

RESEÑAS
REVIEWS

JACQUES A. BROMBERG, PETER BURIAN, eds., *A Companion to Aeschylus*, Blackwell companions to the ancient world, Hoboken: Wiley, 2023, xx+572 pp., ISBN 978-1-405-18804-3.

Il volume, frutto della collaborazione di studiosi di chiara fama e ricercatori emergenti, nasce con l'intento di offrire un'ampia panoramica degli studi attuali su Eschilo – perlomeno di area anglofona – coprendo una ricca serie di argomenti (profilo biografico e storico-letterario, aspetti tematici, strutturali e performativi, contesto politico e sociale, ricezione antica, orientamenti critici e rivisitazioni moderne) e combinando l'informazione di base con la ricerca di chiavi di lettura nuove o comunque divergenti. All'introduzione di P. Burian (*Aeschylus and his Place in History*, pp. 1-11) seguono i contributi, articolati in quattro sezioni: la prima (*Aeschylus in His Time*) è dedicata al contesto storico-culturale in cui visse il poeta. R.W. Wallace (*Democracy's Age of Bronze: Aeschylus's Plays and Athenian History, 508/7–454 BCE*, pp. 15-26) esplora il rapporto fra le tragedie superstiti di Eschilo e la democrazia ateniese: il suo progressivo sviluppo coincide in gran parte con la carriera del tragediografo, che mette al centro dei suoi drammi alcuni dei temi più caldi e problematici del dibattito politico a lui coevo, come il rapporto fra Greci e barbari, fra libertà e tirannide, oppure il ruolo della donna nella società. Riguardo a quest'ultimo punto Wallace condivide l'idea di R. Winnington-Ingram secondo cui il poeta, presentando i personaggi femminili in termini per lo più positivi, rivela di non condividere l'umiliazione della donna nella società ateniese, che progredisce di pari passo con la democrazia. P.J. Finglass (*Aeschylus, Lyric and Epic*, pp. 27-39; *Tragedy before Aeschylus*, pp. 40-6) ricostruisce il retroterra letterario della produzione del poeta, indagando sui suoi rapporti con la lirica arcaica (in particolare con Stesicoro, con cui Eschilo ha diversi e notevoli punti di contatto), con l'epica e con la tragedia primitiva: impresa non facile dato lo stato frammentario delle nostre conoscenze, e tuttavia i pochi dati a disposizione consentono di apprezzare la capacità del poeta di distanziarsi da ciò che lo aveva preceduto grazie alla sua creatività. Altrettanto problematica, e per le stesse ragioni, è la questione dei rapporti tra Eschilo e il pensiero filosofico, oggetto del contributo di J.A. Bromberg (*Aeschylean Drama and Intellectual History*, pp. 47-60): si è più volte tentato di trovare un collegamento fra passi delle tragedie e frammenti di questo o quel pensatore presocratico, ma non sempre la convergenza è prova di un'effettiva influenza, giacché potrebbe spiegarsi con una comune derivazione da un sapere tradizionale condiviso. Un capitolo significativo della vita di Eschilo è rappresentato dai suoi soggiorni in Sicilia, di cui tratta M. Bell III nell'ultimo contributo della sezione (*Aeschylus in Sicily between Tyranny and Democracy*, pp. 61-73); durante il primo di questi soggiorni (probabilmente intorno al 471) il poeta rappresentò i *Persiani* e le *Etnee* su invito del tiranno di Siracusa Ierone. Delle *Etnee* l'autore propone una ricostruzione a

partire dalle esigue testimonianze superstiti, includendo tra queste, sulla scia di Eduard Fraenkel, anche il controverso ‘frammento di Dike’ (F 281a R.)¹.

