrale in *Epigr. Bob.* 29 Sp.", *WS* 128, 2015, 129-143, ove, seguendo l'edizione di Munari, non ho indicato le virgolette al v.3, perché ritengo che tutti e quattro i versi siano fittiziamente posti in bocca alla lepre.

[26] Vd. quanto ho osservato in "Forme e funzioni", 504 sg.

dizione di Mun. né in quella di Sp.[27] Ampio nell'introduzione all'*Epigr*.51 *In Scyllam Constantinopolitanam in circo* il quadro delle testimonianze storico-letterarie e iconografiche relative alla perduta scultura bronzea di Scilla posta nell'ippodromo di Costantinopoli[28]; ma per il *Fortleben* della vicenda del protagonista dell'*Epigr*.63 (Teombroto o Cleombroto) appare decisamente fuor di luogo il rinvio alla «riproposizione musicale di M.Sgalambro -F.Battiato, *Di passaggio*» (370), perché i due testi non hanno nulla a che vedere l'uno con l'altro.

Come ho più volte sottolineato, gli *Epigrammata* sono il frutto di una raffinata elaborazione retorica di alto livello che varia il modello greco con un adattamento spesso rovesciato del senso originario, con una dotta tecnica allusiva nell'indicazione del messaggio culturale o del rapporto con la fonte: si considerino, ad esempio, il sovvertimento della tradizionale rappresentazione di una Penelope impudica nell'*Epigr*.36, di cui mi sono occupata anni orsono segnalando la diffusione delle varianti alternative del mito, e la speculare caratterizzazione di Didone oscillante fra mito e storia, che nell'*Epigr*.45 si colloca sulla scia degli epigrammi ellenistici di 'riabilitazione' e di quelli di polemica letteraria, con una finzione poetica strutturata come un epigramma funerario che ha molti elementi di affinità con gli autoepitafi dei poeti concepiti come *Schlußgedicht* di un βίος[29]; il motivo dell'arte verisimile da me evidenziato negli epigrammi dedicati alla *bucula Myronis* che si inseriscono nel ciclo delle ἐκφράσεις retoriche, non puro prodotto di fantasia, ma nemmeno descrizioni di un'opera realmente presente dinanzi agli occhi del poeta[30]; il prodigio delle acque 'incendiate' negli *Epigrr*.1, 38 e 58 con il τόπος retorico della meraviglia, significativo nella poesia eziologica narrativa e nella poesia elogiativa[31]; il tema dell'arte allusiva nel ricordato *Epigr*.29 che si fonde con la retorica della meraviglia e dell'assurdo; la θήσις εἰς γαμητέον inserita in *Epigr*.47 nel ciclo degli epigrammi volti apparentemente a denigrare, secondo una diffusa tendenza, la pedanteria dei grammatici, ma con-

[27] Sulla tradizione di *Epigr*.43 vd. ora Portuese, *Per la storia della tradizione*, 68 n.1.

[28] Sulla *Quellenforschung* del carme vd. O. Portuese, "*Epigr. Bob*. 51 Sp. e il mito di Scilla: un *naufragium* elegiaco?", *RCCM* 57, 2015, 311-324, che ha rilevato nel carme una contaminazione di tematiche diffuse negli epitimbi per i naufraghi del VII libro della *Palatina* e di motivi ovidiani, evidenti nella sovrapposizione delle due varianti del mito di Scilla.

[29] Vd. Rosa Maria D'Angelo, "Didone fra retorica e tecnica della variazione. *Anth. Plan*.151~*Epigr.Bob*.45 Speyer (=Ps.Auson.2 pp.420 sg. Peiper), *RPL* 28, 2005, 35-50, soprattutto 46 e n.52.

[30] Vd. Rosa Maria D'Angelo, "Un *lusus* fra *vita* e *ars*: *Epigr. Bob*. 10-13 Sp.", *RFIC* 139, 2011, 162-174.

[31] Rosa Maria D'Angelo, "Il θαῦμα delle acque incendiate fra ἀδύνατα retorici e intenti eziologici: un tema diffuso nella tradizione antologica tardoantica", *AL. Rivista di studi di* Anthologia Latina 3, 2012, 3-20; vd. quanto osservo a p.11 per la "falsche Lemmatisierung" di *Epigr*.38. La retorica della meraviglia e il confronto con Stat. *silv*. 1,3,20 *miranda fides!* e con *AL* 377, 9 R.^{2} = 372, 9 SB *mirabile dictu* mi hanno indotta a conservare (13 sg.) il testo tradito in 38,3, ove leggo *admiranda fides dictu*.

tenenti in realtà una dichiarazione programmatica dell'anonimo raccoglitore della Silloge[32]. Sotto questa luce va affrontata l'interpretazione dei singoli componimenti, la cui complessità di interpretazione discende proprio dalla difficoltà di enucleare il loro messaggio allusivo e il particolare senso retorico fra le pieghe di diffusi τόποι, fra traduzioni e variazioni di modelli letterari. Ne deriva che si priva decisamente dell'opportunità di comprendere peculiarità stilistiche e tecnica compositiva degli *Epigrammata* una lettura che, sulla base della valutazione della Silloge come un florilegio di componimenti di «poeti che mostrano differenti capacità di rielaborazione poetica» (7) tende a cogliere presunte debolezze compositive rispetto al modello, che ne determinano un giudizio di valore negativo: 160 sg. *ad Epigr.* 22 «il poeta bobbiese non fa altro che applicare un metodo imparato a scuola: rielabora materiali comici … sulla base di schemi retorici … Nonostante l'indiscutibile corrispondenza tematica, fra i due testi -*scil. Epigr.*22 e Anassandride *PCG* II 53 Kass.-Aust.- risultano notevoli le differenze, che rivelano il sottile sforzo di rielaborazione da parte del poeta»; 207 *ad Epigr.* 30,1 «nell'epigramma bobbiese c'è un evidente tentativo di fedeltà all'originale» (*scil. AP* V 96); 227 *ad Epigr.* 35 «il tentativo di maggiore fedeltà all'originale (*scil. AP* V 95) si manifesta anche nel mantenimento della costruzione chiastica … Il risultato … anche in questo caso non è esente da imperfezioni»; 246 *ad Epigr.* 38,3 «un costrutto involuto che denuncia le difficoltà compositive del poeta»; 293 *ad Epigr.*46 «il componimento traduce *AP* XI 400 … Si tratta di un pallido tentativo di *aemulatio*»; 299 *ad Epigr.*47«Il poeta mostra una discreta capacità poetica»; etc.

In conclusione, questo secondo libro della N. sugli *Epigrammata Bobiensia* corregge le numerose sviste del primo e si rivela utile per la ricca bibliografia e per la vasta informazione di cui dà prova nel commento, ma presta ancora scarsa attenzione al rapporto con i modelli greci, che l'*auctor* di Bobbio ha realizzato nelle più disparate forme di *variatio* retorica, con una romanizzazione stilistica, un'interpretazione a volte anche polemica (vd., ad esempio, l'esegesi di ἀρχέτυπον di *Anth.Plan.*151,1 in *Epigr.*45,1) e un'acquisizione della tradizione greca, non solo epigrammatica, certamente molto più ampia di quella apparentemente evidente, che andava rilevata ai fini di una decodificazione del messaggio allusivo degli *epigrammata.* Nuocciono al lavoro tratti di frettolosità che emergono dalla redazione dell'apparato critico non conforme al metodo filologico (vd. *supra* 407-409), dai travisamenti nell'indicazione di studiosi: Haasse (162); Keibel (309), entrambi non citati nell'ampia *Bibliografia*; Shackleton Bayley (69); dalla difformità nell'indicazione dei codici (in italiano, 5, in latino, 269); dalle incongruenze e inesattezze che ricorrono nelle citazioni bibliografiche: l'articolo della stessa N.,

[32] Vd. D'Angelo, "Forme e funzioni".

"Divertissements…", pubblicato in *Lexis* 33,2015, nella *Bibliografia*, 442, viene giustamente indicato alle pp.432-452, mentre nella *Prefazione*, VII, alle pp.456-476; il sottotitolo del mio articolo, "Didone…", pubblicato in *RPL* 28,2005 continua curiosamente ad essere citato in maniera errata (424), come in N. 2011 p.XLII, "Ant. Plan."; dalle spiacevoli sviste: 195: 'si implica' per 'si impicca'; 210: 'Biblioteca specifica' in luogo di 'Bibliografia specifica'.

E' evidente dunque che per l'interpretazione della Silloge non possiamo ancora prescindere dalle pregevoli edizioni di Munari e di Speyer, dagli studi di Campana, di Mariotti e dei successivi filologi che con acribia hanno analizzato le complesse problematiche della raccolta sul piano critico-testuale ed esegetico, perché, nonostante il tono sicuro dell'A.[33], da questo volume non emergono novità sul piano della costituzione del testo, né significativi progressi per la sua interpretazione.

Rosa Maria D'Angelo
Università di Catania
letteraturalatinadangelo@unict.it

[33] Vd., ad esempio, 185 sg. *ad* 26,3: «L'alternativa proposta da Munari in apparato, *otia dat rus*, non è … necessaria… una congettura … inaccettabile»; 295 *ad* 46,1: «Munari congettura *esurientibus* … non si accorge però che λιμοῦ non è attestato dai codici, bensì è congettura di Brunck … , poco opportuna e superflua»; 311 *ad* 50,1: «Non si può mantenere il testo tradito, come vorrebbe Mariotti»; 374 *ad* 63,4 «Già E.Fraenkel … difendeva *scivit*, ma la sua proposta di emendamento … non è chiaramente intellegibile».

Albertus G. A. Horsting, *Prosper Aquitanus. Liber epigrammatum*, Series: Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 100, Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter 2016, vii+160 pp., ISBN 978-3-11-033398-5.

The CSEL series presents a text that had not been edited for more than three hundred years and for which the editor attempts a critical edition and a *stemma codicum* for the first time. He studies the textual tradition and the intricate web of sources of and influences from the work at some length (pp. 1–66) and edits it critically with rich apparatuses (pp. 77–156). Hitherto the standard edition was the one reprinted in Migne's *Patrologia Latina* (PL 51, coll. 497–532B), originally by Jean-Baptiste Lebrun des Marettes and Luc-Urbain Mangeant (Paris 1711) who used several manuscripts and report some variant readings. Their text has recently been reprinted with an Italian translation in Stefania Santelia, *Prospero d'Aquitania «Ad coniugem suam». In appendice «Liber epigrammatum».* Napoli, Loffredo 2009 (Studi latini 68). Michele Cutino is currently preparing another edition with French translation for the series Sources Chrétiennes for which he studies the challenging manuscript tradition again. It will be interesting to compare his results.

Prosper of Aquitaine (c. 390–after 455) was a disciple of St Augustine who wrote extensively on his master's ideas and helped to divulge them both in prose and in verse. His *Liber epigrammatum* is extant in at least 180 manuscripts owing much of its success to the fact that it was used in monastic schools. It is indeed very well suited for this purpose as it condenses much of St Augustine's teaching in a brief metrical, easily understandable form, well suited for memorisation. The work's structure is uniformly: title, sentence, epigram of 1 to 12 distichs. The sentences are taken from Prosper's *Liber sententiarum* (Ed. Gastaldo, CCSL 68A), which in turn often depends on his *Expositio in Psalmos,* extant only for Psalms 100-150, the rest being apparently lost (p. 4). These depend on Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos,* other sentences stem from other works of Prosper's master, especially *De civitate Dei* and *De trinitate*. The first 58 epigrams correspond to the first 58 sentences, but in the second part there are some inconsistencies: occasionally there is no sentence at all, sometimes the order is different, especially after epigram 81 the author seems to have used only a few of his many more sentences. Due to this and the fact that in four verses (4,4, 39,6, 52,4, 58,8, discussed pp. 20-22) the manuscript tradition exhibits two equally convincing verses of roughly the same content that both look like genuine Prosper, the editor considers that the work may be unfinished (p. 13f). It is difficult to decide whether the sentence headings were originally part of the text (P2 and L1, on which see

below, do not contain them), although the editor's arguments (pp. 11-14) for retaining them seem rather convincing.

The editor decided to use for his edition all known manuscripts older than the 12th century, which amount to 41. Besides, readings from three of the most important early prints (including Le Brun des Marettes/Mangeant) are also included in the apparatus. He thus provides us with the first scholarly edition of this popular text: critical text and rich apparatuses are certainly a great advance over the previous editions. Still, as the editor himself readily admits, his *stemma codicum* (p. 57) will hardly be the last word on the complicated transmission of this text. The witnesses contain a relatively homogenous text, many of the apparatus entries are *lectiones singulares*. As expected for a monastic school text there is a lot of contamination among the manuscripts. It quickly becomes clear that three manuscripts are by far the most important ones: P1 (Paris, BnF, lat. 11326, online http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b105154782) a sixth or seventh century uncial, P2 (Paris, BnF, 2772) and L1 (Leiden, UB, Vossianus lat. Q. 86), both from the early 9th c. All other studied manuscripts are grouped by the editor into the families β, δ, ε as well as a contaminated group arising from β and δ, all of which together form a superfamily. P2 and L1 are closely related to one another. The position of P1 is less clear. The editor makes a case that it does not belong to the P2-L1 family and joins it with the rest of the tradition (the aforementioned superfamily) under a hyparchetype ψ against the P2-L1 family. But there is only one relatively solid looking conjunctive error for P1 and the rest against P2-L1 (*plectit* vs. *punit*, p. 46). One might wonder why the editor does not consider the possibility that the archetype could have split into three families (P2-L1, P1, rest), such that ψ would be one and the same with ω. Strikingly, the stemma constructed by the editor is always bipartite. Indeed, accepting the provided stemma, for the doublet verses 4,4 one would be forced to conclude that version *a* is archetypal, and version *b* secondary and thus not by Prosper. Under these circumstances it might have been interesting to specifically search for post 12th c. manuscripts related to P1-P2-L1 by using their significant readings (like 31,1: *aeternam* not *caelestem)*. This could have shed more light on the relationship of the major groups. Furthermore the cases of contamination shown in the stemma do not seem to adequately represent the whole picture: e.g. the interesting example discussed on p. 54 depends on a transmission of text between P1 or W (ε family) to the δ family, a connection that is not documented in the stemma. But the full picture of contaminations for all considered manuscripts may be impossible to elucidate. It would also have been interesting to know more about corrections of archetypal mistakes (as in 43,2) which could have been highlighted more clearly in the text. Despite these few desiderata, the new edition is certainly without paragon at present.

PHILIPP ROELLI
roelli.mls@gmail.com

Orestis Karavas, Κολλούθου Ελένης αρπαγή. Εισαγωγή, μετάφραση, σχόλια Ορέστης Καραβάς, Athens: Δαίδαλος – Βιβλιοθήκη Αρχαίων Συγγραφέων, 2015, pp. 159, ISBN 978-6188006058.

The book under review consists of an introduction, text and Modern Greek translation, and a commentary to Colluthus' *The Rape of Helen*. The translator and author of the accompanying texts, Orestis Karavas, is a specialist in Late Antique literature, with publications mainly, but not only, on Lucian and Colluthus. This book is his second annotated translation of a Late Antique text, preceded by a Modern Greek translation and commentary of Lucian's *Podagra* (Athens, 2008).

Chapter I of the Introduction (Ὁ Κόλλουθος καὶ ἡ ἐποχή του, pp. 9-14) offers an overview of recent developments in scholarship regarding Colluthus and his times. Considering the latter, it is particularly welcome that Karavas does justice to the richness and diversity of Late Antiquity by mentioning authors as different as Synesius, Nonnus of Panopolis, Gregory of Nazianzus, Romanos the Melodist or George of Pisidia, as well as the currents of the "Third Sophistic" and anchoretism. Chapter II (Μετρική, γλῶσσα, τεχνική, pp. 15-20) examines the metre, language and technique of the text, placing Colluthus' poem into the context of Late Antique literary production, especially post-classical hexameters. Chapter III (Ἑλένης ἁρπαγή: πηγές, p. 20-25) on the sources of *The Rape of Helen* tracks Helen's myth from the Homeric epics to the Late Antique poems and rhetoric excercises. Chapter IV (Νεότερες ἐκδόσεις καὶ μελέτες, pp. 25-32) summarises the research on Colluthus and his appraisal in modern scholarship and ends with a list of the variants Karavas adopts in deviation from Cuartero i Iborra's edition (Barcelona, 1992), which he otherwise follows. Finaly, Chapter V (Χειρόγραφα καὶ παλαιὲς ἐκδόσεις, pp. 32-33) offers an overview of the manuscript traditon and older editions. The introduction is followed by a bibliography (pp. 35-45).

The text and Karavas' Modern Greek translation are printed on facing pages (pp. 47-75). The text is printed without apparatuses, whose functions are relegated to the commentary and partly the introduction. The translation is in a kind of rhythmic prose: verses or half-verses, mainly political (i.e. the verse first recorded in the Middle Byzantine period that has become increasingly popular up to date) but also trochaic octasyllables (also popular since the Byzantine times), are easily recognised throughout the Modernn Greek text. The translation shows an awareness of the interpretation challenges and the relevant scholarly discussions regarding Colluthus' text.

The commentary takes up almost half of the book (pp. 77-151). Language and style, interpretation, *similia*, possible sources and textual criticism are discussed verse-by-verse, usually with reference to the bibliography.

The book concludes with an Index locorum and an Index terminorum et nominum (pp. 153-159).

Overall, the book is readable also by non specialists (at least in part), but the aboundant references to state-of-the-art scholarship make it particularly recommendable for students of Classics and Byzantine Studies.

Dr. Mag. Eirini Afentoulidou
Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Institut für Mittelalterforschung
eirini.afentoulidou@oeaw.ac.at

Calvin B. Kendal – Faith Wallis, *Isidore of Seville: On the Nature of Things. Translated with introduction, notes and commentary*. Translated Texts for Historians, 66, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2016, xiv+313 pp., £25.00 (pb), ISBN 978-1-78138-294-3.

There has been a revival of interest in recent years in Anglophone scholarship in Isidore of Seville. Much has been centred on his *Etymologies,* and so this volume making available for the first time another of Isidore's widely-read works to English readers without Latin is to be greatly welcomed. For those with Latin its introduction and notes still have much to offer. The book is divided into three sections: an introduction, the translation proper, and a chapter by chapter commentary to which are added five brief appendices. There is also a full bibliography and a useful table of sources and parallel passages.

