

Zitierhinweis

Lindermann, Jens-Olaf: review of: Leofranc Holford-Strevens (ed.), *Auli Gelli Noctes Atticae, Libri (XI-XX)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019, in: *Exemplaria Classica*, 26 (2022), p. 364-367, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33776/ec.v26.7422>, downloaded from Website

exemplaria
C L A S S I C A
Journal of Classical Philology

copyright

Dieser Beitrag kann vom Nutzer zu eigenen nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken heruntergeladen und/oder ausgedruckt werden. Darüber hinausgehende Nutzungen sind ohne weitere Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber nur im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Schrankenbestimmungen (§§ 44a-63a UrhG) zulässig.

productively, it must be taught to and read by undergraduates; grass roots matter for changing dominant scholarly paradigms.

Still, Boyle's commentary is a fine achievement overall. His appreciation of Seneca's dramatic power ensures a continued and welcome flourishing of scholarly interest in Senecan tragedy. For decades now, Boyle has been in the vanguard of a major Senecan revival; much of the progress made in the past forty years of Senecan studies is in some measure due to him. His current commentary on the *Agamemnon* indicates that this is still the case: its appeal is wide, its learning deep, and its zeal infectious. The volume leaves one with a lasting impression of the *Agamemnon*'s value, and of its pervasive influence over later European drama. With such a useful resource to hand, the *Agamemnon*'s stock will, it is hoped, continue to rise for a long time yet.

ERICA BEXLEY
Durham University
erica.m.bexley@durham.ac.uk

LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS, *Auli Gelli Noctes Atticae: Praefatio et Libri I-X*, Oxford Classical Texts, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2019, 464 pp., £50.00, ISBN 978-0-19-969501-0.

LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS, *Auli Gelli Noctes Atticae: Libri XI-XX*, Oxford Classical Texts, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2019, 384 pp., £50.00, ISBN 978-0-19-969502-7.

LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS (ed.), *Gelliana: a Textual Companion to the "Noctes Atticae" of Aulus Gellius*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2020, xx+204 pp., £65.00, ISBN 978-0-19-969393-1.

Another edition of Aulus Gellius is to be welcome, and this one certainly – to give back the slightly modified words, Holford-Strevens wrote in his *Wiener Studien* review of a commentary on the 9th book of Aulus Gellius in 2006, written by the reviewer¹. This review takes into account both Holford-Strevens' new critical Oxford edition of the *Noctes Atticae* and the *Gelliana*, a textual companion to this edition, which guide the reader through emendations and annotations made in the edition. Because I owe Holford-Strevens so much for his advice during my own Ph.D work, this review can of course not remain neutral, but tries however to be as detached as it can.

¹ This review was written during a research project thankfully granted by Gerda Henkel Stiftung (project: Die gromatischen Traktate des Iulius Frontinus – Wissenstransfer im Spannungsbogen von Vermessungstechnik und Recht im Römischen Reich, at Freie Universität Berlin, Department of Law, (Prof. Dr. Cosima Möller).

The structure of the two volumes edition is as follows: *Testimonia antiqua* (vii-x), the *praemonenda* (xi-l), with its sections *de codicibus* xi-xv, *de codicibus prioris partis* (xv-xx), *de codicibus alterius partis* (xx-xxviii), *de libris recentioribus* (xxviii-xxx), *de epitomis* (xxxi-xxxii), *de codicibus ex impressis descriptis correctis interpolatis* (xxxii-xxxiii), the famous *codex Buslidianus*² (xxxiii-xxxiv), *de ordine librorum* (xxxiv-xxxvi), *de florilegiis et excerptis* (xxxvii-xl), *de scribendi ratione* (xl-xlii), *de lemmatis* (xlii-xliii), *de ratione interpungendi* (xliii-xliv), *de apparatu critico* (xliv-xlix), *de ratione edendi* (xliv-l). The *Praemonenda* are followed by *notae* (li-liv; the *sigla* used in this edition), a *conspectus editorum Auli Gelli* (lv-lvii), the *signa codicum* (lix-lxiv), and then the text of the *Noctes* books i-x, (1-395; end of the first volume) and after a repeated *signa codicum* (v-ix), pp. 397-684 the second volume with the books xi-xx: the numeration of the pages runs through the two volumes, which is perfectly acceptable. After that comes a *conspectus editionum praeter Gellianas* (685-8), which contains the critical editions of other authors cited in the *Noctes*, a *conspectus studiorum* 689-720, and the *Indices*, i. *nominum propriorum* 721-52, i. *bibliothecarum* 752 and an i. *verborum praeter nomina propria selectorum* a) *Latinorum* 752-62, b) *Graecorum* 762-4.