Il cuore del volume è costituito dalla seconda sezione (*Aeschylus as Playwright*), che tratta specificamente della produzione eschilea. I primi sette contributi hanno per oggetto le tragedie superstiti (A. Garvie, *Persians*, pp. 77-87; I. Torrance, *Seven against Thebes*, pp. 88-98; R. Futo Kennedy, *Fear of Foreign Women in Aeschylus's Suppliants*, pp. 99-113; D.H. Porter, *Disorder, Resolution and Language: The Oresteia*, pp. 114-29; P. Burian, *Eumenides: Justice, Gender, the Gods and the City*, pp. 130-44; K. Ormand, *Intertheatricality and Narrative Structure in the Electra Plays*, pp. 145-57; I.A. Ruffell, *Prometheus Bound: The Principle of Hope*, pp. 158-70). Gli altri saggi trattano delle tragedie frammentarie (A. Podlecki, *Slices from Aeschylus's Feast: The Fragmentary Works*, pp. 171-84), dei drammi satireschi, un genere nel quale gli antichi riconoscevano a Eschilo una sorta di primato (C. Shaw, *Aeschylean Satyr Drama*, pp. 185-200) e di altri aspetti della sua drammaturgia, dall'impianto tetralogico al rapporto tra parola e rappresentazione scenica, dalla musica al linguaggio. In particolare, A.H. Sommerstein (*The Tetralogy*, pp. 201-13) propone una sintesi delle tetralogie attestate (su questo argomento si veda anche il citato contributo di Podlecki) e di quelle ricostruibili congetturalmente, con un'utile tavola sinottica relativa ad ambientazione, genere del coro, arco temporale della vicenda per ciascuna delle tre tragedie. A.C. Duncan (*Visualizing the Stage*, pp. 214-29) evidenzia l'unitarietà dell'esperienza teatrale e il legame funzionale fra metafore e «material anchors», elementi fisicamente presenti sulla scena che aiutano la comprensione delle metafore. E. Stehle (*The Choruses of Aeschylus*, pp. 230-41) analizza forma, struttura e contenuto delle parti corali, giungendo alla conclusione che il poeta, nelle tragedie che concludevano una trilogia, sceglie di affidare ai cori composti da donne o divinità femminili il ruolo di rappresentare la base su cui un nuovo ordine sociale può essere instaurato. N. Weiss (*Music, Dance and Metre in Aeschylean Tragedy*, pp. 242-53) tenta una ricostruzione degli aspetti musicali e coreutici dell'opera eschilea sulla base di quanto si può ricavare dal testo stesso (soprattutto dal metro e dai passi autoreferenziali in cui il coro si concentra sul canto e sulla danza che sta eseguendo) e dalle testimonianze antiche (prime fra tutte le *Rane* di Aristofane e la *Vita Aeschyli*). R.B. Rutherford (*Aeschylus: Language and Style*, pp. 254-66) sonda le asperità dello stile eschileo, che già suscitava critiche ai tempi di Aristofane, e ne analizza gli elementi: tra questi, creazione di nuovi vocaboli spesso composti, impiego frequente di invocazioni rituali, di metafore e immagini che a volte si materializzano in essenze concrete nello stesso dramma o in un altro della stessa trilogia. Chiude la sezione un capitolo dedicato al trattamento eschileo del mito (A. Park, *The Long View in Aeschylus: Intergenerational Myth-Making*

¹ La proposta di Fraenkel di assegnare il frammento alle *Etnee* non è universalmente condivisa; mi permetto di rinviare al mio articolo “Il ‘Frammento di Dike’ (Aesch. F 281a R.): uno *status quaestionis* sui problemi testuali ed esegetici”, *Lexis* 28, 2010, 133-54.

through the “Other”, pp. 267-79), esaminato con particolare riferimento a due aspetti: il ruolo di primo piano che il poeta spesso assegna ai personaggi femminili o non greci (basti pensare a Clitemnestra nell’*Oresteia*, o alle Danaidi, donne e al tempo stesso straniere) – categorie ‘altre’ che nell’Atene coeva occupavano posizioni marginali – e la narrazione intergenerazionale, nella quale ogni vicenda è inserita nel contesto più ampio di una storia che abbraccia più generazioni.