The introduction is ninety pages long. Its first section (around 25 pages) places Isidore in his temporary and intellectual context and explores the purposes of the *DNR*. It identifies the work as being something of an outlier in Isidore's oeuvre, being neither a work of *grammatica* nor an aid for preaching or exegesis, but rather an hybrid of the two. The editors note the relative poverty of the information available to Isidore, but see the *DNR* as the product of a "intelligent, creative, and even audacious mind" (p.12). Here a little more on the internal inconsistencies of the *DNR* and the degree to which Isidore understood all that he had read would perhaps have been useful. This question is dealt with in the commentary on specific points, but a more extended general discussion would also have been welcome. Isidore, it is argued, intended that the *DNR* would contribute towards a "Christianised erudition" that would "guide curiosity concerning profane knowledge into the channels of *doctrina christiana*" (p.26). Isidore's approach to his subject is one of rational explanations which were intended to suppress apocalyptic or millennarial interpretations of natural phenomenon among the laity, and perhaps especially among the clergy, on the one hand, but also on the other to challenge a growing fundamentalist Christianity which rejected the learning of the past. Cosmas Indicopleustes's *Christian Topography* is singled out as an example of this trend which concerned Isidore. Perhaps a little more could have been said about Isidore's relationship with Lucretius and the *DNR's* with the earlier poet's *De Rerum Natura*. Was Isidore concerned that the rational approach towards natural phenomena that he admired could, without due care, slip into atheism? Perhaps a little more could also have been said about Isidore's reluctance at times to pursue his rationalising agenda to its logical

conclusions. Notoriously chapter 27 of the *DNR* equivocates as to whether stars possess souls. As our editors note, here there would have been an ideal opportunity to crush some of the ideas advocated by Priscillianists, but it is one that Isidore does not take. Some further speculation on that reluctance would have been useful.

The remainder of the introduction is taken up with a discussion of the genesis of the work and its manuscript tradition. The first part is taken up with a discussion of the three recensions of the *DNR*. All are seen as products of seventh century Spain. This includes the so-called long recension and the "mystic addition" of chapter one. These are seen as early and composed in the Iberian peninsular in contrast with much scholarship which posits a later and perhaps Irish origin for this part of the work. The authors hint that from stylistic criteria the "middle recension" may have been composed under Isidore's instruction rather than being a direct product of the bishop himself (p.42). A further section deals briefly with the relationship between the *DNR* and King Sisebut's poem-epistle on eclipses and the diffusion of the two across Western Europe. The work is argued to come to England by way of Lombard Italy and to Gaul in the hands of monks fleeing from the Moorish invasion of the Iberian peninsula, in AD 711. There is then a long inventory of the manuscripts and editions of the text (33 pages).

The translation of the *DNR* itself takes up 77 pages. The translation is clear and crisp. Isidore's quotations and close paraphrases from his sources are usefully printed in italics making them easy to identify and give the reader a good sense of the bishop's relationship with, and deployment of, his source material. The text also reproduces where they are encountered in our manuscripts the six *rotae*, or circular diagrams, and the figure of the elements found in chapter 11. The internal labelling of the figures is translated for the reader in the figures themselves. The diagram of the phases of the moon in chapter eighteen and the T-O map found at the end of chapter 47/48 are also reproduced. Chapters are enumerated by the long recension, but the alternative numbering of the middle recension is also given to avoid confusion and the beginning and the end of the "mystic addition in chapter one are clearly marked.

The commentary of 76 pages is detailed and, where relevant, includes discussion of the diagrams in the text as well as the text itself. The reader is taken through the complexities of interpretation, such as those regarding the "elements" diagram of chapter 11 and Isidore's views of the heavens in a careful and lucid fashion. There is a tendency for the authors to leave their reader in a state of *aporia* at times, but this is, perhaps, no bad thing.

The appendices reproduce Sisebut's verse account of eclipses and briefly discuss its relationship with Isidore's text and that between king and savant (which is seen as troubled).

Prior to the publication of this volume, Anglophone scholars naturally turned to Jacques Fontaine's *Traité de la nature, suivi de L'épître en vers du roi Sisebut à Isidore* (Boardeaux: Féret et fils, 1960, reprinted Turnhout:Brepols 2002 = Collection des Études Augustiniennes: Série Moyen Âge et Temps modernes (EAMA) 39). While this work in no way supersedes Fontaine, much has happened in 56 years. Kendall and Wallis engage in a lively fashion with Fontaine and present new theories and developments in an equally thorough and lucid way. As such this volume is now, and rightly, destined to be the first port of call for any Anglophone, and perhaps many non-Anglophone scholars in work on Isidore's fascintaing text.

Andrew Fear
University of Manchester
andrew.fear@manchester.ac.uk

Enara San Juan Manso (ed.), *El* Commentum Monacense *a Terencio*. Anejos de Veleia, Series Minor, 31, Vitoria-Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco/ Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, 2015, 571 pp., ISBN 978-84-9082-162-6.

The early mediaeval commentaries on Terence are a greatly undervalued resource, both for students of the text of Terence and of its reception. They began to proliferate in the ninth century, as soon as the comedies became an established part of the Carolingian educational curriculum. Donatus' commentary had been rendered largely unusable due to the corruption of the text and its use of Greek, and to fill the vacuum a group of new commentaries appeared, modelling themselves on late-antique works on Vergil or Horace, but with little real information to go on—some of their glosses derive from standard grammars, but they also contain ludicrous explanations of the Roman past based on nothing more than misguided etymologies. Nevertheless, these texts became very popular, and quickly became contaminated—some early manuscripts, such as Paris, BnF, lat. 7903 (s.11), already contain two different redactions of the same notes written side by side in their margins.

Scientific, critical editions of these works are a major desideratum, and the problem for modern scholars has been further exacerbated by the partial edition published by Teubner in 1893 of the *Scholia Terentiana*, in which its editor, Friedrich Schlee, purported to offer readers a late-antique commentary which he reconstructed from various notes excerpted from a range of manuscripts, as well as a sufficient sample of a later commentary to demonstrate to them why they should not even bother reading it. Contemporary reviewers, such as E.K. Rand, were scathing, labelling Schlee's highly eclectic study "disastrous and futile", while the leading modern authority on Terence's transmission, Claudia Villa, has aptly described it as "una operazione arbitraria e del tutto inadeguata alla complessità del problema".[1]

The *Commentum Monacense* (CM), a commentary originally copied in Brescia in Northern Italy around the year 1000, but now named after the single manuscript in which it is found, Munich, BSB, Clm 14420 (siglum *M*), was a particular victim of Schlee's hasty methodology. His main interest in it was in fact to extract the lemmata which he printed separately to provide evidence for the Δ branch of the Terence tradition, and he treated the remaining text of the CM in magpie fashion, including approximately a third of it in his reconstructed text. A good example is provided by the prologue to *Andria*, for which Schlee reproduces a single gloss in *M*, so that

[1] E. K. Rand, "Early Mediaeval Commentaries on Terence", *CP* 4, 1909, 359-89 at 366; C. Villa, *La "lectura Terentii". Vol. 1. Da Ildemaro a Francesco Petrarca*, Padua 1984, 7.

the reader is left with no idea that the commentary on the prologue in fact occupies 31 lines in the manuscript.

Schlee's work, however misguided it may have been, also came at a time when classical scholars had little, if any, interest in the early reception and transmission of the texts which were their livelihood. In fact, until recently hardly anyone else has attempted to make any of these works available in print, and scholars are usually forced to rely on digital reproductions of manuscripts accessible on the internet. In the case of *M,* although the BSB has uploaded a reproduction, there is an added difficulty in that the opening four folios are severely damaged and practically illegible in the resolution provided on their website.

It is in this context that two major doctoral studies of the CM have been completed in recent years and have since been published. In 2011 Franz Schorsch produced a partial edition of the CM based on his dissertation at the University of Leipzig,[2] which contains a very useful introduction, discussing inter alia the relationship of the CM glosses to other texts, and summaries of the spelling and punctuation used by the scribe, but which has a major drawback in that he chose only to publish the commentary on three of the six plays, *Andria*, *Heautontimorumenos*, and *Phormio*.

Just four years later, Enara San Juan Manso (SJM) published the present edition, based on her dissertation at the University of the Basque Country. In it she provides a critical introduction which describes the mediaeval commentary traditions on Terence as well as the development of scholarly interpretations, the contents of the CM (comprising an *accessus* and glosses of various nature, grouped together as continuous text), the specific affinities of the CM to other manuscript traditions, the lemmata and their relationship to the text of Terence, and finally some reflections on the origins of the text and its sources. There is a complete description of *M*, then an extensive bibliography. Her text of the commentary for all six comedies (which I found very accurate whenever I had cause to examine it) then follows, accompanied by two apparatus; the first a slender one presenting variants from the other editions, such as Schlee and Schorsch, as well as a small number of cognate manuscripts (and glossing the lemmata using the Oxford edition of Kauer and Lindsay), and the second a much more extensive compilation of parallel passages from such sources as glossaries, grammarians, and other commentaries on Terence, including Donatus, Eugraphius, and the dominant exegetical text of the ninth century, the so-called *Commentum Brunsianum* (CB), named after the early nineteenth-century editor of the only full edition of it to date, Paul Bruns.

I felt that some remarks of SJM about the importance of Schlee for scholarship on this topic (p. 12) were well-intentioned but misplaced—the gap

[2] F. Schorsch, *Das* Commentum Monacense *zu den Komödien des Terenz*, Tübingen 2011.

of more than a hundred years in any significant scholarship on this subject should be sufficient grounds for disregarding Schlee and his influence. It is also noteworthy (although by no means a criticism of SJM) that whenever she cites the CB it is through the medium of *H*, the manuscript from Halle used by Bruns in 1811 for his edition. *H* is later than many important witnesses for this text (such as BnF lat. 16235), and both contains interpolations and omits passages (in particular a large section of the commentary on *Adelphoe*); on the other hand, Bruns' edition is still the *only* easily accessible printed text of this commentary,[3] and despite its relative early date, is a remarkably good transcript of the manuscript. What SJM's study really shows is the rapidly developing nature of this type of research. There has to be a starting point, and accurate editions such as this are required before other works are tackled—not only the CB, but also such works as the scholiastic commentaries on Terence. This in turn will allow us to study properly as yet unclassified exegetic traditions, such as those found in an inserted gathering in Escorial, S III 23, or in a later layer of glossing in Valenciennes, BM, 448.

Besides the immediate practical use of this edition for scholars struggling to decipher digital reproductions of *M*, particularly the opening folios, there is also some useful material provided on the nature of the text, particularly through SJM's analysis of scholia and their sources in the CM (pp. 17-22). Here in fact I found comparison of her analyses with those of Schorsch illuminating, since they come from different perspectives. In general, Schorsch's lists of examples are more complete and thorough,[4], while SJM's give a much better overview since they relate to the full text of the CM. Thus SJM cites seven glosses where translations from Greek or Greek equivalents for Latin terms in Terence are given (p. 19 n.40), most of which occur in *Eunuchus*, while Schorsch, who did not publish this play, only lists two instances of the scholiast's apparent knowledge of Greek, both of which come from *Andria*.[5] Nevertheless, neither of these was picked up on by SJM in this context—one is a direct word-gloss without reference to its Greek origin, while the other is a remark that the name Dauos is a Greek nominative. The two studies thus complement each other well, and can be used in close conjunction. Rather than going over the same territory, they exemplify the rich nature of this commentary material, where there is still much to explore.

[3] A series of initial manuscript studies were undertaken in the 1970s by Y.-F. Riou into the CB, but unfortunately these did not progress beyond an edition of the *Accessus* to *Andria*; see 'Essai sur la tradition manuscrite du *commentum Brunsianum* des comedies de Térence', *RHT* 3, 1973, 79-113.

[4] Compare, for instance, his list of 26 usages of *ironice* or variants (p. 15 n.79); SJM (p. 20 n.50), cites only four "entre otros", while noting that it is by far the most commonly used reference to a rhetorical figure.

[5] See Schorsch p. 17, and note too his useful observation that the varying quality of the scholia in the CM are a product of its disparate sources.

There remains the thorny issue of the relationship of the CM to the other commentary traditions. As noted by SJM, the close relationship of the lemmata in the CM to the text of BnF lat. 7900A (siglum *Pc*), written in Milan, as well as the presence in *Pc* of a chunk of commentary closely related to the CM, point strongly to a Northern Italian origin of the CM during the second half of the ninth century, in an area which had strong cultural links to Germany at this period. But there are still some much broader questions which need to be answered, particularly with regard to how some of the highly fanciful glosses of the CB, probably somewhat earlier in date and originating from the general area of Lotharingia,[6] also turn up in the CM, while others do not. In the glosses to the didascalia to *Eunuchus*, for instance, SJM's edition now shows that the CM parallels the CB in stating that the *Ludi Megalenses* took their name from games dedicated to Jupiter which were held in the Greek city of Megale (*Eunuchus* 1 [didasc.]); in fact, they were held in Rome and were named after Cybele in her capacity as Mater Magna. Likewise, in the prologue to *Adelphoe* the CM parallels the CB in stating that the play *Synapothnescontes* by Diphilus was called *Sinaphotnes*, and that Contes Diphilus was a Greek playwright (*Adelphoe* 6a); this amusing error must have come about through ignorance of Greek and false word division of an exemplum in *scriptio continua*.

But the CM does not include other ludicrous inventions of the CB, such as its explanation of the didascalia to *Eunuchus* that the musician at the first performance, Flaccus, performed on *tibiae* which were of unequal length because a lame man has one leg shorter than the other (misunderstanding *Claudi* in the name *Flaccus Claudi* [i.e. Flaccus slave of Claudius] as a form of *claudus*, 'lame').[7] Rand, who appears to have relied solely on Schlee for readings in *M*, in fact assumed that this last reading was present in *M*,[8] and so placed little value on the CM, but SJM's edition now clearly shows it was not. Does this partial independence therefore show that the CM was a revision of the CB by careful scholars, or rather do both commentaries independently incorporate strands of faulty critical traditions? The relationship of the two texts needs to established firmly, which can only start to happen when a critical edition of the CB of the same thorough standard as that of SJM appears.

Andrew Turner
The University of Melbourne
ajturner@unimelb.edu.au

[6] For discussion of dating, see R. Jakobi, "Das Commentum Brunsianum," in *Terentius Poeta*, ed. P. Kruschwitz, W.-W. Ehlers, F. Felgentreu, Munich 2007, 37.

[7] For discussion, see *A Facsimile Edition of Terence's Comedies: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. F. 2. 13*, ed. B.J. Muir and A.J. Turner, Bodleian Digital Texts 2, Oxford 2011, "Introduction" § 6.3.

[8] Rand (n.1), at 363.

MARTIN REVERMANN (ed), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014, 498 pp., ISBN 978-0-521-74740-0.

The great appeal of *The Cambridge Companion* series is its ability to offer "lively, accessible introductions to major writers, artists, philosophers, topics and periods." Having a volume in the series devoted to Greek comedy is especially welcome not only because *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy* expands the series' offerings on ancient drama—it is an ideal companion volume to the well-received *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (1997) and *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre* (2007)—but also because the study of Greek comedy entails such a wide range of topics, issues, and approaches. Regarding this latter concern in particular, the success of *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy* stems from its organization as a "continuum" that moves conceptually through the social and cultural circumstances that shape the interpretation of ancient comedy (3). The result is a volume that excels in balancing concerns of text and performance along with those of historical context and subsequent reception, and that also manages to present fresh perspectives from which students at all levels may contemplate Greek comedy. In particular, editor Martin Revermann and his fellow contributors deserve unreserved praise for keeping this volume from being too "Aristophanes-centric" or "Menander-centric" (6) and, one may add, from being too "Athens-centric" as well. Greek comedy was a highly competitive field with a vital presence outside of Athens, and the authors acknowledge this by presenting their readers with the development of comedy beyond the long shadows cast by Aristophanes and Menander, and independent of prescriptive ideas about the evolution of the genre.

In *Part I Setting the Stage (in Athens and Beyond),* the authors provide a "topography of the genre" for comedy (5). David Konstan's chapter (*Defining the genre*) opens the volume with a discussion of the key features of Greek comedy that highlights the propensity of both Old and New Comedy to define themselves "against a constellation of neighboring forms" (29), their own boundaries always distinct from tragedy and yet always shifting in an "evolutionary dance" that both confirms and challenges the norms of drama (42). Zachary Biles (*The rivals of Aristophanes and Menander*) focuses on the intensely competitive nature of Old Comedy, particularly the extent to which open rivalry was, due to the textual constraints of tragedy, the particular preserve of comic poets (44) and how these rivalries fostered the

development of "demagogue comedy" (57). Of particular note in this section is Keith Sidwell's challenge to the theory of a linear development for comedy from Old, to Middle and New (*Fourth-century comedy before Menander*). In addition to making the reader aware of how much evidence for Middle Comedy we do have (60-64), Sidwell suggests that this evidence—when taken on its own merits, rather than as a way station between Aristophanes and Menander—provides a frame for re-interpreting the diversity of subject and tone in Middle Comedy: The genre may in fact be better understood as "two separate highways" (72), a distinction reflective of Aristotle's categories of satirical and plot-based comedy, with the two varieties running parallel to each other until the satirical fades under the pressure generated by restrictions on speech. Kathryn Bosher's chapter (*Epicharmus and early Sicilian comedy*) turns the reader's attention to the 300-year tradition of comedy in Sicily and south Italy. Bosher's excellent overview of the wealth of information, albeit fragmentary, for Western comedy provides a context for the career of Epicharmus and for a tradition of theatre created "by tyrants, not by the democracy" (93). In this section's concluding chapter, *The iconography of comedy*, Eric Csapo surveys the visual evidence that survives for Greek comedy which exists preserved across a surprising variety of media (vase paintings, terracotta masks and figurines, reliefs, mosaics [9]). Csapo moves chronologically through the materials—and provides numerous illustrations—as he emphasizes the influence of Greek comedy on visual arts and urges the importance of integrating these artifacts into a study of Greek comedy for a more comprehensive understanding of performance practices and conditions.

Part II Comic Theatre explores the specifics of performance, focusing on dramatics and dramaturgy, the synergy between performance and audience, and the particular language and diction of Greek comic theater. C.W. Marshall's chapter (*Dramatic technique and Athenian comedy*) introduces the reader to the structure and features of Old Comedy, and to how these elements informed the audience's expectations as to what they were going to see on stage (131). In *Character types*—his first contribution to the volume—Ian Ruffell examines the back-and-forth between recognized character types (cook, slave, soldier, etc.) and individual characters. The interplay between stock types and unique individuals was both a sort of dramatic shorthand for the audience and a way to push against, thwart, or confound audience expectations of both plot and humor (165). At the close of this section, Andreas Willi (*The language(s) of comedy*) offers an analysis and overview of the dialect, register, function, and mode of comic language. Of particular note in this chapter is Willi's discussion of the rapid changes in the register of comic language (175) and his inclusion of the language of Sicilian comedy, which forms a second and distinct dialect for the genre.