The material, presented in the *Praemonenda*, is not in every sense completely new of course: The complete textual tradition of the twenty books preserved in the mss is twofold, one for the *praefatio* and the books i-viii of the *Noctes* and one for the books ix-xx and the *lemmata* of these books. Completely lost is the text of book viii and the *lemmata* of book xix. Comparing the Oxford edition of Marshall (1968) and this edition of Holford-Strevens, one can see the difference of both editions in the *sigla* on the very first blink: one page of *sigla* in Marshall's and six pages in Holford-Strevens' edition. *Tempus optimus adiutor* – some of the mss, Holford-Strevens has used, were discovered (or differently evaluated) after Marshall's edition and even Marshall had pointed out in his *Texts and Transmission* article³, that research hasn't come to an end yet. Progress can be also discovered in using the *florilegia*⁴ and, totally new in establishing the text, Holford-Strevens uses the medieval *epitoma* of Gellius. I can only consent with Kiss in his *BMCR*⁵ review, that «It would be hard to find another recent editor of a classical text who has expanded our knowledge of the sources so radically.» Therefore there are much more *signa codicum*, and also

² The famous now lost codex Buslidianus B^U (Marshall β) was probably written not before 1469. It dates (Holford-Strevens, xxxiv) from the end of the 15th century. Because most of its readings are preserved by Louis Carrion (Ludovico Carrio Brugensis, ca. 1547-1595), notoriously suspected for his forgeries, it is difficult to evaluate the value of his readings. Holford-Strevens has accepted the textual additions of B^U in 1.1.3. *quanta longinquitas corporis ei mensurae conveniret* (om. E), because it makes the sentence understandable.

³ Marshall, "Aulus Gellius", in Reynolds *et al.*, eds., *Texts and Transmission*, Oxford 1983, 176-80.

⁴ The Φ tradition (s. xi) with seven mss and the φ with two mss. (s. xii) by William of Malmesbury.

⁵ Daniél Kiss review *Aulus Gellius: Attic Nights, preface and books* (Auli Gelli Noctes Atticae: Praefatio et Libri) see <https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2021/2021.12.34/>.

the *recentiorum signa* used and imprinted by Hertz or by Cavazza. It is, by the way, a little bit confusing, that this list is interrupted by the critical abbreviations which are printed between the *florilegia* and the *recentiorum signa* – not only in vol. 1, but also with an apparatus in vol. 2. Beside the *apparatus criticus* Holford-Strevens also provides us with a *apparatus fontium*, which contains cross-references of Gellius himself and the classic authors, he has cited.

The *praemonenda* are written in a Latin, that is inspired by the great humanists⁶. Also inspired by these *studiosissimi* is, I think, the abundance of knowledge spread out on this *tabula eruditionis* – sometimes, as I am afraid, not so helpful in its mass, as it is surely intended. Although Holford-Strevens, as I noted, has a favour for short *asyndeta*, the information given exceeds its use, for example on xli (*de scribendi ratione*), when the writing of *res publica* or *ius iurandum* is discussed with examples of French (*ledit ladite*), of German (*der Hohepriester*), of Polish (*rzeczpospolita*) and of Plautus' *miles*. Here and on quite a lot of occasions, the German proverb «In der Kürze liegt die Würze» would have been given a more precise information.