La terza sezione (*Aeschylus and Greek Society*) indaga la posizione di Eschilo rispetto ad alcune tematiche di ampia rilevanza sociale e antropologica, come la religione, la giustizia e il diritto, la guerra, l’imperialismo. R. Seaford (*Aeschylus and Subversion of Ritual*, pp. 283-94) si sofferma su diverse situazioni che, soprattutto in virtù delle parole usate dai personaggi, si configurano come rituali ‘sovvertiti’ con esito funesto o comunque negativo (ad esempio, lo spargimento del sangue di Agamennone, con i tre colpi inferti, è accostato da Clitemnestra alle triplici libagioni; le Danaidi prospettano a Pelasgo la minaccia di impiccarsi alle statue degli dei in termini che alludono all’uso di appendere tavolette votive). A. Shilo (*Ghost, Demons and Gods: Supernatural Challenges*, pp. 295-309) analizza le presenze soprannaturali nel teatro eschileo, evidenziando fra l’altro la natura contraddittoria, non sempre pienamente positiva, con cui sono tratteggiate le divinità. S. Nooter (*Inscribing Justice in Aeschylean Drama*, pp. 310-22) esamina le metafore e le immagini associate all’idea di giustizia (particolarmente ricorrente quella della scrittura, che evoca il concetto di qualcosa di stabile, permanente e che offre garanzie per il futuro; ma al tempo stesso suggerisce un modello di giustizia ‘differita’ che si contrappone alla violenza della vendetta immediata). S. Derbew (*Race in Aeschylus’s Suppliant Women and Persians*, pp. 323-33) mostra come Eschilo, nel tratteggiare l’alterità degli stranieri (le Danaidi o i Persiani) metta in luce la precarietà di distinzioni troppo nette basate su criteri quali il colore della pelle o il vestito. S. Roy (*Aeschylus’s Persians and the “Just War”*, pp. 334-45) interpreta lo scontro fra Greci e Persiani nella tragedia eschilea alla luce della teoria del *bellum iustum*, la cui codificazione risale a Sant’Agostino e soprattutto a San Tommaso d’Aquino, ma di cui si rinvencono anticipazioni anche nel pensiero antico. E. Baragwanath (*Aeschylus and History*, pp. 346-60) si sofferma in particolare sulla definizione dell’alterità nei *Persiani* e nelle *Supplici*, suscettibile (forse già per i contemporanei) di interpretazioni diverse, e in ogni caso problematica e aliena da quelle contrapposizioni e categorizzazioni troppo rigide a volte presupposte dai moderni interpreti. F.S. Naiden (*Aeschylus and Athenian Law*, pp. 361-72) analizza gli aspetti giuridici di *Supplici* ed *Eumenidi* in relazione, rispettivamente, al diritto dei supplici e alle procedure processuali in uso nell’Atene del V secolo. D. Rosenbloom (*Aeschylus’s Athens between Hegemony and Empire*, pp. 373-88) mostra come nei *Persiani* e nell’*Oresteia* il potere e le guerre di conquista siano presentati come atti di *hybris*, laddove nelle *Eumenidi* il modello positivo è rappresentato dall’Areopago, garante e ispiratore, assieme al culto delle Eumenidi, di quel rispetto (*sebas*) e di quella giusta paura

(*phobos*) che costituiscono fondamenti imprescindibili della legalità e del vivere civile.

I contributi dell'ultima sezione (*The Influence of Aeschylus*) riguardano la fortuna del poeta dall'antichità a oggi. Il primo (M. Griffith, *Critical Approaches to Aeschylus, from the Nineteenth Century to the Present*, pp. 391-411) propone una rassegna della letteratura critica degli ultimi due secoli. C.W. Marshall (*The Reception of Aeschylus in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries*, pp. 412-24), esaminando le allusioni a Eschilo contenute in Euripide e nei comici, ipotizza possibili repliche dei suoi drammi nel tardo V secolo (tra cui una dell'*Oresteia* negli anni intorno al 420 e una dei *Sette* prima del 409)² e nota come invece dal IV secolo in poi egli non abbia goduto di particolare popolarità. M. McCall (*The Transmission of Aeschylus: The Miracle of Survival*, pp. 425-36) traccia una storia del testo dei drammi 'miracolosamente' sopravvissuti alla fine del mondo antico, dal momento della composizione (che egli ritiene sia avvenuta solo oralmente e mnemonicamente; solo dopo la rappresentazione il testo sarebbe stato fissato per iscritto) alle prime edizioni a stampa, soffermandosi in particolare sulla tradizione manoscritta medievale che fa capo al celebre *Laurentianus* plut. 32.9. D.H. Roberts (*The Bow of Ulysses: Aeschylus and his Translators*, pp. 437-54) esamina alcune traduzioni moderne di Eschilo in lingua inglese. Alle riprese del mito di Prometeo in età moderna, soprattutto dal XVIII secolo in poi, è dedicato il saggio di Th. Ziolkowsky (*Variations on a Theme: Prometheus*, pp. 455-66): il Titano è stato oggetto di rappresentazioni ambivalenti, ora positive ora negative, e assunto come eroe di ideologie contrapposte. La ricezione dell'*Oresteia* è invece il tema di ben tre contributi: A. Lecznar, *Myth, History and Revolution in the Nineteenth-Century Reception of the Oresteia*, pp. 467-78, sulla sua fortuna nell'Ottocento; V. Liapis, *Three Landmarks in the Reception of the Oresteia in Twentieth-Century Drama*, pp. 479-90, sulle rielaborazioni da parte di E. O'Neill (*Mourning Becomes Electra*, 1931), Th.S. Eliot (*The Family Reunion*, 1939) e J.-P. Sartre (*Les Mouches*, 1943); H.R. Marshall, *Oresteia on Stage: Koun, Stein, Hall and Mnouchkine*, pp. 491-504) su alcune rappresentazioni della trilogia negli anni Ottanta-Novanta del secolo scorso. H.P. Foley (*Transforming Aeschylus on the Modern Stage*, pp. 505-17) discute invece le rappresentazioni/adattamenti moderni delle altre tragedie eschilee. La natura eminentemente politica del teatro di Eschilo ne rende possibile l'uso 'impegnato' a sostegno di cause politiche o di promozione sociale: gli esempi di questo «applied theatre» riferito a Eschilo sono discussi da P. Meineck (*Applied Aeschylus*, pp. 518-32). Infine, R. Mitchell-Boyask (*Teaching the Oresteia as a Work for the Theatre*, pp. 533-43) presenta un possibile uso didattico dell'*Oresteia* nell'ambito di un'esperienza teatrale in una classe scolastica; l'occasione offre lo spunto per riconsiderare anche alcuni