Part III Central Themes opens with Stephen Halliwell's *Laughter*, a

discussion of the fundamental link between *to geloion,* the laughable, and comedy. Here Halliwell surveys what the ancients themselves believed about the origin and nature of laughter, but also provides a well-considered contrast between the different shades of laughter in Aristophanes and Menander, with Aristophanic laughter being that which is always imminent, and Menandrian, that which is often unexpected or delayed for effect (198-202). Ian Ruffell's second contribution, *Utopianism*, considers the contrast between Old Comedy's pointed social commentary and its penchant for the creation of alternative worlds (206). This exploration of how utopias may be used by comedians to affirm or criticize is enriched by the inclusion of Mendandrian utopias, which may lack the magical realism of Aristophanes', but feature instead a "best possible" version of the world for the characters. In *The Greek 'comic hero'*, Ralph Rosen reframes the figure, "taking up the baton", so to speak, from Cedric Whitman, and presents the hero as a focal character created by the comic effect of the collision between the necessities of heroism and the ambiguities of real life. Moreover, beyond this initial effect, the hero also instantiates a "faux heroism" that parallels Aristophanes' representation of himself as a comic poet (239). David Kawalko Roselli (*Social class*) considers the relationship between comedy and social class. The diversity of the Athenian theater audience (242-246) is reflected in the challenges to the established order presented by Aristophanes' heroes, although Aristophanes never presents an unqualified idealization of the lower classes (15). Helene Foley, in *Performing gender in Greek Old and New Comedy*, discusses the constructivist nature of gender on the stage, with male characters having access not only to the garments and accouterments of men—including the grotesque of the phallus— but also to those of women. In contrast, female characters are not only tied to traditional gender roles, but denied the sort of freewheeling and brash gender appropriation and heroism of their male counterparts (273). At the conclusion of this section, Martin Revermann's own chapter (*Divinity and religious practice*) discusses comedy's engagement with the religious. Here, Revermann walks his reader through a seeming paradox: how comedy, which is itself part of a religious festival, flourishes by mocking the divine and its patron god in particular, and yet ultimately reinforces the unassailability of the divine in the real world (285).

Part IV Politics, Law, and Social History focuses on "comedy's interaction with its political and social environment" (16). Alan Sommerstein opens the section with *The politics of Greek comedy*, in which he explores comedy's engagement with "matters concerning the state" and the enmeshment of comedy and politics (291). Moving through the fifth century, Sommerstein observes a more conservative bend to comedy with the fourth century, although the material is scant, yielding apolitical works leading into the rigorously domestic world of Menander. Edith Hall (*Comedy and Athenian festival culture*) discusses dramatic festivals as an

experience that both inverts cultural norms and supports the unity of the city that sponsors them; while the plays themselves may challenge public opinion, the experience of spectatorship creates a sense of community identity through participation in a shared experience (307). In *Comedy and Athenian law*, Victoria Wohl delineates the relationship between the two institutions, an affiliation in which comedy whets the critical instinct that is so important to the judicial elements of the democracy. Here, Wohl makes a compelling case for the courts and comedy as "the vulgar tongue" of the city, a dialect both common (i.e. the lawcourts) and offensive (i.e. the comic stage), but central to communication. To close the section, Susan Lape and Alfonso Moreno (*Comedy and the social historian*) consider Old and New Comedy as sources for social history. Here Lape and Moreno present a thorough redressing of the perceived problems with using Aristophanes as a source for the socio-economic realities of Athens and the supposed benefits of using Menander (337).

Part V Reception deals with the survival of Greek comedy and its subsequent theatrical tradition. Here again, Revermann and his contributors deserve praise for dedicating a full section of the volume to the exploration of how the works of Aristophanes and Menander have been, and continue to be, re-contextualized and re-performed in order to inspire new creative works. This section begins with Richard Hunter (*Attic comedy in the rhetorical and moralising traditions*) discussing the reception of Greek comedy by the *cognoscenti* of the Hellenistic and Roman world. For the educated elite who lived their lives on a public stage, comedy was "good to think with" (373). To borrow lines from Aristophanes or Menander concerning public speech, censorship, or satire allowed the speaker to evince education as well as to illuminate current events, and Hunter supports this interpretation with a discussion of passages from Quintillian, Plutarch, and Dio Chrysostum. In *Contexts of reception in antiquity*, Sebastiana Nervegna considers the Hellenistic and Roman era adoption of comedy into pedagogical curricula and the continuing performance of and preference for Menander, with the plays being seen as compositional models for comedy and as instructive material for building character among young men (402). Michael Fontaine (*The reception of Greek comedy in Rome*) makes the case for Plautine comedy as not merely a translation of a Greek original, but rather as an operatic reboot that made use of "musicalized verse" and integrated song (406). Although Plautus' audience would have undoubtedly recognized his plays as comedy, Fontaine suggests that Plautine comedy may also be understood as Hellenistic literature, in that it reflects the genre's predilection for translation and adaptation. In *The transmission of comic texts*, Nigel Wilson provides an overview of how the dramatic texts were reproduced and disseminated, including thoughtful consideration as to what a collector might have to do to get his hands on a copy of a particular comedy subsequent

to performance (425). For the last entry in the volume, Gonda Van Steen (*Snapshots of Aristophanes and Menander: from spontaneous reception to belated reception study*) traces the "reverse polarity effect" of the survival of Menander and Aristophanes, discussing how the ancient's preference for New Comedy over Old shifted throughout the centuries, thanks in part to the survival of Aristophanes' comedies and the disappearance of Menander's until the twentieth century. However, Van Steen is quick to point out—and rightly so—that the ascendance of Aristophanes is also due to his link to the Western intellectual tradition, as well as the long-standing tradition of re-performance in modern Greece (449).

To conclude, *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy* strikes an astounding balance between the topics necessary for a thorough discussion of an often-tricky subject. This volume captures the continuing relevance and irrepressible vitality of Greek comedy without sacrificing discussions of text for those of performance, and without subjugating the ongoing reception of these works to the study of their historical moment. From the range of subjects and methodologies covered, to the inclusion of a "Further Reading" section in each chapter, it is clear that Revermann and his fellow authors have composed this volume not only to inform their readers—which it does admirably—but also to equip them to go out and discover still more on their own. As such, *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy* is both a welcome addition to the *Cambridge* series and to the library of anyone who studies Greek comedy.

Karen Rosenbecker
Loyola University New Orleans
krosenbe@loyno.edu

ANDREA FALCON (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Aristotle in Antiquity*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2016, xvi+512 pp., ISBN 978-90-04-26647-6 (hardback), 978-90-04-31540-2 (e-book).

A common contemporary understanding of Aristotle–but one that extends back at least to Dante's characterization of him as '*il maestro di color che sanno*'–is summarized by the eminent mid-twentieth-century historian of philosophy John Herman Randall, Jr.:

> remain[ing] the aloof, impartial observer, not deeply implicated in the struggles of that [Greek] world, . . . his great aim in life was to understand. . . . His crabbed documents exhibit. . . the passionate search for passionless truth. . . . There is in him a tremendous energy, an indefatigable industry, a sheer power of thought, that fascinates anyone who takes the trouble to understand what he is doing (John Herman Randall, Jr., *Aristotle* [New York: Columbia University Press], 1).

Is Randall's Aristotle the "real Aristotle"? Or must we look elsewhere? Serious study of this splendid anthology will surely lead the reader to suspect that such questions are misplaced. If ever there were a philosopher the real life of whose thought exists in the various, diverse readings of him, Aristotle must be a prime candidate.

Of course, part of the reason for this situation lies in the fortune–or misfortune–of his *corpus*. On the one hand, there were Aristotle's "published" works, now only extant in fragments but once famously characterized by Cicero as '*flumen orationis aureum*' (*Acad.* 2.119). On the other hand, we have the 'crabbed documents' referred to by Randall. These are the works that constitute the extant *corpus*; they are what Cicero called *commentaria* and what contemporary scholars now often term the 'school treatises'. To those who (unlike us) knew both groups of works, the contrast must have been striking. But just the *corpus* that we do have makes it understandable why there seemed to be, in antiquity, a felt need to explain its shape and form. An account from the late first century B.C./early first century A.D. (augmented by Plutarch's later *Life of Sulla* 26) is what Randall terms the 'romantic story of Strabo' (Randall, *Aristotle*, 23), found in Strabo's *Geography* (Str. 13.1.54). According to the story, at the death of Theophrastus, Aristotle's successor as Peripatetic scholarch, the school treatises, in some form, were

bequeathed to one Neleus, who hid them away. They remained in the possession his descendants, who eventually sold them to a famous bibliophile, Apellicon of Teos, in the first century B.C. The works were then brought by the Roman general Sulla, with the rest of Apellicon's library, to Rome, where they received 'some form of scholarly attention by the grammarian Tyrannio [who, incidentally worked on Cicero's library], who passed them on to Andronicus of Rhodes' (Myrto Hatzimichali, 'Andronicus of Rhodes and the Construction of the Aristotelian Corpus', 81 in the present volume). Hatzimichali points out that 'the most extraordinary claim made in Strabo's story is that Aristotle's books were unavailable to the Peripatetics after Theophrastus and this compromised their level of philosophizing' (ibid., 82). She also notes that this claim is one feature of Strabo's story which is particularly open to scholarly doubt and concludes that 'the question of precisely which Aristotelian texts were available in the Hellenistic period, and where, cannot be settled with full certainty, especially since availability does not imply easy access, interest, and use. Moreover, our evidence suggests that different transmission histories apply to different texts, depending on the interest of readers at various parts of the Hellenistic world' (ibid., 83).

This rich volume addresses the controversial issue of the extent and nature of Aristotle's influence in the Hellenistic era in the first of its three major parts, *The Hellenistic Reception of Aristotle*. Perhaps because of the relative dearth of hard evidence, this is the shortest of the three parts. It consists of three chapters: 'Aristotle and the Hellenistic Peripatos: From Theophrastus to Critolaus', by David Lefebvre; 'Aristotle and the Garden', by Francesco Verde; and 'Aristotle and the Stoa' by Thomas Bénatouil.

The second part is entitled *The Post-Hellenistic Engagement with Aristotle* and consists of two subdivisions, *The Peripatetic Tradition* and *Beyond the Peripatetic Tradition*. The former subdivision contains five chapters, beginning with the contribution of Hatzimichali from which I quoted above and continuing as follows: 'Aristotelianism in the First Century BC', by the editor of the volume, Andrea Falcon; 'Peripatetic Ethics in the First Century BC: The Summary of Didymus', by Georgia Tsouni; 'Aristotelianism in the Second Century AD: Before Alexander of Aphrodisias' by Inna Kupreeva; and 'Alexander of Aphrodisias', by Cristina Cerami. From the second subdivision, *Beyond the Peripatetic Tradition*, we have seven chapters: 'The Reception of Aristotle in Antiochus and Cicero' by John Dillon; 'The Appropriation of Aristotle in the Ps-Pythagorean Tradition' by Angela Ulacco; 'The Reception of Aristotle in Middle Platonism: From Eudorus of Alexandria to Ammonius Saccas', by Alexandra Michalewski; 'Galen's Reception of Aristotle', by R. J. Hankinson; 'Plotinus' Reception of Aristotle' by Sara Magrin; 'The Ancient Biographical Tradition on Aristotle' by Tiziano Dorandi; and 'Aristotle in the Aëtian *Placita*' by Jaap Mansfeld.

The third major part of this volume, *Aristotle in Late Antiquity*, contains eight chapters. Not surprisingly, this part is the most wide-ranging both chronologically and in other respects. It begins with the post-Plotinian Neoplatonist encounters with Aristotle and concludes with his reception by early Christian writers (from Clement of Alexandria to Nemesius of Emesa). Its eight chapters are as follows: 'Porphyry and the Aristotelian Tradition', by Riccardo Chiaradonna; 'An Intellective Perspective on Aristotle: Iamblichus the Divine', by Jan Opsomer; 'Themistius', by Arnaud Zucker; 'Syrianus and Proclus on Aristotle', by Pieter d'Hoine; 'Ammonius and the Alexandrian School', by Michael Griffin; 'Simplicius and Philoponus on the Authority of Aristotle', by Pantelis Golitsis; '*Aristoteles Latinus*: The Reception of Aristotle in the Latin World', by Christophe Erismann; and 'Early Christian Philosophers on Aristotle', by George Karamanolis.

The volume is prefaced by 'Acknowledgments', 'Notes on Contributors', and a brief 'Introduction' by the editor, Andrea Falcon, in which he discusses the periodization underlying the volume. At the end of the volume there are indices *nominum* and *locorum*. There is no general bibliography, since each chapter concludes with its own list of references. I note the welcome fact that, with the exception of several senior scholars such as Dillon, Hankinson, and Mansfeld, most of the contributors are early- or mid-career scholars. Thus, this anthology provides compelling evidence that the future of Aristotle studies is in good hands.

The contents of this volume are too deep, detailed, and diverse to admit of any brief summary. However, what one might term the trajectory of the reception of Aristotle in antiquity is discernible in its several chapters. Along this trajectory are at least three points of particular significance. To begin with, at the close of the Hellenistic period (during which Aristotle and his works remain, at least from our perspective, in something of a haze), there is the renaissance of the first century B.C., to which I have already alluded. How much this had to do with elements of Strabo's 'romantic' story and the textual work of Andronicus is uncertain. Renewed interest in Aristotle extended beyond the Peripatetic tradition; and Falcon claims that 'the rise and gradual affirmation of the idea that there are ancient authorities and that Aristotle is one of them is now considered an important factor in the return of his writings' (Falcon, 'Introduction', 2). This development did not lead to a unified interpretation of Aristotle. Rather, again according to Falcon, it resulted in 'a number of different, and often competing, interpretations based on a selective reading of his writings and responding to essentially post-Aristotelian concerns' (Falcon, 'Aristotelianism in the First Century BC', 102).

A second major point of the reception of Aristotle in antiquity surely is the work of Alexander of Aphrodisias, who 'presents himself as a teacher appointed to a state-endowed chair of Aristotelian philosophy by the emperors

Septimius Severus and Antoninus Caracalla (*On Fate* 1.18-2.2)' (Cristina Cerami, 'Alexander of Aphrodisias', 160). This places his *floruit* in the late-second and early-third centuries A.D. Cerami notes that 'Alexander designs his own reading of Aristotle to answer not only competing philosophical systems [e.g., Stoicism, in is his discussion of the determinism-responsibility issue in the *De Fato* and elsewhere], but also alternative interpretations of Aristotle' (ibid, 161). She believes–rightly, in my view–that Alexander 'is without doubt the most prominent figure in the reception of Aristotle in antiquity' (ibid.) and that 'it is not inappropriate to speak of Alexander's philosophical project as a form of Neo-Aristotelianism' (ibid.). Alexander is not only an important philosopher in his own right, working within the Aristotelian tradition, but is also the *fons et origo* of the ancient tradition of commentary on Aristotle–although Aspasius' slightly earlier commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* is the earliest extant commentary on any of Aristotle's works (see Inna Kupreeva, 'Aristotelianism in the Second Century AD', 138ff.). Alexander's commentaries (some of which are now lost) serve as important sources for later ancient commentators, down to Simplicius and John Philoponus in the sixth century A.D.; and his interpretation of Aristotle was known and used by Plotinus in the third century A.D. (see Sara Magrin, Plotinus' Reception of Aristotle', 258 ff.). Long before Ibn Rushd (Averroës) (1126-1198) became "the Commentator", Alexander surely merited that title.

The third juncture in the trajectory of the reception of Aristotle in antiquity is more of an interval than a point. Although, in some sense, it begins with Plotinus as the founder of Neoplatonism, it is the contention of this volume that its real beginnings lies with his successors–in particular, Porphyry, who initiates both the late-antique tradition of Neoplatonist commentary on Aristotle and the conception of a particular philosophical concord between the thought of Plato and that of Aristotle. Of course, pre-Plotinian Platonism had encountered Aristotle. Those encounters tended to oscillate between the poles of accommodation, as in the unacknowledged use of Aristotelian terminology and doctrine by the so-called Middle Platonist Alcinous in his *Handbook of Platonism* (*Didaskalikos*) (second century A.D.), and explicit rejection of Aristotle's thought as incompatible with that of Plato, as in the 'confessional anti-Aristotelianism' (to use the phrase of Riccardo Chiaradonna) of Atticus (also second century A.D.), 'the virulence of [whose] critique was not based on a direct reading of the Aristotelian corpus; rather it was a reaction to readings of exegetes who attempted to unify Plato and Aristotle into a single philosophical position' (Alexandra Michalewski, 'The Reception of Aristotle in Middle Platonism', 228).

Plotinus' reaction to Aristotle seems to lie somewhere between these poles. It might be maintained that his use of Aristotle's thought, while critical to the point where he might be considered, as by Karl Praechter,

'the last anti-Aristotelian Platonist' (Riccardo Chiaradonna, 'Porphyry and the Aristotelian Tradition', 322), was nonetheless probing and constructive. In the estimation of Michalewski, 'it is only with Plotinus that an in-depth engagement with Aristotle and the Peripatetic commentaries on his works entered the Platonic *cursus*' (Michalewski, 'Aristotle in Middle Platonism', 234). It is the contention of several authors in this volume that the true heir of the concordist reading of Plato and Aristotle initiated by Ammonius [Saccas–the teacher of Plotinus] was Porphyry rather than Plotinus' (Michalewski, ibid.). Chiaradonna argues that 'after Plotinus it was simply impossible to rehearse the old pre-Plotinian harmonizing approach to Aristotle [and Plato]. . . it was no longer enough to say that some Aristotelian theories are prefigured in Plato. Plotinus' engagement with Aristotle and the Peripatetic commentators established a much higher standard for debates about Plato and Aristotle' (Chiaradonna, 'Porphyry and the Aristotelian tradition', 337). According to Chiaradonna, Porphyry took up this challenge in his concordist project 'through an in-depth exegetical work that crucially relies on the previous Peripatetic commentators. After Plotinus, it was necessary to make sense of Aristotle in his own terms in order to properly integrate his philosophy into Platonism' (ibid.).