I would like to skip an extended discussion about the textual decisions made by Holford-Strevens in his text, thanking him by the way, that he had accepted my correction of *non ex vulgari<a> consuetudine* in 9.1.8: All textual decisions are that of the editor and in using the edition, there is the opportunity to accept or to decline these decisions. Furthermore the sheer amount of changes made by Holford-Strevens makes it impossible to discuss it in a review. I therefore would like to stress one decision, that hasn't convinced me: Gellius has written in *praef. 25 capita rerum quae cuique commentario insunt exposuimus hic universa, ut statim declaretur quid quoque in libro quaeri inveniri que possit* (= All chapter titles of these books I gathered here in total in order to make it clear at once, [A] ...what in which book can be looked up and found or [B] ...what in the book too can be looked up and found.) [A] is leading us to the conclusion Holford-Strevens has made, when he completely excludes the chapter titles from the text and places the headings in the table of contents, that was preserved, with the *praefatio*, in a single volume in the archetype. [B] on the other side can be interpreted in a way, that the *tituli* of the single chapters were not only stored in the volume that contains the *praefatio*, but that they could also be found again as *lemmata* in the single books. For that interpretation, one could also use the phrase *hic universa* (= here in total): Is this an exclusive or inclusive description? I personally favour the

⁶ Personally I doubt, that this 'holy' tradition is of any use beside the fact, that it shows the ability of the editor to write in Neolatin, which says nothing about his editorial capabilities and competence; the prefaces of editions in Old Greek are inconsequentially not written in Greek, editions of Middle-English authors not written in Middle-English. Modern technology therefore urges the author (and also Holford-Strevens) to use such terms like *luce quam vocant ultravioletacea* (xii) or *in officina Heidelberger Digitalisierungszentrum*. Beside the Latinization of names is not consequently done. Holford-Strevens writes *a Angelo Maio* (xii) and *post Hertzium Hosium Marshallium* (xlviii) or *cum Housmanno* (xlix) but not his own name at the end of the *praemonenda* nor all names in the footnotes.

second option. Be it as it may – it would have been more «user-friendly» to print the *tituli* over the chapter and not under them as HS has chosen (which would be also acceptable, if one will follow Holford-Strevens' decision, that the *lemmata* over the single chapters are an addition later made by the medieval scribes). Connected with this question too is the use of Greek numbers for indicating these chapters, which Holford-Strevens has deduced from mss. *V*, *C* and *B* (*praemonenda*, xliii). Gellius himself only has used Latin numeration, so using Greek letters in the chapters was probably not his manner. Beside that Greek letters would have been leading to greater confusion in the order of chapters during the textual tradition, e.g. ΙΔ or ΙΑ, ΙΕ or ΙΦ, Γ, Ι, Γ or Ε, Φ or Θ and *vice versa*.

The *Gelliana* too are concise, learned and helpful. They offer on 165 pages the discussions of the textual decisions in an admirably condensed way. Before this there are the Prolegomena (ix-xv), containing some of the reasons for making this edition, a note on Christianisms (xvi-xvii), where some misspellings of Christian scribes are listed (e.g. *ecclesias* for *et Ctesias* in ms. δ 9.4.3), conventions (xviii) and abbreviations of often used standard literature. The discussion of the single books is followed by *Appendix* with *emendata* of Holford-Strevens' book 2004, and 2003 and its reprints, «editions and translations cited by originator alone» (181-2), another bibliography (183-99), and another concise *Index* (201-4). In the *Gelliana* Holford-Strevens shows on what careful balanced fundament he has edited the *Noctes*. His *Gelliana* is an outstanding entry to the text. I therefore would advice the reader to use for a certain passage the *Gelliana* first, and the *apparatus* afterwards. Holford-Strevens' edition combines a lifelong dedication to the author with an excellent sensitivity for Gellius' style, with the necessary cautiousness in evaluating the textual variants and in judging the emendations. It naturally will be the standard edition of Gellius. *Atque ego avide statim pergo ad libros*; I would welcome it, if Holford-Strevens soon would publish a commentary on the *Noctes Atticae*.

JENS-OLAF LINDERMANN
Freie Universität Berlin
j.lindermann@fu-berlin.de

TIM WHITMARSH, *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon books I-II*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge-New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020, 294 pp., \$99.99, ISBN 978-1-107-19036-8.

Coincidiendo con el quincuagésimo aniversario de The Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics Series, este 2020 apareció la edición y el comentario de los dos primeros libros de *Leucippa* y *Clitofonte* a cargo de Tim Whitmarsh. Se trata del