² Per una rassegna completa dei drammi eschilei oggetto di possibili repliche ai tempi di Aristofane si veda già l'elenco di Radt in *TrGF* III 56-7.

problemi filologici come attribuzione delle battute, distribuzione dei ruoli tra gli attori, movimenti scenici ecc.

Nell'*Epilogue* (pp. 544-57), J.A. Bromberg, coeditore del volume, illustra la storia della sua genesi e l'articolazione dei contenuti, e dà conto anche di una scelta precisa (p. 547): ciò che è stato chiesto agli autori dei contributi è stato «to avoid encyclopaedic treatments of their subjects (as many such resources already exist for students of Greek literature), but to stake out a unique claim and invest in making an argument that might showcase their interests, research methodologies, and descriptive styles». Questa scelta spiega, per esempio, alcune chiavi di lettura fortemente 'orientate' come quella di Garvie, che ridimensiona la 'storicità' dei *Persiani* a vantaggio della loro iscrizione nella tradizione epica del *nostos*; oppure quella di Futo Kennedy, che vede nelle *Supplici* non tanto una celebrazione dell'accoglienza quanto piuttosto, soprattutto nella ricezione da parte del pubblico ateniese, una rappresentazione dei pericoli insiti nell'immigrazione. Alcune di queste proposte esegetiche non mancheranno di suscitare discussioni; per limitarci all'esempio citato delle *Supplici*, è lecito domandarsi come si possa conciliare l'interpretazione, per così dire, 'xenofoba' con la nota rappresentazione di Atene come città ospitale e aperta che è uno dei cardini della propaganda politica del V secolo e dell'immagine che gli Ateniesi avevano di sé (basti citare le celebri parole dell'epitafio di Pericle in Tucidide II 39, 1 τὴν τε γὰρ πόλιν κοινὴν παρέχομεν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε ξενηλασίαις ἀπείργομέν τινα ἢ μαθήματος ἢ θεάματος, ὃ μὴ κρυφθὲν ἂν τις τῶν πολέμιων ἰδὼν ὠφεληθείη). Gli Ateniesi potevano benissimo, senza avvertire troppa contraddizione, considerarsi i più ospitali tra i Greci (e dunque, presumibilmente, leggere il dramma di Eschilo come un'esaltazione dell'ospitalità, come la maggior parte della critica moderna) e poi votare leggi restrittive contro gli stranieri; esattamente come potevano, qualche decennio dopo, applaudire le commedie antibelliciste di Aristofane in teatro e appoggiare Cleone nell'Assemblea. Senza considerare che, al di là di quel che poteva pensare il pubblico delle *Supplici* – ed è bene ricordare che non lo sappiamo; l'unica cosa certa è che l'intera trilogia ottenne il primo premio – sarebbe prioritario capire che cosa pensava l'autore, o che cosa voleva (o si aspettava) che pensassero gli spettatori. Il fatto che la decisione di concedere ospitalità e protezione alle Danaidi venga assunta dall'assemblea di Argo all'unanimità (πανδημία, v. 607) e senza tentennamenti (οὐ διχορρόπως, v. 605) da questo punto di vista è significativo, soprattutto se confrontato con l'esito incertissimo della votazione dei giudici areopagiti nelle *Eumenidi*: evidentemente per Eschilo l'accoglienza degli stranieri era, e poteva apparire anche dal punto di vista della collettività, meno problematica dell'assoluzione di un matricida.