The following chapters in the third part of this volume show the variety of shapes that this project assumed among the Neoplatonist commentators. Thus, toward the beginning, we have Iamblichus 'the Divine', 'who was convinced that Aristotle's works contained the essence of Plato's ontology, as Aristotle was an heir to the Pythagorean-Platonic tradition. In order to bring these nuggets of wisdom and hidden layers to light, he resorted to his famous intellective contemplation' (Jan Opsomer, 'An Intellective Perspective on Aristotle', 355). And, at the end of the late antiquity, we have Simplicius, who 'endeavoured to establish Aristotle not only as an unshakable authority in philosophy of language and natural philosophy but also as a philosopher who fully shared with Plato knowledge of the divine truth (i.e. the truth about the first realities of the cosmos: the Soul, the Intelligence, and the One)' (Pantelis Golitsis, 'Simplicius and Philoponus on the Authority of Aristotle', 419). Golitsis argues convincingly that Simplicius self-consciously uses Aristotelian commentary as a means of refuting the deviations of his Christian contemporary (and former fellow-student of Ammonius, son of Hermias) John Philoponus from this 'divine truth'–as, for example, in Philoponus' arguments against the eternity of the world.

The life of Aristotle's thought extends, of course, far beyond the chronological boundaries of this volume. And the various engagements of later thinkers with that thought are perhaps even more diverse in content and form than those instances studied in this volume. To consider just several examples from contemporary philosophy, Aristotle's thought has played a significant role in finitistic and intuitionistic philosophy of mathematics,

in the renaissance of virtue ethics, and in the development of functionalistic theories of mind. This outstanding "Companion" should prove of great interest to anyone who has studied or encountered the Philosopher, whatever the nature of that study or encounter. Although the reader's particular background and preoccupations will mean that some chapters hold more interest for him or her than others, all the contributions are just that–scholarly, thoughtful, and useful contributions to our understanding of Aristotle and his place in the intellectual history of our world.

MICHAEL J. WHITE
Professor Emeritus of Philosophy and of Law
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85287 USA
mjwhite@asu.edu

Serena Bianchetti, Michele R. Cataudella, Hans-Joachim Gehrke (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Geography. The Inhabited World in Greek and Roman Tradition*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2016, xviii+490 pp., ISSN 1872-3357; ISBN 978-90-04-28511-8 (hardback); ISBN 978-90-04-28471-5 (e-book).

Scholarship devoted to the study of Greek and Roman geography has gone through periods of rise and decline. In the last decades of the 19th century and the beginnings of the 20th, a period characterised by the overall expansion of Classical studies, ancient geography was the subject of interest of scholars such as Karl Müller or Hugo Berger, among others, who dedicated significant efforts to both the study of ideas of geographic space in Antiquity and their evolution, and the publication of critical editions of the works of ancient geographers. Products of such efforts are, for instance, the two volumes of *Geographi graeci minores* (Müller, Paris 1855, 1861), the first edition of the geographic fragments of Eratosthenes (Berger, Leipzig 1880), the work of Karl Trüdinger, *Studien zur Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie* (Basel 1918), or the monumental *Geschichte der wissenschaflichen Erdkunde* (Berger, Leipzig 1903), the earliest study dealing with ancient geography as a science, describing and analysing its progress. Nevertheless, in the wake of such growth, the fifty years following up to the last decades of the 20th century saw practically no significant development in subsequent studies on Greek and Roman geography. 1984 and 1985, however, marked a turning point in the field, when the works of Oswald Dilke (*Greek and Roman Maps*, 1985) and, in particular, Pietro Janni (*La mappa e il periplo: cartografia antica e spazio odologico*, Rome 1984), opened a new era of studies in the geographic thought of the ancient Greeks and Romans. Shortly afterwards, interest in the publication and commentary of the texts of the ancient geographers also returned with renewed energy, giving way, among other things, to the wide-ranging projects aimed at the (re)edition of the Greek fragmentary geographers headed by Didier Marcotte (in the context of the Budé Collection) and Hans-Joachim Gehrke (*FGrHist* V).

This *Companion to Greek and Roman Geography* should be regarded both as a result and as a testimony of the interest ancient geography has been eliciting in the last 30 years. The three editors are, to a great extent, responsible for the increase and progress of studies in the field described: apart from the already-mentioned Hans-Joachim Gehrke, Serena Bianchetti and Michele Cataudella have authored countless contributions to the research

area, ranging from topics as diverse as the voyage and work of Pytheas of Massalia, the sitting and nature of the Pillars of Heracles, the geographic thought and works of Eudoxus of Cnidus and Dicaearchus of Messina, the reception of Greek geography among Christian authors, or the relationship between astronomy and cartography, *inter alia*. Moreover, under their guidance, the book brings together many of the most relevant authorities in recent scholarship on ancient geographic literature and thought.

The work is organised in accordance with a structure that combines chronological order with the conceptual evaluation of the periods and authors it deals with. It consists of three main sections, respectively dedicated to the archaic and classical periods (up to the voyage of Alexander the Great), the Hellenistic and Roman periods, and Late Antiquity, presenting the first of these as preliminary in relation to the "real" development of geography as a mature science ("Geography before Geography"), and the last period as an era of legacy reception ("Geographical rebounds"). This entails a view of Hellenistic and Roman times – between the generation after Aristotle and Alexander and the work of Ptolemy – as the age in which ancient geography made its greatest strides forward and produced its most relevant and original results. However, the editors entitle this section "Geography between Science and Politics", in view of that relevant aspect of geography as a science that is frequently fostered to serve the needs and interests of the ruling power, a discipline that depends on the information provided by expeditions and explorations sent by the elite, and an area of knowledge that benefits from the protection and support of institutions – like the Alexandrian Museum – promoted by political authorities.

The chapter by Reinhold Bichler on "Persian Geography and the Ionians: Herodotus" opens the volume as well as the first section. The author highlights the importance of Herodotus as the first Greek author whose specific concept of the world is known to us. In addition, the paper somehow prefigures the main topics that will structure the second section of the book: the dialogue between geographic knowledge and political power. The gist of the study is principally the influence of the historical context – i.e., the Persian wars – on Herodotus' geography, such that the depth and density of geographic details that the *Histories* offer depends on the way the different countries were affected by wartime events.

The second chapter ("The Sea of Greeks and Romans"), by Pietro Janni, focuses on the importance of the sea as a key element in early Greek geography. Ancient geography, indeed, was born from the practical experience of sailors, a fact that makes the author consider it not only a "geography" in the strict sense, but also a "thalassography". The great expeditions of exploration that brought Greece most of its geographic information were mainly maritime explorations: of the Mediterranean, the Ocean beyond the Pillars of Heracles – sailing either northwards or southwards –, the Indian Ocean, etc. Even the

campaign of Alexander the Great entailed an investigation of the Hyrcanian Sea.

Gianfranco Maddoli's paper ("The Concept of Magna Graecia and the Pythagoreans") calls attention to the fact that the ancient authors frequently associate the denomination of "Magna Graecia" (or in Greek μεγάλη Ἑλλάς) to the Pythagorean school. This fact leads him to trace the origin of such denomination and to connect it to the blossoming of the cities of southern Italy between the 6th and 5th centuries BCE, which also coincides with the main period of Pythagorean success in that region.

Giovanna Daverio Rocchi researches the "Systems of Borders in Ancient Greece", both among the Greeks themselves and with respect to the barbarian "others". The author points out that ancient Greek boundaries are flexible margins resulting from the confluence of a self-perceived homogeneous ethnic group, shared linguistic, religious and cultural peculiarities, natural geographic limits and political units. This is true particularly in the archaic and classical periods, when the Greek poleis established their limits according to criteria that involved "geography, history, law, economy and religion" (p. 64).

Hans-Joachim Gehrke's chapter analyses "The «Revolution» of Alexander the Great: Old and New in the World's View". The expedition of Alexander to the east inverted the proportion between theory and experience in the knowledge of Asia among the Greeks. Thus, the author aims to evaluate the impact of this new knowledge through the reconstruction of Alexander's "mental map". So, he offers an in-depth account of the geographic "state of the art" in the time of Alexander. In this context, apart from the clear idea of the Indus' course as independent from the Nile and the awareness of the Persian Gulf as distinct from the Red Sea, the Alexandrian campaign did not substantially change the Greek image of Asia. However, the main contribution of the expedition is the abundance of new details that made progress possible among later scientists, outstanding among them Eratosthenes.

Finally, Veronica Bucciantini's "Geographical Description and Historical Narrative in the Tradition on Alexander's Expedition" closes the first section of the book. The author compares the accounts of Indian hydrography in the remnants of the works of Nearchus of Crete, Onesicritus of Astypalaea, Ptolemy son of Lagus and Aristobulus of Casandreia, seeking out their peculiarities and differences. Onesicritus' fondness for the fabulous diverges from Nearchus' interest in correcting the exaggerations and fictional inventions of earlier authors (mainly Ctesias). Aristobulus' interest in engineering works, as well as the practical exploitation of natural resources, fully concords with his role as architect within the Macedonian expedition. In the fragments of Ptolemy, however, hydrographic information is conspicuous by its absence, probably due to the prevailing interest of this author in pragmatic aspects of military and political practice.

The second section of the volume starts with a short trip back in time: Michele Cataudella's chapter on "Some Scientific Approaches: Eudoxus of Cnidus and Dicaearchus of Messene" dedicates detailed study to the works and scientific attitudes and theories of Eudoxus, Aristotle's contemporary, one generation ahead of Alexander's historians. However, his thought is presented as ancestral to one of the most relevant concerns of subsequent generations of geographers: he appears as the first to prefigure a geographic vision based on a main parallel and a main meridian, the cornerstone of the network of latitudinal and longitudinal lines that Dicaearchus with his "diaphragma", and, above all, Eratosthenes, would later develop during the Hellenistic period.

Eratosthenes is precisely the topic of Serena Bianchetti's paper ("The «Invention» of Geography: Eratosthenes of Cyrene"). It was he, indeed, who coined the terms "geographer" and "geography" to refer to an activity and a discipline presenting itself as distinct from that of the philosopher and, for the first time, relying on a defined method: that of extracting conclusions about the earth from observations of the sky. The observation of celestial phenomena led him to draw a network of nine parallels or *klimata*, even if these abstract lines were based on empirically observed salient elements of landscape (rivers and mountain ranges) in constant interplay with the so-called "sphragides" – i.e. wide geographic areas denominated as the Egyptian cadastral divisions – building a new example of the dialogue between science and politics.

The contact between astronomy and geography is also the main focus of Klaus Geus' study on "Progress in the Sciences: Astronomy and Hipparchus". The principal aim of Hipparchus' geographic work is to outdo that of Eratosthenes by criticising and improving some aspects of it. In contrast to the limited set of latitudinal lines of Eratosthenes, Hipparchus' main contribution to geography was the development of an abstract grid of parallels ranging from 0 – the Equator – to 90º N – the North Pole –. Moreover, Hipparchus disagrees with his predecessor with respect to some particular details of his geographic view, as, for instance, regarding the existence of an all-encompassing ocean surrounding the inhabited world (the *oikoumene*) and the uniqueness of this alleged island we live on; rather to the contrary, he conceived other *oikoumenai*, the extreme ends of which were even visible to us.

In his "The Indian Ocean from Agatharchides of Cnidus to the *Periplus Maris Erythraei*", Didier Marcotte explores the role these authors play in creating the view of the area extending from the Horn of Africa to the Bay of Bengal as a unity, far exceeding our modern idea of the "Red Sea". The French scholar studies Agatharchides and his work as a continuation of the early "climatological" approach the companions of Alexander applied to the study of the Nile and the Indus valleys, comparing the similar physical

features they found and the similarities between the peoples who inhabited them. Natural history and human history then turn into one and the same thing. The second half of the chapter, however – dedicated to the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea – serves Marcotte to illustrate the decisive role of merchants in the progress of geographic knowledge of the Indian Ocean.

That same territory, between Africa and India, as well as early climatological theory, is behind Pierre Schneider's contribution, dealing with "The So-called Confusion between India and Ethiopia: The Eastern and Southern Edges of the Inhabited World from the Greco-Roman Perspective". As its title announces, this paper mainly aims to analyse the alleged confusion in order to re-interpret it, revealing its testimonial value in relation to a way of understanding the southern side of the *oikoumene*, and not as the result of a mistake.

The next chapter, by Pascal Arnaud, entitled "Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa and his Geographical Work", calls attention to the cultural context of the Roman Empire and its impact on ancient geographic knowledge. Arnaud deals with the problems entailed by the transmission of the fragments of Agrippa's work, their reflection in Pliny and the (in his opinion, unlikely) relationship between Agrippa and the "anonymous chorographer" quoted by Strabo, the nature of the work (as a text, perhaps unfinished, rather than a monumental map in its origins), and its purpose. He studies the extant testimonies on Agrippa's vision of the world, which place him as the last example of Hellenistic geographic tradition, rather than as the first expression of the Roman vision.

The subordination of scientific research in the field of geography to practical (mainly political, military and administrative) uses is the core of Anne Kolb's chapter, "The Romans and the World's Measure". Through two parallel processes consisting of surveying the space and appropriating it by creating pervasive infrastructures, such as the road networks, the milestones along them and the monumental inscriptions on public buildings, the Roman Empire manages its conquered territories and integrates them into a cultural structure.

However, the most outstanding instance of geographic literature in Roman times is the work of Strabo, which is precisely the topic of Francesco Prontera's contribution ("Strabo's Geography"). The work illustrates the tension, permanent throughout the Hellenistic period, between awareness of the need to draw up the map of the inhabited world on the basis of astronomical observations and the scarcity of such data, compared to the abundance of empirical information regarding the diverse regions and the history and ways of life of the peoples inhabiting them. The *Geography*, then, reflects the wide range of differing knowledge that the geographer needs to possess (physics, astronomy and mathematics, as well as the philosopher's all-encompassing knowledge of the human and the divine), and responds to

the interests of the cultivated Greek aristocracy in the cities of the Empire, as well as of the Roman upper class, educated according to the parameters of the Greek school tradition.

Eckart Olshausen's chapter ("News from the East? Roman-Age Geographers and the Pontus Euxinus") proposes a revision in the knowledge of the Black Sea area in the works of Roman authors (Menippus of Pergamon, Strabo, Pomponius Mela and Pliny) with an eye to the sources they used. His analysis allows for appreciation of the fact that the region had been well-known since Hellenistic times, so that the Roman period had no need for new explorations to deepen or improve data about it.

After dealing with the eastern part of the Empire, the book presents a chapter regarding the west, which depicts a very different scenario in Gonzalo Cruz Andreotti's contribution on "Rome and Iberia: The Making of a Cultural Geography". In contrast to the early exploration of the Black Sea, the Iberian Peninsula had scarcely been explored until the arrival of Roman conquest, a period that was able to contrast inherited theoretical models with empirical information. The Roman expansion made a real difference with regard to scientific knowledge about the west, making it possible to include the area in the world maps, providing scientists with more accurate measurements of distances, and transforming and fleshing out the traditional image of the history and ways of life of the diverse human communities inhabiting Iberian territory.

Kai Brodersen's chapter on "The Geographies of Pliny and his 'Ape' Solinus" applies a critical eye in analysing the alleged lack of originality in the *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* with regard to the *Historia naturalis*. Solinus' innovative character in terms of geographic vision consists of his way of presenting the spatial data: as against the periplus-structure of his source, he frequently adds references to the cardinal points; that is, he substitutes the linear description of Pliny using the concept of area, allowing his readers to envisage a map.

The progress of cartographical science in Roman times is the main topic of the contribution by Germain Aujac, "The «Revolution» of Ptolemy" – a revolution that mainly consists of the full development of the network of abstract latitudes and longitudes for situating the cities and the use of conic projection to prepare his map, based on lists of coordinates for the places to be represented. The author, besides, depicts Ptolemy as an outstanding scholar who, apart from his interest in high-level science, was also conscious of the need to provide lay audiences with instruments, such as his handy tables, which adapted science to their level of comprehension and interest.

The last section of the Companion, dedicated, as has been said, to the reception of ancient geography in late Antiquity and in the Middle Ages, begins with Michael Rathman's contribution on "The *Tabula Peutingeriana* and Antique Cartography". He traces the earliest archetype of the extant

Tabula – one of the most famous examples of medieval cartography – to the Hellenistic age, being it later redrawn and modified up to the 5th century CE (the date of ca. 425 is suggested in p. 359 as the end of the editing process).

In his chapter on "Geography and Religion: The Lists of the *Thearodokoi*", Emilio Galvagno deals with documents that exceed late Antiquity by a wide margin, ranging from the Hellenistic age to the 5th c. CE. He studies the itinerary-like structure of many of the extant records for the travels of the "*Thearoi*", messengers sent by *poleis* holding religious festivals to invite other communities to participate in the games they organised.

Finally, the chapter written by Jan R. Stenger on "Eusebius and the Representation of the Holy Land" closes the volume, providing the reader with an example of the meaning of geographic knowledge to a Church Father. Eusebius first coined the concept of "holy place" and elaborated a sort of geographic directory or gazetteer in his *Onomasticon*, which aimed to give an account of the places where events of the Bible took place. Many of these places still existed, offering material evidence in support of the Christian faith.

The Companion, thus, offers the reader an account of the most outstanding authors who dealt with geography in Antiquity, a complete survey of the main problems they faced, and a profound analysis of the works they wrote and their transmission. The diverse chapters deal with aspects concerning ancient approaches to the field of geography, the reception and survival of ancient works, and modern methodologies to apply to the study of their extant testimonies. The contributors consistently attain the highest level of scientific rigour while at the same time avoiding jargon and unnecessary complication. All this makes the book an interesting piece of research for specialists with a background in the field of ancient geography, while also being an excellent and useful instrument for scholars from other areas of knowledge, interested in the geographic ideas of the Greeks and Romans.

Irene Pajón Leyra
Universidad de Sevilla
irene.pajon.leyra@gmail.com

PHILIP HARDIE (ed.), *Augustan poetry and the irrational*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2016, xiv+327 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-872472-8.

The book under review sets out to examine some of the manifestations of the irrational in Augustan poetry with a view to demonstrating to what extent they are a deep-rooted presence in both Roman thought and literature in the time of Augustus. Augustan poetry, despite the commonplace view of it as the product of an age of balance and rationality, a sort of 'Age of Reason' *ante litteram*, appears to be conspicuously permeated by the irrational, a force that was, indeed, controlled and repressed during that time, but never truly annihilated. Therefore, several of the Augustan texts that have come down to us let the irrational tellingly surface, for example when unruly or potentially dangerous emotions such as love, anger, fury are unleashed, thus infringing moral and social rules as a reaction to Augustan propaganda. Given that the volume's title hints at E.R. Dodds' famous study of *The Greeks and the Irrational* (1951), of which classicists still lack a 'Roman' equivalent (cf. p. 3), this book, by seeking to fill a lacuna in the discipline, certainly serves a useful purpose. Moreover, it sets out to prove that the irrational (or the related concept of 'failure of reason'), far from being a marginal or occasional presence, can be posited as a distinctive feature of the Latin canon of the Augustan period, usually labelled 'classicism'. However, being a multi-authored proceedings volume issued from a conference, it displays – in a quite predictable way – an array of methodological approaches and a variety of styles that cannot guarantee the formal unity typical of a mono-authored book. Nonetheless, readers may rely on the introduction of the editor P. Hardie, who, while taking stock of the themes tackled by the contributors, also provides perceptive insights into the key concepts and questions raised by the main topic of the volume. The reading of Hardie's introduction is thus highly recommended: being an essay-like paper rather than a summary of the volume's contents, it fulfils more than just an informative function by establishing links between the papers and tracing a coherent interpretive path throughout the book. Hardie's paper briefly touches, for example, on *Furor* as a veritable obsession for the Romans of Augustan Rome, owing to the dreadful evocation of past political violence and disorder it brought along (it inhabits or, rather, infests several moments of Augustan poetry, as in the close of Virgil's *georg.* 4 or of the *Aeneid*); on erotic irrationality in elegiac poetry; on the interchange of Dionysiac and Apolline elements, which appears to be more nuanced than one may be led to suspect; on Lucretius as an impossible model for the Augustan poets to follow; on the irrational as

the only adequate, though unexpected, way of creating an 'imperial sublime'; on literary female characters as figures of unreason, which brings the gender issue into play.

The volume is divided into five major sections, under which papers sharing themes or approaches are gathered. I think this makes sense overall, although it comes as a bit of a surprise that W. Fitzgerald's contribution, revolving around Alexander Pope's *Eloisa to Abelard*, is placed alongside papers dealing with Tibullus, Ovid and Propertius despite the presence of a unifying theme ('Reason and Desire') and the editor's clarification of the label 'Augustan' in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England in the introduction (p. 1). Since P. Hardie's paper too, in the close of the volume, deals with some aspects of reception, the editor might perhaps have considered devoting a specific section to this branch of studies.

The authors of the contributions are both leading experts in the field and younger scholars, which is indeed a praiseworthy choice. Papers offer discussions on the irrational in Augustan poetry from a variety of perspectives encompassing intertextuality, discussion of philosophical views on reason/unreason, analysis of the political and social life in the Augustan Age: this age, despite being just a fraction of the history of Rome, may certainly be taken as a representative illustration of the way the irrational came to pervade the literary and political discourse, thus questioning the role of values like measure and rationality traditionally attached to it.

Part 1 contains three papers revolving around the themes of civil war and the return of the repressed. E. Giusti ('My Enemy's Enemy is My Enemy: Virgil Illogical Use of *metus hostilis*'), after succinctly but effectively discussing the notion of *metus hostilis* in Roman thought and establishing new intertextual points of contact between some lines of Virgil's poem and Aeschylus' *Persians* (a welcome addition to the tragic texture of the poem already brought to light by scholars), focuses on the entangled relationship between Rome and Carthage: she discloses a complex assimilation of the two cities, which also blurs the distinction between Trojans, Carthaginians, Greeks and Romans. This is a very rich paper, having much to say, despite concision, about identity construction 'in a whirlwind of shifting western-eastern paradigms' (p. 55), which inevitably challenges any rationalizing principle underlying the Roman notion of *metus hostilis* (on the construction of the enemy, though not strictly speaking related to the problem of the irrational, cf. also U. Eco, *Inventing the Enemy and Other Occasional Writings* [transl. by R. Dixon], Boston/New York 2012). S. Rebeggiani ('Orestes, Aeneas, and Augustus. Madness and Tragedy in Virgil's *Aeneid*') looks for (both visible and less visible) traces of Orestes' character in Virgil's *Aeneid*, presenting an 'original argument', to borrow the editor's judgement (p. 6), that Orestes, as well as being linked to Aeneas, also represents a suitable model for Octavian to exact revenge for the murder of his father Julius Caesar.

Rebeggiani makes several good points on Orestean allusions in Book 2, 3 and 12 of the poem (*inter alia* he offers an interesting and, maybe, decisive interpretation of *Aen.* 3.332 *patrias … ad aras*), also demonstrating very convincingly how Virgil innovates upon the motif of the hero's madness by creating a strong link between *furor* and vengeance: Orestes' actions come to embody a viable paradigm for both Octavian's and Aeneas' vendettas in light of their being divinely sanctioned. The first section is rounded off by a contribution of M. Labate ('The Night of Reason: the Esquiline and Witches in Horace'), who mainly focuses on the relationship between the irrational and some urban contexts of Augustan Rome in Horace. He argues that the site of the Esquiline in *sat.* 1.8 and *epod.* 5, in spite of the fact that it had been relandscaped by Maecenas as his residence and *horti*, at night time still retained disturbing features of its past owing to the witches' practice of black magic. Labate effectively shows how Horace's texts are, thus, capable of reactivating, through the evocation of the earlier squalor of the place, dark memories of death and violence.

Part 2 revolves around counting and accounts in relation to the opposition order/disorder in Augustan poetry. C.D. Haß ('Beyond ″Cosmos″ and ″Logos″: an Irrational Cosmology in Virgil, *Georgics* 1.231-58?') analyses the cosmological section of Verg. *georg.* 1.231-58 from a semiotic perspective bringing to the fore the underlying process of rationalization oscillating between *didaxis* and *poiesis* (although, in my view, his approach makes things a bit too complicated). J.P. Schwindt ('The Magic of Counting: on the Cantatoric Status of Poetry [Catullus 5 and 7; Horace *Odes* 1.11]') explores the function of counting based on the use of big or infinite numbers in the pre-Augustan poet Catullus, who famously toys in *c.* 5 and 7 with the confusion brought about by the *basia* he exchanges with his mistress Lesbia as a way to exercise control over the world of love. Schwindt then reads Horace's ode 1.11 against the Catullan backdrop, arguing that number plays are connected in Horace to oriental astrology and therefore banished, whereas the *carpe diem* is identified as a sort of rational principle entitled to confer measure to both life and poetry. E. Gowers ('Under the Influence: Maecenas and Bacchus in *Georgics* 2') concentrates on Virgil's *Georgics* 2, examining it as the product of a self-consciously irrational writer. She contends that the book's dedicatee, Bacchus, and Virgil's ideal reader, Maecenas, share common features and both have connections with the irrational. She also shows with persuasive arguments that Virgil's treatise on arboriculture puts on display two contrasting and yet complementary impulses, force and spontaneity, which refer not only to plant life but also to poetry and acculturation, a process, this one, not seldom entailing violence (cf. *georg.* 2.74-7).

Part 3 has its main focus on the duality of reason/desire and, as one may expect, especially revolves around elegy. J. Burkowski ('Apollo in Tibullus 2.3 and 2.5') looks at the way Apollo is portrayed in Tibullus' poems 2.3

and 2.5: these elegies, for all their proximity, offer two strikingly different representations of the god, an irrational Apollo consumed by love for Admetus in the *exemplum* of 2.3, a very dignified patron of poetry and prophecy in 2.5. Burkowski demonstrates how and to what extent Tibullus, in his double role of poet and lover, relates himself to Apollo, ultimately pointing out the distance between the god as naturally belonging to the universe of rationality and the elegiac lover as an inherently irrational creature. J. Fabre-Serris ('The *ars rhetorica*: an Ovidian *remedium* for Female *furor*?') devotes her attention to discussing the role of rhetoric in Ovid's amatory poems. After analysing some passages drawn in particular from Propertius and Ovid, in which female *furor* is presented as more dangerous than men's erotic passion, she insightfully argues that Ovid has come up with his own 'solution' to make women control their own *furor*, a solution that will turn beneficial both to themselves and to men: to this end, the poet endows the heroines of myth with the possibility of resorting to the *ars rhetorica*, as is well exemplified in some of the *Heroides* and in some episodes from the *Metamorphoses*, in which, as Fabre-Serris points out, women attempt to rationalize their situation. Let me just add a quick thought. I wonder whether the *ars rhetorica* granted to women proves effective in the end: given the general failure brought about by their rhetoric, it looks like Ovid did not really want to assign to women the 'right' *verba*, through which, on the contrary, men usually succeed in seducing, persuading or deceiving. W. Fitzgerald ('Augustan Gothic: Alexander Pope Reads Ovid') takes us forward in time to another Augustan age, that of English literature, offering a reading of Pope's heroic epistle *Eloisa to Abelard* and showing how Pope draws on Ovid's *Heroides* as the most suitable model, for a male poet, to give voice to a female character, also with a view to Gothicizing it. D. O'Rourke ('The Madness of Elegy: Rationalizing Propertius') investigates the duality of madness/reason throughout Propertius' corpus: he makes many good points about the poet losing control in his first three books as a result of acknowledging Cynthia as a centre of irrationality, which he then claims to have overcome at the end of Book 3. However, as O'Rourke argues, the alternation of erotic and aetiological themes that characterizes Book 4 is suggestive of the poet's difficulty of both sticking to the new rationalistic project announced in 4.1 and committing to philosophical wisdom as attempted earlier in the previous books, thus hinting at his relapse into irrationality.

Part 4 deals with philosophical and rhetorical issues related to the irrational. M. Citroni ('The Value of Self-deception: Horace, Aristippus, Heraclides Ponticus, and the Pleasures of the Fool [and of the Poet]') offers a rich set of insights into the theme of pleasure within Horace's moral discourse, emphasizing the rational awareness and control that the poet attaches to it: even the *carpe diem* motif, as also already emphasized by Schwindt in this volume, is strongly linked to the necessity of *sapere*. As

Citroni shows by bringing into the discussion *epist.* 15 and 17 and devoting special attention to the character of Maenius and to that of the philosopher Aristippus, Horace goes as far as to propose, also by means of self-irony, a rationalization of luxury, thus overturning traditional ethic views on it. Citroni then addresses, after quoting the anecdote of the man of Argos and his Greek sources, the related aspect of the *levis insania*, which consists of a balanced combination of (slight) unreason and normality and is also key to poetic inspiration. S. Heyworth ('Irrational Panegyric in Augustan Poetry') draws attention to the features of paradox, absurdity, excess, hyperbole in some passages of Augustan poetry having panegyric tone and content (especially in Virgil, Ovid and Horace) with a view to suggesting that, when poets appear to exaggerate, it is not just simply a matter of 'inspiration': they are driven to irrationality (and even lies) by the need or, rather, pressure to praise Augustus. Also, they do so by carefully exhibiting lack of reason in their praises (for a different reading of irrational praises on the part of the Augustan poets as the only adequate response to 'imperial sublime' cf. Hardie in the introduction, pp. 20-21; Max Weber's definition of 'charisma', cited at p. 20, as essentially opposed to rationality, is worth being recalled).

The volume is rounded off by Part 5 with two papers specifically revolving around Virgilian figures of the irrational. S. Clément-Tarantino ('*Caderent omnes a crinibus hydri*: the Problems of the Irrational in the Juno and Allecto Episode in *Aeneid* 7'), concentrates on Allecto's role in Book 7 of the *Aeneid*. After referring to the implausible description of how Amata is overcome by *furor* in the famous lines about the snake (346-56), which have long been the object of scholarly debate and criticism (on a possible model for the snake scene cf. also C. Battistella, 'Il serpente sotto il cuore', *Seminari Romani* 8, 2005, 311-16), she then goes on to discuss the deer hunt scene as the *prima causa* of the upcoming war in light of Tiberius Claudius Donatus' commentary. Donatus' interpretation, focusing on the countrymen's *furor*, seeks to explain and make sense of an (again) improbable scene (at least according to Macrobius' judgement): it posits that sort of *furor* as a natural type of *furor bellicus*, thus attempting to defend the consistency of Virgil's text. P. Hardie ('Adamastor and the Epic Poet's Dark Continent') comes back to the theme of *Fama* as the quintessence of irrationality, a theme that he has already thoroughly explored in his 2012 book. Building on the work of D. Quint ('The Epic Curse and Camões Adamastor', in *Epic and Empire*, Princeton 1993), he turns now to Vaz de Camões' poem *The Lusiads*, which abundantly draws on Virgil's *Aeneid* as its main model, devoting special attention to the figure of the giant Adamastor and his connections with *Fama* from a densely intertextual perspective.

Before concluding this review, I would like to recall a passage that, despite hinting at an event of the pre-Augustan age and not being related to poetry, is quite indicative of how difficult exerting control over the irrational can be

for human beings, a condition that is also well reflected in the works of the Augustan poets discussed in this volume: in the famous account of Caesar's murder in Plut. *Caes.* 66.2, Cassius is said to have turned his eyes to the statue of Pompey to invoke him, although he was following the doctrine of Epicurus and, therefore, should have been immune to such forms of superstition: 'but the crisis, as it would seem, when the dreadful attempt was now close at hand, replaces his former rationality with inspired emotion (ἐνθουσιασμὸν ἐνεποίει καὶ πάθος ἀντὶ τῶν προτέρων λογισμῶν; transl. by Perrin, slightly modified).

Overall, this volume has many merits and offers original and high-quality contributions. As a final remark, however, it has to be pointed out that editorial care is unluckily not at its best here (apart from the occasional typos, it should be noticed that, for example, translations in Heyworth's paper are confined to footnotes, which is not consistent with the criterion adopted in the rest of the volume). Also, I believe that readers would have certainly benefited from even just one paper devoted to exploring the theme of the irrational in Augustan art (on the *Ara Pacis* cf. briefly Hardie in the introduction, p. 16).

Chiara Battistella
Università degli Studi di Udine
chiara.battistella@uniud.it

RICHARD HUNTER - S. P. OAKLEY (eds.), *Latin literature and its transmission: Papers in honour of Michael Reeve*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016, xiv+366 pp., ISBN 978-1-107-11627-6.

The volume under review contains fourteen papers on Latin literature originally presented at a conference held January 2013 in Cambridge honoring Michael Reeve on his 70th birthday, supplemented by a list of the honorand's publications over a period of nearly fifty years (1967-2015). The focus of the volume and the location of the conference are both tributes to Reeve's "outstanding tenure of the Kennedy Professorship of Latin" (p. xiii) from 1984 to 2007.

The papers, almost equally divided between topics of textual and literary criticism, are arranged in alphabetical order by author surname. For the purposes of this review I have sorted them into two clusters, each chronologically arranged according to the date of the Latin text it treats. As will become obvious, the chronology is nearly as arbitrary as that of the volume itself – where to put the papers on Renaissance criticism and reception? for example – but the clusters themselves, one of papers with a literary focus, the other of papers more concerned with textual matters, may serve the reader's convenience. As it happens, the rearrangement also allows me to begin and end with papers that are particularly attentive to showing how, in the terms of the prefatory blurb, textual and literary criticism are "mutually supportive" (p. i). The volume itself is neatly produced and the occasional images are clear and helpful[1].

At the core of the papers in the first and larger cluster of papers are questions about what should be printed in the text of a Latin author. Yet each of the seven critics frames his (yes, his) investigation differently.

D. H. Berry opens "Neglected and unnoticed additions in the text of three Cicero speeches (*In Verrem* II.5, *Pro Murena*, *Pro Milone*)" (**Chapter 2**) with a Ciceronian epigraph cleverly repurposed for textual criticism: *latius patet … contagio quam quisquam putat* (Cic. *Mur.* 78) and concludes with four sensible criteria for the detection of interpolations in the text of Cicero (p. 21). En route he discusses passages from the three titular speeches (with something on a fourth, *Ver.* 1, in the final footnote), proposing or reviving earlier proposals for excisions. For several of the excisions a plausible origin in a explanatory gloss is proposed: *Ver.* II.5.13 [*quae lautumiae uocantur*],

[1] The number of typos that affect the sense is small: *iuueni* for *iuuenci* at Lucr. 2.360 (p. 48), *Aen.* 5.719 *dicti* for *dictis* (p. 63), *Aen.* 10.385 *crudelis* for *crudeli* (p. 67, line 1), Lucr. 5.879-80 *copore* and *aligenis* (p. 125), 11.8.1 should read 11.8.2 (p. 238, line 2).

Mur. 43 [*Seruius*], Mil. 96 [*arma*], *Ver.* 1.48 [*hominum*]. A parallel passage supplied by a learned reader underlies, it is suggested, the intrusion of one anaphoric series (*ubi ternis denariis aestimatum frumentum, ubi muli, ubi tabernacula, ubi tot tantaque ornamenta magistratibus et legatis a senatu populoque Romano permissa et data*) in the midst of another (*ubi quaestores, ubi legati,* [...] *denique ubi praefecti, ubi tribuni tui*) at *Ver.* II.5.83; Berry adds *denique* to the material already excised by Ernesti and concludes that in *ubi ternis ... data* we have a previously unknown fragment of Roman oratory[2].

Glosses drawn from Asconius are said to account for some counterproductive or erroneous phrases in the *pro Milone* (27 [*a Lanuuinis*], [*quod erat dictator Lanuui*], [*quae illo ipso die habita est*], 46 [*illo ipso die*], [*cuius iam pridem testimonio Clodius eadem hora Interamnae fuerat et Romae*]). Throughout, Berry evinces little sympathy with editorial reluctance to excise and, on better grounds, with failure to mention excision as a diagnostic repair in the apparatus, and he seems to envisage relegating the surplus text to the apparatus, as in Clark's editions, rather than bracketing it. The result, if put into practice, would minimize the extent to which Cicero's readers are disturbed by signs of the text's transmission.

In "Overlooked manuscript evidence for interpolations in Lucretius? The rubricated lines" (**Chapter 5**) Marcus Deufert makes a new case for the presence of interpolations in Lucretius' *De rerum natura*. More specifically, he argues that a small number of interpolations can be detected. Apropos of nine verses that seem to have been rubricated in the archetype, he suggests that they were accompanied in the pre-archetypal tradition by symbols indicating doubt about authenticity, a legacy of the work of ancient critics and paralleled in the Virgilian tradition[3]. As it happens, most of these verses (and sometimes the passages they introduce or conclude) have been excised or suspected by editors: 2.42-3, 2.706a, 2.710, 3.672a, 3.759, 3.805, 3.905, 3.949; the exception is 3.905. He also builds a new case against the authenticity of 3.949 *atque etiam potius, si numquam sis moriturus*; this entails restoring the transmitted *perges* in 3.948. The first appendix treats thirteen lines for which rubrication is attested only in O, raising doubts about the authenticity of four of them (2.1023, 1.11, 2.887, 2.94). The second appendix treats lines rubricated in O and omitted in Cesena, Biblioteca Malatestiana S 20.4, a descendant of the *Poggianus*, suggesting that the rubrication in O

[2] A parallel passage might also account for the elaborately-phrased surplus text at *Mil.* 46: *cuius iam pridem testimonio Clodius eadem hora Interamnae fuerat et Romae* (on which see below).

[3] For a different explanation of the rubrication see recently D. Butterfield, *The early textual history of Lucretius'* De rerum natura. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, p. 169

was transmitted to the *Poggianus* and misinterpreted by the scribe of the Cesena manuscript, who treated the relevant lines as *tituli*.

In the next paper, David Butterfield's "Some problems in the text and transmission of Lucretius" (**Chapter 3**), we get a glimpse of the future OCT of *De rerum natura*, along with valuable discussions of Lucretian usage on almost every page. The textual problems under consideration here are presented with exemplary clarity and efficiency. They are too numerous to list individually, so I will just sample the types. The first discussion concerns three discrepancies between the doublet 1.926-50 ~ 4.1-25, one of which (1.950 *qua constet compta figura* ~ 4.25 *ac persentis utilitatem*) supports the conclusion that passages are both authentic and properly placed, while the others are emended to *perspicis* (in 4.24, to match 1.949) and *nam* (4.11, to match 1.936) respectively. Butterfield builds a robust case against *dispansae* at 1.306, arguing in favor of Nonius' bland *candenti* (or *candenti in*), but the elaborate explanation for the origin of the homely *dispansae* (p. 39) is not redeemed by the useful digression on medial-line interference from above and below. Physical damage is hypothesized to explain unrelated but proximate problems in 2.919-20, faulty word division the anomalous *at* of 3.1068. The complicated genesis offered for the bizarre line-end of 6.563 is less persuasive than the observation that it supports the placement of the Itali in a line of descent from O (p. 48). For the heifer of 2.356 Butterfield proposes *instat*, excellent in sense, murky (or perhaps mucky?) in origin. These learned disquisitions are presented with a seasoning of wit, sometimes sharpish but mostly entertaining.

We get a more comprehensive, if still preliminary, sketch of another future OCT from Richard Tarrant in "A new critical edition of Horace" (**Chapter 14**). After demonstrating that a new edition is needed, Tarrant shows us some of what we can expect from his. A new collation of post-tenth-century manuscripts will be made, and some results from a new collation of the oldest manuscript, R, are offered here. Doubt is cast on Klingner's classification of the manuscripts, particularly on the integrity of the Ξ family. The new edition will be more hospitable to conjecture than some of its predecessors, and more importantly, its apparatus will be more open to alternatives to what is in the text. However, the transmitted text will occasionally be restored, ee.g., *Odes* 1.4.8 *uisit* and 2.1.21 *audire* (with a nod to Pollio's *recitationes*). As possible interpolations, besides the universally condemned lines found at the head of *Sat.* 1.10 in one branch of the tradition, Tarrant flags one line in the *Ars poetica* (349[4]), two stanzas in the *Odes* (2.16.21-24, 3.11.17-20), and unspecified lines in *Odes* 4.8. Tarrant's plans for the critical apparatus are

[4] It would be helpful to indicate the necessity of taking *semper* from 350 *apo koinou* here, since without the adverb of 349 the musical blemish described in 348 is not just habitual, *persaepe*, but unvarying.

illustrated by a three-fold comparison of Klingner, Shackleton Bailey, and Tarrant on *Odes* 1.31. We can expect a thorough (and welcome) rationalization of the sigla. The paper concludes with a discussion of non-authorial features of the tradition, namely, the *tituli* and the arrangement of the collection.

After these two foretastes of eagerly awaited volumes we now turn to a paper that deepens our appreciation of an edition that has been on our shelves for some time. Gian Biagio Conte's "On the text of the *Aeneid*: An editor's experience" (**Chapter 4**) is a collection of notes explaining ten textual choices in the 2009 Teubner edition. In some of them, as in his 2016 book *Critical notes on Virgil: Editing the Teubner text of the* Georgics *and the* Aeneid, with which there is considerable overlap here, he is responding to the critiques of reviewers; bibliographical specifics are given in the book. The notes are arranged according to features pertinent to the editor's explanation or repair of the paradosis. The new punctuation of 9.463 (*suscitat aeratasque acies: in proelia cogit*) is explained, as is the retention of the paradosis at 10.366-7 (*aspera quis natura loci dimittere quando/ suasit equos*). The bracketing of interpolations is defended for 1.380 [*et genus ab Ioue summo*], [4.126], and [9.151], likewise the admission of readings based on indirect tradition at 7.110 (*ille*) and 5.720 (*animum*). The last three notes argue the case for conjectures adopted in the text at 5.326 (*ambiguumue*), 7.543 (*caelo*), and 10.386 (*incautus*; this passage is not discussed in the 2016 book). The point of some of these discussions would be clearer if Conte's text, punctuation, and apparatus were included somewhere in the note. Instead, Mynors' text is cited at the head of each note, accompanied by a selective apparatus. There is no conclusion.

The next paper in this category treats the textual notes of a scholar who did not edit the text he emends here. Simon Malloch's "Acidalius on Tacitus" (**Chapter 11**) is a reclamation project, aiming to rescue the humanist Valens Acidalius and his *Notae* on Tacitus, posthumously published in 1607, from their current obscurity. Malloch focuses on the critical acumen demonstrated in Acidalius' emendations to Lipsius' text of the *Annals*. These are mostly small changes that improve the sense, and some have been adopted by modern editors, including Malloch himself. Excision is a favorite technique: 11.8.2 *unde metus* [*eius*] *in ceteros*; 11.26.1 [*siue*] *fatali uecordia an imminentium periculorum remedium ipsa pericula ratus*; 11.26.2 *flagitii*[*s*] *manifestis*. But there are also some more elaborate fixes, such as the rewriting at 13.32.2 (*quem ouasse de Britanniis retuli* for the second Medicean's *qui ouans se de britanniis rettulit*), outstripped in its alterations by the repair proposed for 14.48.2 (for which I refer you to the paraphrase-resistant pp. 241-2). Repairs involving multiple interventions often imply purposeful innovation at some stage in the transmission, an implication that could be brought more fully into the discussion here. Malloch concludes by arguing the merits of replacing *excusaturos* at 1.59.4 with *excusaturum*, a proposal revived, if not first excogitated, by Acidalius.

The last of the textual papers, S. P. Oakley's "The *editio princeps* of Priscian's *Periegesis* and its relatives" (**Chapter 13**), takes us to down to the sixth century for Priscian and the sixteenth for some of the manuscripts discussed here. It offers an analysis of one family in the manuscript tradition of Priscian's Latin translation of Dionysius' *Periegesis*, aiming to "serve as a practical example of how a rich incunabular tradition may be classified" (p. 264). The family is a sprawling one, with nine independent manuscript witnesses, twenty incunables, and eleven manuscripts dependent on the *editio princeps*; the present chapter has a companion piece elsewhere on the other two families. The analysis is based on a collation of lines 1-214 and selected spots from later in the 1087-line poem; it is suggested, however, that for the incunables at least the results will hold good not just for the poem, one of Priscian's "minor works," but also for the entire corpus (p. 278). Primarily a methodical review of the branches within one family and their interrelations, the paper also offers valuable general observations – on, for example, the differences between the errors characteristic of manuscripts and print editions (p. 277) – and demonstrates the surprising, indeed nearly complete, dependence of Italian incunables on the *editio princeps* (p. 288). This chapter more than any of the others in the collection pays the honorand the compliment of adopting his method and style. Given that the paper offers itself as a example for others to follow, and looking to the future, I will say that I wonder whether continuous prose is the best way to present an extensive transmission process; as I read it I was constantly making diagrams and tables to keep track of things, and I welcomed the "chain" sketched – textually: "a>c>e>f>g>i>j>m>n>s (and conceivably >t)" (p. 288) – by the author in summarizing some of the analysis. The discussion of relationships among the derivative witnesses builds the scaffolding for book history and concludes with a hint of what that history might look like: "It [Ko] is perhaps the first manuscript of an ancient Latin author identified as both deriving from a printed edition and having progeny of its own" (p. 290).

I now turn to the papers that address questions of a more literary nature, beginning with Monica Gale's "*Aliquid putare nugas*: Literary filiation, critical communities and reader-response in Catullus" (**Chapter 6**). Gale surveys Catullus' poems about poetics with an eye less on how poems should be written and more on how they should be read, offering discussions of Catullus 1 (complete with *arido* in line 2 and *patrona uirgo* in line 9) and other poems that pay particular attention to Catullus' construction of his ideal reader and his anxieties about authorial control over the meaning of his works. Poem 1, scrutinized according to Genettian paratextual categories, is shown to advertise and aggrandize the accompanying *libellus* and guide the reader's approach to it. Important themes that emerge from the survey include the literary connoisseurship of poets (poem 1), rival reading strategies

(poem 16), the surrender of irony into the reader's hands (poems 42 and 49), and literary judgement (poems 36, 14, and 22).

In Matthew Leigh's "*Illa domus, illa mihi sedes* – on the interpretation of Catullus 68" (**Chapter 10**) we get an analysis of Catullus 68, with particular attention to the apology in lines 33-40 and the role of the *domus* in unifying the 160-line composition as a verse epistle accompanying the gift of a poem. Leigh begins by stating his position on various problems in the verse epistle of lines 1-40: the complaint of the addressee is taken to be "the outpourings of sentimental youth," in essence a reflection of Catullus' former self (pp. 198-9), *munera ... et Musarum ... et Veneris* are love poems by hendiadys (p. 202), the referent of *scriptorum* is purposefully occluded (p. 204), and the contents of the *capsula* are 68B (p. 206). Passages relevant to the *domus* as both building and family are assembled to show the value and fragility of the *domus* in the world of the poem, which is described as "the story of a sentimental education suddenly interrupted and of the new perspective on people and experience drawn from loss" (p. 214). With the help of *On the sublime* (32.1) the poem's torrent of similes is explained as a representation of passion (p. 216). The addressee and honorand? Mallius (68A) and Allius (68B), with a nod to the suggestive overlay of the two in the elided *me Allius* at 68.41 (p. 220). All points are accompanied by discussion of other interpretative possibilities.

In "Dogs, snakes and heroes: Hybridism and polemic in Lucretius' *De rerum natura*" (**Chapter 7**) Emma Gee explores the intertextual connections between Cicero's *Aratea* and Lucretius *DRN*, aiming to refute Merrill's assertion that they are coincidental and arguing that some them are vehicles of Lucretian polemic against Cicero[5]. More precisely, she suggests that echos of Cicero's "Stoic-orientated text, the *Aratea*" (p. 135) are used to combat – or perhaps parody (p. 136) – misconceptions about the nature of the universe such as the possibility of hybrids and Heracles. The major intertext under consideration in this argument is Cicero's description of the Dog-star (*Arat.* 107-19), bits of which Lucretius repurposes in various discussions of faulty preconceptions. Gee also looks at Lucretian echoes of rationalist arguments against mythology from Palaephatus and Empedocles, and the Euhemerism that makes Epicurus "divine," suggesting that Lucretius may have known a Stoic predecessor to the depiction of the philosopher-hero Heracles that we see in the *Quaestiones Homericae* by a first-century CE Heraclitus (pp. 137-9). She concludes with the proposal that Lucretius' constellation-like Epicurus (3.1-4) appropriates Cicero's description of the constellation Centaur (*Arat.* 450-3) in a sort of "philosophical recycling" (p. 141).

[5] Her starting point is W. Merrill, "Lucretius and Cicero's verse" *University of California publications in classical philology* 5, 1921, 143-54.

With Alessandro Barchiesi's "Jupiter the antiquarian: the name of Iulus (Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.267-8)" (**Chapter 1**) we move on to Virgil. The paper is a meditation on Jupiter's announcement of the alteration of Ascanius' name from Ilus to Iulus, with particular attention to the efficacy of Jupiter's assertion, which brings into being the change that it announces. The name Iulus, Barchiesi argues, is given to the boy by a great-grandfather acting as his *pater familias*, and the scene initiates the work-around necessitated by Homer's omission of Ascanius from the *Iliad*. According to his reading the scene also adjudicates among the etymologies competing to explain the new name, casting its weight in favor of *Iulus* as a diminutive of *Iouis*. The paper is enlivened by incidental delights such as note 6, in which Barchiesi comments on the "antiquarian polemics" involved in using the adjective *Ilia* in the line about *Ilus*' name change *(Ilus erat, dum res stetit Ilia regno*), a line in which Virgil departs from the mainstream tradition according to which Aeneas was accompanied not by a son but by a daughter – Ilia, in fact – when he arrived in Italy. Another such is the observation (p. 7) that shortly after activating the etymology of Iulus as "little Jupiter" Jupiter calls him *magnus* (*Aen*. 1.288).

"Maritime Maro: Virgil's Fourth *Eclogue* in Renaissance Venice" (**Chapter 9**), by L. B. T. Houghton, is a study of of visual, musical, and literary uses of reminiscences of Virgil's fourth *Eclogue* in the Venetian Republic, specifically the *Virgo* (Astraea, with a combination of classical and scriptural attributes), the *Saturnia regna*, the *puer*, the *concordes Parcae*, and above all the phrase *te duce*, so useful for political panegyric (*Ecl*. 4.13). "Reminiscence" is Houghton's term (see, e.g., p. 179), for in some of the works discussed here the connections with the poem are admittedly generic or tenuous. In an interesing "local variant" (p. 185) on this widespread Renaissance trope, some of these Venetian works manage to evoke Eclogue 4 *and* celebrate seafaring, despite its banishment in the original (4.37-9 *Hinc ... / cedet et ipse mari uector nec nautica pinus / mutabit merces*); hence the *double entendre* of the paper's title, "Maritime Maro." Another curious adaptation to the republican context is the use of the golden-age paraphernalia to celebrate selfless (i.e., non-mercenary) friendship (pp. 189-92).

In "On the good ship Ingenium: *Tristia* 1.10" (**Chapter 12**) Llewelyn Morgan highlights Ovid's display of untrammeled *ingenium* in his first book of exile poetry, specifically its trajectory from threatened and suspect in *Tristia* 1.1 to survivor in 1.11, paying particular attention to *Tristia* 1.10, a poem about Ovid's ship and its journey. Morgan argues that the ship's Minervan associations suggest and explain the survival of Ovid's poetic *ingenium*, despite future vicissitudes and past "attempts to make him a non-person" (p. 260). The chapter concludes with some welcome words celebrating the survival of books, beginning, but not ending, with *Tristia* 1.

The placement of the last paper to be discussed, Stephen Heyworth's "Authenticity and other textual problems in *Heroides* 16" (**Chapter 8**), may surprise on two counts. Why does a paper on the *Heroides* follow a paper on the *Tristia*? And why is a paper by the distinguished editor Stephen Heyworth in the literary cluster? The first surprise is Heyworth's, not mine: in this discussion of *Heroides* 16, the letter of Paris, whose authenticity Heyworth accepts, the poem is given a late date, with publication possibly posthumous. The answer to the second question will, I hope, emerge from what follows. Thematic and dictional parallels between *Her*. 16 and Ovid's exile poetry suggest, it is argued in the paper's first section, that the double epistles "comment on [Ovid's] situation as well as that of the characters in whose names they are written" (p. 148). The remaining sections of this substantial paper are devoted to explicating and resolving the problems of the exiguously transmitted verses 16.39-144, in line with the principle made explicit in the paper's final paragraph, namely, that the disputed passage was no less "liable to corruption and indeed interpolation than the rest of the *Heroides*" (p. 170, a principle that needs the rider "provided that the disputed passage was ancient," as is in fact asserted here (e.g., p. 155). In section 2 Heyworth argues that the Treviso edition (*c*. 1475) is an independent source for the (authentic) text of 16.39-144, offering as a new argument against interpolation the implausibility of the scenario required to generate both 16.39-144 and the similarly transmitted 21.145-248. After plunging into the "morass" (p. 156) represented by the much-emended lines 16.38-39, Heyworth emerges with the proposal that the lines were added in two stages to paper over the problems caused by the loss of authentic lines starting at 16.40. It is slightly tendentious to use the awkward vulgate version of the beginning of line 16.145 (*credis et*) to launch an argument against the transition being original (p. 155), since the emended version *crede et* is accepted later (p. 158). It also seems somewhat odd that there should be signs of textual repair *within* the passage that fell out of the main line of transmission – the addition of 16.39 and the patch at 16.144 for "damage incurred by the last line of the lost passage" (p. 159, referring to *inter formosas*) – since physical damage is not explicitly invoked until the paper's last section and the scenario sketched there is neither likely to yield a new hexameter nor particularly compelling per se. Other problems in the disputed passage are removed by excision (16.49-50, as "a rather feeble attempt to mend" a lacunose narrative, and 16.97-98 as "mythological embroidery," pp. 162 and 164 respectively) and emendation (16.79 *audent* for *ardent*). Overall, Heyworth's chapter makes good on the volume's stated aim of showing the literary implications of work by textual critics.

It will be obvious that these summaries provide only a hint of the range and quality of the work elicited here by an opportunity to honor Michael Reeve. The editors note that in *Latin literature and its transmission* "full

justice has not been done ... to his extraordinary achievements as a student of manuscript traditions," and they challenge others to "enter the field" (p. xiv). Judging by this volume, the results of that challenge are eagerly to be awaited.

Cynthia Damon
University of Pennsylvania
cdamon@sas.upenn.edu

D. Paniagua- M. A. Andrés-Sanz (eds.), *Formas de acceso al saber en la Antigüedad Tardía y la Alta Edad Media. La transmisión del conocimiento dentro y fuera de la escuela,* Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2016, xi+311 pp., ISBN 978-2-503-56987-1.

One of the most fascinating topics that bridge Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages is the transmission of culture from the former to the latter. In the broadest sense it includes not only texts but also art and architecture. Two monographs that come to mind that paved the way on the theme of transmission of knowledge are: the magisterial seminal work of Pierre Riché, *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West: From the Sixth through the Eighth Century* (trans. John J. Contreni) University of South Carolina, 1976 and recently, the superb study of Yitzhak Hen, *Romans Barbarians: The Royal Court and Culture in the Early Medieval West*, Palgrave, 2012. These monographs meticulously chronicle the role of monasticism and monarchies in the transmission of classical culture to the Middle Ages. Riché chronicles the activity of monastic centers or 'schools' where this work took place; the Hen volume focuses on the active role of several barbarian monarchs in promoting literary culture in their respective kingdoms to preserve and transmit classical culture, mainly literary but in some cases art and architecture. Even though this theme has received much attention by scholars, there is still an immense amount of work left to be done. We have only started to tap this rich field of study at every level. Our present collection of essays contributes to this topic but only through internal scrutiny of texts, paleography, stemma of texts, and language. The essays are expertly presented, their analysis solid, and their diverse conclusions compelling. Anyone who intends to engage this volume must have a very good reading knowledge of Spanish, Italian, French, and English. It will also require a good knowledge of Latin, paleography, and the historical background that is assumed by the authors. For specialists this will not be a problem.

The volume is dedicated to the eminent philologist at the University of Salamanca, Carmen Codoñer. The two editors are also at the University of Salamanca: David Paniagua is a 'Ramón y Cajal' researcher in the Department of Classical and Indoeuropean Philology at the University of Salamanca and María Adelaida Andrés Sanz is Titular professor of Latin Philology in the Department of Classical and Indoeuropean Philology at the University of Salamanca. The findings were presented at an international symposium on the topic in question held at the University of Salamanca, October 2014, under the direction of the editors of this volume David Paniagua and María Adelaida Andrés - Sanz. The editors indicate that the common denominator

is the exploration of a variety of texts that reflect a rich cultural background. In addition, their material transmission as preserved in manuscripts and the environments (school or not) in which this took place.

In the words of the editors the essays have as their object to deepen certain aspects of Late Antique and Early Medieval Latin texts that are related to the transmission of knowledge. The subject matter of the volume has very little for the historian with the exception of one essay by Paolo Chiesa, "Studenti di greco? Carlo Magno e Liutprando." The rest, however, will be of great interest to philologists, paleographers, and cognate fields. The essays range in subject matter, there are pre – Christian late antique texts, some from the Church Fathers, several in the Carolingian period, two on Isidore of Seville, and others whose focus is manuscripts.

The book contains the following essays: David Paniagua y M.ª Adelaida Andrés Sanz, "Introducción." Carmen Codoñer, "El tratamiento de la palabra en latín." Carlos Lévy, "La transmisión del escepticismo en la tradición filosófica romana." Marisa Squillante, "L'ambiguità della parola in Agostino." Luigi Pirovano, "Alcune considerazioni sulla «protostoria» delle *Interpretationes Vergilianae* di Tiberio Claudio Donato." Giovanni Polara, "Scrivere e leggere: scritture esposte non convenzionali." Massimo Gioseffi, "Ancora su Coronato e *Viuo equidem uitamque extrema per omnia duco* (AL 223 R.^{2} = 214 Sh.B.)." David Paniagua, "Nuovi e vecchi testimoni manoscritti delle *Voces uariae animantium* di Polemio Silvio." Paulo F. Alberto, "Corippus' Panegyric of Justin II in Carolingian Grammatical Texts." Jacques Elfassi, "Nouvelles sources augustiniennes dans le premier livre des *Différences* d'Isidore de Séville." Rodrigo Furtado, "A collection of chronicles from Late Antique Spain: Madrid, Complutense 134, ff. 25vb-47vb. Content, structure and chronology." Paolo Chiesa, "Studenti di greco? Carlo Magno e Liutprando." M.ª Adelaida Andrés Sanz, "*De notis et signis*. Algunas cuestiones sobre el léxico de la *Praefatio in psalterium* atribuida a Isidoro de Sevilla." We can locate the studies by subject in the following broad categories: Language (Gioseffi, Polara, Codoñer, Chiesa, Squillante, Andréz Sanz; Manuscripts (Furtado and Alberto); Transmission (Pirovano, Lévy, Paniagua, Furtado, Alberto, and Elfassi).

There are a few shortcomings in the volume overall that I would like to signal. What is sorely lacking in the majority of the essays, save one, is the historical context where this learning took place. The brief 'presentation' is of no use in explaining how the essays specifically are intended to advance the agenda suggested in the title. Equally absent is a conclusion by the editors to tie together these studies to articulate what overall has been accomplished to deepen our understanding of the transmission of knowledge. Then there is the ambiguous last line in the title, *La transmisión del conocimiento dentro y fuera de la escuela*. The editors never explain what is meant by 'escuela – school,' the reader is left wondering. The transmission of knowledge that

is explored in the studies never indicate if it occurred within a 'school.' It would have been helpful, if it was clarified what is meant by a school! Do they mean centers of learning or even perhaps a school of thought; we are left in the dark! An explanation in the opening section on what places of learning looked like in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages where this transmission of knowledge took place would have gone a long way to clear this up. Another missing element that is common in the majority of books of essays is a summary of the article in a language other than the one it is written. I would like to make clear that these concerns do not in any way undermine the high quality of these studies; the authors have executed essays of the highest order.

Each essay has a complete bibliography of sources consulted that reflect a good knowledge of their topic and that they read broadly the research of scholars from diverse countries. The book is accompanied with an index of authors and texts and an index of manuscripts. FIDEM and Brepols are to be lauded for the publication of this volume and the authors for the time dedicated to produce these highly informative studies.

Alberto Ferreiro
Seattle Pacific University
beto@spu.edu

RANDALL J. POGORZELSKI, *Virgil and Joyce: nationalism and imperialism in the Aeneid and Ulysses*, Madison; London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2016, x+78 pp., ISBN 978-0-299-30800-1.

Presumably an elaboration of his PhD dissertation, Pogorzelski's *Virgil and Joyce: nationalism and imperialism in the Aeneid and Ulysses* fills an important gap in Joyce Criticism. Robert Schork, the undisputed authority on *Latin and Roman Culture in Joyce* (UP of Florida, 1997), affirmed that "Latin was Joyce's first second language"(2) and verified that Virgil's work was part of his library in Trieste. With his initial help, Pogorzelski starts by tracing direct references to Virgil in *Ulysses*, goes on to read Virgil through Joycean lenses, and brings in "Nationalism" as *tertium comparationis*. He contends that Joyce uses Virgil to construct "a cultural history of Ireland through the European classical tradition" (11), and, in turn, Pogorzelski himself uses Joyce to discover a new Virgil, the Virgil of Nationalism.

Readers of e-books and similar digital formats often read more than one at the same time. This is obviously not the end of the book bounds. It is only one more step towards non-linear reading. "Could a historiographer," asked Sterne in *Tristram Shandy* long ago, "drive on his history, as a muleteer drives on his mule,—straight forward. . . without ever once turning his head aside, either to the right hand or to the left?" (Penguin 2003, XIV). Books have the capacity to talk to other books. Our attentive reading may easily stop at any given point and take us through a maze of hyperlinks. Every paragraph, every sentence, any word is --or may seem to us-- linked to others. While reading we often hop from book to book at a pace directly proportional to our degree of obsession and inversely proportional to our concentration. It is no news to start this review noting that we generally read James Joyce in this way.

As he wrote *Ulysses*, he also reordered the ways in which we were to see the connection between his words and those in other works."I believe I told you;" said Joyce to his friend Frank Budgen, "that my book is a modern *Odyssey*. Every episode in it corresponds to an adventure of *Ulysses*" (*James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses*, OUP, 1989, 20). Joyce's friend Stuart Gilbert, himself a graduate in Classics at Oxford, did a lot to promote the idea that we were to read *Ulysses* keeping an eye on the *Odyssey,* and envisioning Homer more or less as a "prefiguration" of Joyce, though the only evidence we have is the title of the novel (not even the Greek names of the episodes were ever published). The distance between the writer's appar-

ent intentions and the textual parallels are such that we never know how far to take them or when to stop. Whether they are labelled "influence," "allusions," or "intertexts," we are likely to end up repeating the dying replicant's words in *Blade Runner*: "I've seen things you people wouldn't believe."

What came afterwards is well known to Joyceans (and commonly known as the "Joyce industry"). In order to read *Ulysses*, even precariously, we can hardly resist the temptation to stop from time to time and open other books. We need at least half a dozen on our desk. Weldon Thornton's *Allusions in Ulysses* (U of North Carolina P, 1968) or James Atherton's *The Books at the Wake* (Southern Illinois UP, 1959*)* are indispensable. There are also some concrete, distinguised ghosts. Were it not for his insistence on Homer, many would agree that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* goes first in *Ulysses*. Vincent Cheng's masterful *Shakespeare and Joyce, A Study of Finnegans Wake* (Pennsylvania State UP, 1984) explores the connections between these two major creators –that is, after God, as Joyce would say in *Ulysses*. Also, Mary Trackett Reynolds' *Joyce and Dante: The Shaping Imagination* (Princeton UP, 2014); or Patrick Colm Hogan's *Joyce, Milton, and the Theory of Influence* (Florida James Joyce, 1995) are valiant enough to bring these major writers together. Oscar Wilde, George Bernard Shaw, Giambattista Vico, and many others could be added. Virgil, no doubt, has an important place in this list. Don Gifford's priceless *Annotated Ulysses* (U of California P, 1989), lists no less than a dozen references to Virgil, including cross-references to Dante, Milton, or Blake.

In chapter 1, "Joyce's "Aeolus" and the Semicolonial Virgil**,"** Pogorzelski starts his analysis with the first allusion to Virgil in *Ulysses:*

> VIRGILIAN, SAYS PEDAGOGUE. SOPHOMORE PLUMPS FOR OLD MAN MOSES.
>
> —Call it, wait, the professor said, opening his long lips wide to reflect. Call it, let me see. Call it: *deus nobis hæc otia fecit.*
>
> —No, Stephen said. I call it *A Pisgah Sight of Palestine* or *The Parable of The Plums. (U 07.1054-8)*

Following the (thin) threadline of the episode, "Aeolus," two girls climb up Nelson's Pillar to have a view of Dublin from the top. They are eating plums and spit the seeds (which make a "parable") down the street. That is why Stephen proposes the title *The Parable of The Plums*. The connection between Virgil's quotation in Latin and Nationalism is in order here if we remember the tendency to associate Latin with the Empire and England and Greek with Irish Nationalism.

What else is involved in a flight of stairs? Pogorzelski goes on to argue that "their laborious climb to the top represents the Irish struggle for independence in general, and the land war in particular" (35). It would appear that

Pogorzelski forces the reading of the episode. And does he? The Joycean answer is that he "allegorizes," i.e., raises from the literal reading (climbing the stairs) to a different level (Irish struggle). Further, Pogorzelski borrows the term "semicolonial" from Derek Attridge's successful study *Semicolonial Joyce* (Cambridge UP, 2000), to title this first chapter, "Joyce's "Aeolus" and the Semicolonial Virgil." "Semicolonial" applies to Joyce ambivalent, hybrid --and polemical—attitude in respect of Irish Nationalism. Reading Joyce in this way allows Pogorzelski to see Virgil, from a postcolonial perspective, as semicolonial too.

The only objection to Pogorzelski's reading of the episode has little to do with how far he takes the parallel. This only makes him a Joycean. It is rather his initial assumption that Joyce and Virgil belong exclusively in their separate periods, that "Modern" and "Classic" are independent realities, rather than articifial tools we use to make a precarious sense of history.

The second chapter, "Joyce's Citizen and Virgil's Cacus" centers on the "Cyclops" episode and its association with Virgil's monster Cacus, although the critical terminology used is somewhat elusive (are they allusions? Intertexts?). Cacus, who is killed by Hercules, serves as a model for the citizen, the famous nationalist. But Cacus (as Latin) is also the British colonizer: "'Cyclops' not only links the citizen to the monster Cacus, but also subtly aligns the citizen with the hero Hercules" (49). With the aid of the portmanteau concept of "hybridity," Pogorzelski manages to combine a number of characters into one: the Cyclops and Cacus; the Irish Nationalist and the Roman invader. Other pastoral monsters, together with Fritz Senn's hints to Polyphemus in Ovid's Metamorphosis (52), are added to the citizen's hybrid identity.

Joyce –it often occurs—seems to trap us in a web of resemblances. In 1980 Shari and Bernard Benstock made reference to this particularity in the title of their directory: *Who's He When He's at Home : A James Joyce Directory* (U of Illinois P) It is not a flaw, then, but the natural result of Pogorzelski's meticulous reading of Joyce, that he uncovers multiple and even contradictory identities in the citizen: he is "Cacus" as "shepherd," "Hercules" as "madman," and "Augustus" a "repressive monarch" (67).

Most of chapter 3, "The Virgilian Past of Nationalism," centers on Nationalism and the *Aeneid*. Even though the concept of "Nationalism" itself is modern and initially alien to Virgil, reading *Ulysses* changes our perception of things, and also our understanding of the past. Consequently Pogorzelski reads the *Aeneid* with postmodern eyes. More concretely, it is Joyce's idea of "Irish Nationalism" that allows him to "envision" a new Virgil, the Virgil of nationalism.

And what is a Nation? "—A nation? says Bloom. A nation is the same people living in the same place" (*U* 12.1422-3). Pogorzelski can read in Bloom's definition the preeminence of "territoriality" over race and language. He adds to this the creation of artificial ancient roots: "They imagine the territory as an ancient and natural whole" (79). The ways in which Virgil constructed ancient roots for Italian identity are seen as parallel to Joyce's exploration of ancient roots for Irish identity.

With the aid of Benedict Anderson's influential *Imagined Communities* (Verso, 2006), Pogorzelski recalls for us the ways in which Nationalism transforms "fatality into continuity, contingency into meaning (Anderson 2006, 11)" and remarks the "Nationalist's" need of "mourning": "Nationalism, as Anderson makes clear, is a form of mourning"(83). Consequently the chapter ends with an account of the death of Lausus.

"Joyce's Rudy and Virgil's Marcellus" (chapter 5) centers on Marcellus, the heir of the Roman empire, and Rudy, Bloom's dead son. In both a similar process is at work: "the emotional power of ancient injustice to engender collective nationalist identification"(91). In this chapter Pogorzelski makes an important correction in the traditional understanding of *Ulysses*. He contends that Joyce's "Circe" (episode 15 of *Ulysses*) is more similar to the *Aeneid* 6 than "Hades" (episode 6 of *Ulysses*). What makes "Circe" similar to a descent to Hades is its peculiar understanding of time: it is a return to the past (the past of dead friends and family) and an anticipation of the problematic future (by way of prophecies).

At this point, curiously, Pogorzelski takes a two page detour (94-95) to account for references to *Aeneid* 6 in *Finnegans Wake*. Is he suggesting a broader parallel between the *Wake* and Virgil's *Country of the Dead*? In any case, Rudy, Bloom's dead son, appears as a ghost at the end of "Circe," and makes Bloom speculate on what would have become of Rudy, had he lived. Virgil follows the same trend of thoughts regarding the death of his son Marcellus.

Certainly, "paternity" and the loss of a son, are central thematic links in *Ulysses* (that is why the ghost of *Hamlet* haunts the book). What Pogorzelski does is to associate it to Virgil and to Nationalism through Marcellus. First, once Marcellus and Rudy die, the lineage is discontinued. Second, "the association with Marcellus, . . . politizes Rudy"(102). The death of the son, (Marcellus, Rudy), announces the coflicts to come, in Virgil's Rome, in Joyce's Ireland. Again this is at a remove from a literal reading. It is another level of reading, the political level, where "Circe" enacts the "Problem of Succession"(107), namely, the absence of an heir.

Pogorzelski goes to the extreme and associates this discontinuity of lineage to fragmentation in narrative and style. "Circe" is, in this way also, an interruption in the narrative of *Ulysses*: "the discontinuities and anti-narrative style of "Circe" also suggests difficulties of style" (108). Those readers

who are not ready to go this far with Pogorzelski should take into consideration that he supports his arguments with the help of notorious critics, like Emer Nolan, Enda Duffy or David Quint, (111).

Chapter 5, "Virgil's Joycean Poetics," brings a "new" postmodern perspective on Virgil and eventually a "new" Virgil. "Discontinuity" is the essential postmodern feature that Pogorzelski imports from Frederic Jameson to embark on his original reading. Provoked by Imperialism, always according to Jameson (113), "discontinuities" point to the fragmentation of daily life, and this is true in both modern Ireland and ancient Rome, in "times of of violent and significant change" (11). Pogorzelski contemplates a variety of discontinuities. The first is "Familial Discontinuity" (115) and applies to Daedalus' "incomplete" stories and sculptures as he arrives at Cumae. Pogorzelski makes a considerable effort to make us see "incomplete" as "discontinuous." A second type of discontinuity is "semantic" and applies to the sibyl's prophecy (119). Prophecies have multiple meanings, and thus are semantically unstable, whereas the space between text and meaning mark the territory of --precisely-- "discontinuity" (120). A third kind of discontinuity to be seen in the *Aeneid* is "historical" (129) and concerns The Parade of Heroes. The parade is not ordered history, but rather a "discontinuous selection of vignettes" (130). Pogorzelski's undeniable merit and originality in this chapter is slightly marred by enthusiastic –and perhaps vague-- generalizations on discontinuity: "The problem lies in language itself. There is a gap between signifier and referent that renders semantic communication discontinuous" (125).

To conclude, Pogorzelski's *Virgil and Joyce: nationalism and imperialism in the Aeneid and Ulysses* is valuable for many reasons. First, the book exhausts almost all the possible parallels between Virgil and *Ulysses (*not *Finnegans Wake).* There is not much to be added after Pogorzelski's thorough reading. Secondly, a new Virgil is born in this book, the Virgil of Postmodernim. And thirdly, our understanding of "Nationalism" expands its original boundaries, as it is no longer "only" modern, no longer disconnected from the ancient past.

Ricardo Navarrete Franco
Universidad de Sevilla
rnavarrete@us.es

THOMAS HENDRICKSON (ed.), *Ancient Libraries and Renaissance Humanism. The* De bibliothecis *of Justus Lipsius,* Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 265 = Brill's Texts and Sources in Intellectual History, 20, Leiden - Boston: Brill, 2017, xiv+336 pp., $ 158.00, ISBN 978-90-04-33816-6.

During the international colloquium, "Iustus Lipsius Europae Lumen et Columen", held in Louvain in September 1997, Thomas D. Walker concluded his paper with the words: "There remains much to study about Lipsius the historian and his library treatise, especially regarding his sources. A new scholarly edition in English could be the core of such a project." Twenty years later this project found its realization with this nicely produced edition of Justus Lipsius's treatise *De bibliothecis syntagma*. In 1602, the famous Flemish scholar dedicated it to Charles of Croÿ, the fourth duke of Aarschot (1560-1612), and received in return a large silver-gilt cup of no less than 60.5 ounce (almost 2 kg), manufactured for £257. Charles of Croÿ was indeed a generous maecenas and notorious bibliophile, famous for his magnificent library, a large part of which he had inherited from his great-grandfather, the humanist Georgius Haloinus (= Georges d' Halluin in French, Joris van Halewijn in Dutch, c. 1472-1536). In a poem composed for his second wedding, in 1605, his rich library and his fondness of the Greek and Latin treasures it contained were eulogized as follows:

Bibliotheca micans, libris instructa peritis,
Solae deliciae, Graeca, Latina, tuae.

The scholar and the duke shared the same interests, not only in books and classical literature, but also in flowers and gardening. They even shared the same history, at least in part: they both had studied with the same Louvain professor of Latin, Cornelius Valerius ab Auwater (although not at the same time) and they both had switched to the Reformation before returning to the Catholic faith. No wonder then that they developed a close relationship, testified by some fifteen letters of their correspondence which are preserved, and by Lipsius's dedication of three of his works to the duke. With the dedication of the *De bibliothecis syntagma* Lipsius no doubt hoped to persuade the duke to leave his library to the University of Louvain. Until then there existed only a few libraries in the colleges and a number of others privately

owned by some professors. Lipsius's pupil and successor Erycius Puteanus stated in his *Auspicia Bibliothecae Publicae Lovaniensis* (Louvain, 1639, pp. 33-34): "Quot per urbem sparsa collegia et paedagogia, tot propemodum bibliothecae sunt; quot monasteria et coenobia, tot bibliothecae; quot professores et doctores, tot bibliothecae … Inter professores suam quisque possidet bibliothecam et aestimat." In Louvain the University library was founded only in 1636, thanks to the efforts of several personalities, such as the professor of theology Cornelius Jansenius (1585-1638), archbishop Jacobus Boonen, or the lawyer Gerardus Corselius (1568-1636). But before that date more and more initiatives were taken to promote and install public libraries all over Europe, such as the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana in Milan or the Bodleian in Oxford. Lipsius was of course acquainted with such initiatives, especially with those concerning the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, where his pupil Erycius Puteanus played an important role; they may have inspired him to this brief treatise of thirty-four pages, mainly offering a historical survey of libraries throughout Antiquity, but in the meantime designing an ideal library. In doing so Lipsius produced the first major library history of modern times, which met with immediate success and set the standard for library history for several centuries.

This volume begins with a fifty-eight page introduction that starts with underlining the importance of this treatise and the need for a new edition. After a brief presentation of Lipsius's career and an overview of library historiography in the Ancient World, during the Middle Ages and in the age of Humanism, the author focuses on the treatise itself, dealing with its title, the structure and purpose, with its ancient and contemporary sources. The introduction concludes with discussions of the print history, the editorial principles on which the present critical edition is established, and with a note on the commentary. After this long introduction come the Latin text and English translation on facing pages (59-163) and a substantial commentary of 140 pages (pp. 164-304), followed by a rich bibliography (pp. 305-319) and several indices (pp. 320-336).

As for the introduction, it is rather startling to discover the discrepancy between the text on p. 41, figure 2 on p. 45, and the list of editions on p. 46. On pp. 41 and 46 the 1666 edition is referred to as a^5, while in the figure one reads a^6 for this edition; the same goes for the 1702 edition, referred to in the figure as a^7, but on pp. 41 and 46 as a^6 leaving one to wonder how a^5 has disappeared in the figure. Following the bibliographical description in the *Bibliotheca Belgica* and elsewhere, the author systematically describes the 1614, 1620 and 1627 editions as printed in Helmstadt. It should be made clear that these editions were produced in Helmstedt, not in Helmstadt. Helmstadt is the name of a town in Bavaria and another one in Baden-Württemberg. Helmstedt (in earlier times also written Helmstädt) is now known because from the end of WW II until 1990 it was the most important border cross-

ing between the German Democratic Republic and West Germany. From 1576 until 1810 there was also a University: the Academia Julia, founded by and named after Duke Julius of Brunswick. It was in this town that Jacobus Lucius and his heirs printed the 1614, 1620, and 1627 editions of Lipsius's *De Bibliothecis*.

In presenting the Latin text, the editor has chosen to keep Lipsius's orthography, punctuation and even diacritical marks, because in his view they don't present a real obstacle for the reader. This may be true for the experienced reader of (Neo-)Latin texts, who has no difficulty with the long s, with the alternating use of i/j or u/v, or with the ligatures for ae/oe, but it surely could sometimes throw someone into confusion. Conversely, in order to improve readability and make cross-referencing more effective, Hendrickson has introduced numbered paragraphs and a sectioning of the text. For this matter, line-numbering would have been still more effective.

Furthermore the editor presents Lipsius's practice as the normal one in Early Modern times (p. 55), which is simply not true: it is not because in Lipsius's text "the comma indicates the shortest pause, the semicolon a slightly longer one, the colon slightly longer than that and the period longest of all", that this is also the case in other Neo-Latin texts, such as for instance in those of Juan Luis Vives. On the other hand it is perfectly true that the presence of a comma or accents can be helpful for a correct interpretation of a word or a sentence. So in pr. 1.3 (p. 66): "qui primus Regum illustrem habuit … is fuit Osymanduas, Aegypti". The comma suggests that the genitive "Aegypti" is to be interpreted as a genitive of place, not a possessive genitive; the translation thus should be: "The first king to have a famous library … was Ozymandias, in Egypt", not "… Ozymandias of Egypt". For the rest the Latin text is quite accurately edited, if not for a few typographical errors, the first of which unfortunately occurs at the very beginning (p. 60, pr. 1): "Bibiliothecis" instead of "Bibliothecis" (moreover, the small caps of the 1602 and 1607 edition have not been rendered, and in the translation "Libraries" is not in bold, as is the editor's practice in the rest of the text !). In the English translation and the commentary occur equally very few typos, e.g. on p. 111 (pr. 8.6) one should read "ignorant" instead of "ingorant" and on p. 229 : "Van Even" instead of "Van Evan" (also in the bibliography). In general the translation reads smoothly and proves to be faithful to Lipsius's ideas, but occasionally there might be some room for another or better interpretation. A few examples: in pr. 3 (pp. 60-61), a better translation for "Heuria tua, huic urbi in ore atque oculis" could be "your Heverlee, which is in this city's talk and sight", instead of "your Heverlee, right beneath the eyes of the city". And in pr. 4 (pp. 62-63), the Latin "Heuriam, Academiae nostrae suburbanum" is rendered by "Heverlee, home of our university". This statement is repeated on p. 164: "Heverlee, home to the Old University of Leuven". Unfortunately this does not fit the facts: it took until the twentieth

century before the University of Louvain expanded to neighbouring villages such as Heverlee; a better translation could be: "Heverlee, situated near to our University city". In the same paragraph a better translation for "in artium ingeniorumque praecipueque usum" could be: "for the benefit of the arts and *scholars* especially", instead of "for the benefit of the arts and *writers* especially" (my italics; idem dito in pr. 2.1).

Admittedly the most important and innovative part of this volume is the generous commentary, which not only provides the reader with abundant material on the ancient libraries discussed by Lipsius, but also on ancient and modern authors who have contributed to the subject. Here I will limit myself to a most remarkable observation concerning the phrase (pr. 4.4., p. 86): "Hoc enim opinor ἁπλὰ βιβλία dici". The editor comments on p. 222: "Lipsius has made an error in changing the phrase into the accusative: it should be ἁπλῶ βιβλία". I see no need for the use of the dual form; the only error here seems to be the use of the accent, which should read ἁπλᾶ, instead of ἁπλὰ.

The volume closes with no less than four indices: manuscripts – inscriptions and papyri – ancient authors and works – and a general index. A superficial control revealed the absence of several names, such as Jeanne of Hallewyn (p. 161), Philippe of Croÿ (p. 161), George of Hallewyn = Georgius Haloinus (p. 166), Johannes Oporinus (not: Operinus!) (p. 186 and n. 91, p. 188), Alexandre Bosquet (p. 229), Jean Scohier (p. 229).

But despite these small imperfections, this volume is a valuable contribution to the field of library history and of Lipsian scholarship.

G. Tournoy
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
gilbert.tournoy@kuleuven.be

L. Zurli, *Il* limen *(sottile) tra congettura e restituzione*, Perugia: Editrice Pliniana, 2016 (Centro Studi *Anthologia Latina*. Biblioteca 2), 150 pp., 45'00 €, ISBN 978-88-97830-41-2.

¿Considera el lector que es importante que se publique un nuevo libro sobre el viejo arte de la sanación del texto? Alguno podría objetar que el tema es tan antiguo como la Filología misma, o incluso que se trataría de una publicación de corte decimonónico. Sin embargo, basta con reparar en que el texto de todas y cada una de las obras que nos transmitieron griegos y romanos aún debe ser sanado en una cantidad de pasajes variable pero ciertamente no pequeña, y llegaremos a la razonable conclusión de que sí, que se trata de publicaciones importantes y de permanente actualidad, básicas en su sentido más propio.

Pero además me atrevería a decir que la publicación que ahora reseñamos cobra actualidad por aparecer en un momento en que la edición de textos clásicos parece querer superar los límites – en buena medida estériles – de sus propias dinámicas tradicionales entre editores 'conservadores' y 'conjeturales' o entre aproximaciones 'eclécticas' o 'rigurosamente estemáticas' a los textos transmitidos. Es más, la perspectiva digital que se abre ante nosotros invita incluso a superar divergencias formales o de método, como el alcance y función del aparato crítico[1].

Los medios actualmente a disposición de los editores permiten asimismo completar las colaciones de las tradiciones textuales de distintas obras y autores (una tarea – repárese en ello – aún no realizada para la mayoría de

[1] Sobre estas y otras cuestiones relativas a la tarea del editor, así como sobre las perspectivas que se abren ante nosotros, véase el reciente libro de Richard Tarrant, *Texts, editors, and readers. Methods and problems in Latin textual criticism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Como no podía ser de otro modo, el libro ha suscitado el oportuno debate: véanse por ejemplo, con remisiones a otros títulos recientes sobre el mismo tema, las reseñas de A. Ramírez de Verger (*Ecdotica* 13, 2016, 215-26), o G. Conte (*Gnomon* 89.1, 2017, 20-5), o mi artículo-reseña "In Search of Textual Heroes. Apropos a Recent Book on Textual Criticism" (*Paideia* 71.1, 2016, 159-67). También con el libro de Tarrant como telón de fondo, el artículo de Th. Keeline ("The apparatus criticus in the digital age", *CJ* 112.3, 2017, 342-63) se adentra en el interesante mundo de la digitalización de los textos clásicos y sus posibilidades hermenéuticas. Por no citar más que un par de importantes trabajos recientes sobre el tema, recuérdense G. Conte, *Ope ingenii: Esperienze di critica testuale*, Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2013 (véase la reseña de D. Butterfield en *ExClass* 19, 2015, 257-61), o bien P. Trovato, *Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Lachmann's Method. A Non-Standard Handbook of Genealogical Textual Criticism in the Age of Post-Structuralism, Cladistics, and Copy-Text*, Padua: libreriauniversitaria.it edizioni, 2014 (véase el artículo-reseña de D. Kiss, "Taking the Measure of Lachmann and Bédier: an Innovative Handbook of Textual Criticism", *ExClass* 20, 2016, 247-55).

obras después de tantos siglos de filología) y, a partir de ahí, elaborar los correspondientes comentarios crítico-textuales, lo que sin duda contribuiría a definir mejor el método de aproximación al texto (e.g. la mayor o menor necesidad de intervención *ope ingenii* en un pasaje determinado se puede calibrar mucho mejor tras la evidencia de *todos* los testimonios) y descargaría las futuras ediciones de buena parte de la información ya disponible en estos *parerga* previos.

Por otra parte, tanto la digitalización de los textos como la elaboración de estos comentarios textuales abren una perspectiva de trabajo de décadas para la Filología Clásica en lo que sería una suerte de *renovación por vuelta a los orígenes*. Desde luego, ésa es mi propuesta y ése sería mi deseo para nuestras disciplinas, que parecen verse sometidas en los últimos tiempos a una vana necesidad de autojustificarse y de demostrar su capacidad de renovación. Si la filología quiere mantener su esencia textual y no diluirse en estudios culturales, ahí tiene una tarea inmensa y apasionante en la que volcarse, una tarea intratextual que a su vez dará lugar, como siempre ha dado, a multitud de estudios paralelos de interpretación extratextual y metatextual.

Éste es, pues, el contexto en el que Loriano Zurli (en adelante, Z.) y el Centro Studi *Anthologia Latina* nos regalan este breve pero enjundioso libro sobre el arte de la conjetura, unas páginas que decepcionarán – creo – a muy pocos lectores interesados en la crítica del texto. Sí es posible, no obstante, que algún lector no encuentre en ellas lo que el título parece anunciar: una disquisición teórica sobre el arte de la conjetura. El propio autor parece ser consciente de ello cuando abre el libro con esta suerte de *recusatio* ('Premessa', p. 7): "Questo non è un manuale di critica del testo".

Mi principal objeción al libro – y, en general, la única – tiene que ver precisamente con el título, pues me da la impresión de que el autor se ha buscado innecesarias complicaciones: Z. recoge aquí un ramo de textos, pertenecientes a los ss. I-VI, que ilustran sobradamente la necesidad de intervención editorial, de sanación, y que vienen a demostrar por añadidura que la restitución definitiva de un pasaje es más un *desideratum* o una meta que una realidad verificable (*uid. infra*). Porque el título esconde, en realidad, una simple afirmación: el *limen* entre conjetura y restitución es sutil.

Ahora bien, colocar esta opinión – legítima – al frente de un libro obliga al autor a ofrecer una argumentación. Ésta ya viene anunciada en la misma 'Premessa' (p. 7): "Il presente saggio nasce dalla consapevolezza che, nella teoria come nella prassi editoriale, il divario tra congettura e restituzione diventa talora quasi impercettibile; e che l'emendazione *ope ingenii* – per quanto 'palmare' sia o possa sembrare – *vel raro vel numquam* può aspirare a sanare il testo (cui pure viene incollata con relativa stabilità) in maniera duratura e incontrovertibile". Después Z. ofrece algunas páginas dedicadas a esta argumentación teórica: primero, a modo de introducción, el capítulo que él titula (en inglés) "A pragmatical method" (9-25), y al cierre, el broche titulado

"A mo' di conclusione" (137-9). En la introducción Z. aboga por un 'método pragmático' con el que superar las viejas dinámicas entre "conservatorismo e interventismo" (o 'Korruptelenkult' vs *libido coniectandi*, por decirlo con la retórica vehemente de las viejas polémicas), y advierte de que "questa non è e non vuol essere una discussione di metodo, che pressume di insegnare teoricamente come si fa una congettura. È semmai un richiamo alla prudenza (l'ennesimo, sempre salutare però in filologia) che di per sé non implica né fiducia cieca né diffidenza preconcetta nei riguardi della congettura – delle possibilità della congettura" (9). Pretende, en definitiva, enseñar mediante ejemplos cuáles son las condiciones en que un texto reclama la intervención por conjetura, y cuáles son las propiedades que toda conjetura debe reunir de partida si quiere aspirar a ser aceptada como 'palmaria', esto es, a dejar en los lectores y críticos la sensación de que se ha 'restituido' la lectura genuina con que el texto fue redactado en su momento.

Aunque la distinción terminológica así expresada parece no presentar dificultades (*uid.* e.g. p. 17), en la práctica su sutileza hace que el propio Z. hable de estos conceptos siempre en términos relativos: "C'è un solo modo, efficace davvero (e comunque piú di altri), per mostrare che l'ultima parola non è mai detta: affiancare ad una congettura fino ad ora ritenuta palmare, un'altra che pretende di strapparle la palma (in modo da negarla pregiudizialmente a ciascuna delle due). Come dire che il compito del critico non è mai finito, e che da esempi (speriamo) istruttivi, se non anche sempre 'esemplari', forse si potrà ricavare un metodo, sicuramente imparare ad essere cauti" (17). O más claramente aún: "La congettura cosiddetta 'palmare' altro non rappresenta che l'ultimo stadio cui la critica testuale eventualmente perviene nel suo sforzo di restaurare il testo" (56), lo que vendría a implicar que no hay restitución realmente definitiva (más observaciones sobre el 'relativismo' de la conjetura en pp. 73 y 137-9). Esto queda en evidencia en esta afirmación, en la que Z. casi parece incurrir en contradicción terminológica: "A volte si fatica a comprendere come *restituzioni cosí palesemente sbagliate* abbiano avuto una fortuna incontrastata" (85; mis cursivas).

En estas páginas introductorias Z. dibuja una suerte de historia de los estilos y técnicas editoriales, jalonada de útiles advertencias a tirios y a troyanos sobre todo aquello que, en su opinión, el texto exige. Comparto, por ejemplo, estos recordatorios: "bisogna intanto convenire che per quanto ingrato, e superiore in certi casi alle forze del singolo editore il compito possa essere, non esistono scorciatoie in fase di *recensio codicum* e andrà perseguita l'esaustività. Sarebbero da eliminare i *codices inutiles* […]. Ma non ne conosco" (12-13); "L'esegesi è (o dovrebb'esser) la 'via' principale della critica del testo" (19). Especialmente valiosas me parecen sus observaciones (20-1) sobre la necesidad de prestar atención a la puntuación del texto, hasta el punto de que ésta llega a adquirir valor crítico en su propio establecimiento: es decir, hay casos en que un texto ha sido tenido por corrompido simplemente

porque no estaba bien puntuado (véase un ejemplo propuesto para Ovidio, en pp. 27-9).

El cuerpo del libro (pp. 27-136), no obstante, está formado por la discusión de una serie de pasajes a los que Z. ya ha dedicado trabajos anteriores, de ahí que la mayoría pertenezcan a la *Anthologia Salmasiana* a la que el autor ha dedicado tanta atención[2]. Se nos presenta, pues, una especie de *collected papers* en forma abreviada, con la eventual incorporación de *second thoughts* del autor sobre alguno de ellos. No es mi intención entrar a discutir aquí la validez de sus propuestas, que en unos casos me parecen más convincentes que en otros, pero sí creo que ofrecen un precioso espécimen de buena filología: de paciente rigor en el método y de brillantes dotes de inventiva para la solución de los problemas, probablemente los dos rasgos más deseables en la hechura del mejor crítico del texto.

Cierran el volumen un "Indice dei *loci* discussi" (141) y un "Index nominum rerumque notabilium" (143-7, a cargo de Maria Nicole Iulietto).

Luis Rivero García
Universidad de Huelva
lrivero@uhu.es

[2] He aquí el elenco de pasajes discutidos (recogidos en el correspondiente índice en p. 141): Ou. *met.* 6.585; 8.371; 12.216; 14.334, 671; 15.838; Pers. 2.9-10; 3.29, 56; 4.35; (ps-)Sen. *apoc.* 7.4-5; *Herc. Oet.* 1721; Petr. *fr.* 27 M. (= 38 Büch. = *Anth. Lat.* 465 R / 463 Sh. B.); *Alc. Barc.* 71-2; *Peruig. Ven.* 46; Repos. *conc.* 41; centón *Europa* 26, 31; centón *De ecclesia* 27-9; *Anonymi uersus serpentini*, *De Creon<te> et Medea* (*Anth. Lat.* 52 R), *De tumulo Achillis* (76 R); Luxor. 298 R, 336 R, 364 R; *VPS* (*Vnius poetae sylloge*) 99 R, 117.11-12 R, 123.4 R, 133 R, 142.1-2 R, 152 R, 154 R, 174 R, 196 R.