Nell'insieme, comunque, tutti i contributi sono scritti con ricchezza di informazioni e rigore scientifico, e si può senz'altro affermare che l'obiettivo stabilito dai curatori è stato fundamentalmente raggiunto. Un aspetto particolarmente utile alla fruizione è che ogni capitolo, prima della bibliografia finale, presenta un trafiletto intitolato *Further Reading*, in cui si suggeriscono

possibili percorsi di approfondimento critico. Le bibliografie sono aggiornate agli anni 2021-22, anche se – *fremant omnes licet, dicam quod sentio* – la scelta di includervi quasi esclusivamente la produzione scientifica in lingua inglese (scelta adottata da quasi tutti gli autori, con qualche lodevole eccezione come il saggio di Shaw sul dramma satiresco o, per ragioni più che comprensibili, quello di Griffith sugli studi eschilei), che rispecchia una tendenza ormai consolidata in tutti gli studi, non solo classici, costituisce a nostro avviso un limite non da poco rispetto a un'informazione completa sugli orientamenti critici della ricerca. Per limitarci all'ambito italiano, dispiace, per esempio, non vedere mai menzionati studiosi del calibro di Vincenzo Di Benedetto o Carles Miralles, che a Eschilo hanno dedicato pagine fondamentali³; o che un nome come quello di Vittorio Citti – anima degli studi eschilei in Italia negli ultimi decenni (fino alla sua scomparsa nel dicembre dello scorso anno)⁴ e coordinatore di un importante progetto editoriale che prevede la pubblicazione, sotto gli auspici dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, di una nuova edizione critica con traduzione e commento di tutta l'opera superstita di Eschilo, inclusi i frammenti⁵ – figuri solo nel citato saggio di Griffith. A parte questo, il volume costituirà senz'altro un punto di riferimento imprescindibile per gli studiosi negli anni a venire.

Di seguito proponiamo alcune marginali osservazioni critiche e correzioni di refusi.

p. 6 «*Aitniai*» (leggasi *Aitnaiai*).

p. 7: la citazione di Pausania è tratta da I 21, 2, e non I 21, 1. Nella stessa pagina, «Pausnias» va corretto in «Pausanias».

p. 9 «Casssandra»: «Cassandra».

p. 45 «He [*scil.* Pratina di Fliunte] first competed between 499 and 496»: in effetti non sappiamo se questa fosse la prima volta in cui gareggiava. Il lemma biografico di Suda π 2230, da cui deriva la notizia, dice solo che in quell'occasione egli ebbe come concorrenti (ἀντηγωνίζετο, che sarebbe un verbo insolito per designare il debutto) Cherilo ed Eschilo; per altri poeti, quando indica la loro prima partecipazione agli agoni, il lessicografo ricorre solitamente a un frasario più esplicito (es. ε 3657 Εὐπολις ... ἑπτακαίδεκα ἔτη

³ Basti ricordare almeno V. Di Benedetto, *L'ideologia del potere e la tragedia greca. Ricerche su Eschilo*, Torino 1978; C. Miralles, *Tragedia y politica en Esquilo*, Barcelona 1968.

⁴ Non è questa la sede per un resoconto dettagliato della vasta produzione di Vittorio Citti su Eschilo; mi limito a citare *Il linguaggio religioso e liturgico nelle tragedie di Eschilo*, Bologna 1962 (unico lavoro menzionato nel saggio di Griffith); *Tragedia e lotta di classe in Grecia*, Napoli 1978; *Eschilo e la lexis tragica*, Amsterdam 1994; *Studi sul testo delle Coefore*, Amsterdam 2006; e l'edizione delle *Supplici* curata insieme a C. Miralles e Liana Lomiento (cfr. la nota seguente) e preceduta da numerosi studi preparatori.

⁵ Sono stati già pubblicati l'*Agamennone* a cura di Enrico Medda (Roma 2017) e le *Supplici* a cura di Carles Miralles, Vittorio Citti e Liana Lomiento (Roma 2019); anche questi lavori, *ça va sans dire*, vengono ignorati nel corso del volume.

γεγονὼς ἤρξατο ἐπιδείκνυσθαι; 1487 Ἴων, Χῖος, τραγικὸς ... ἤρξατο δὲ τὰς τραγωδίας διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῆς πρὸ Ὀλυμπιάδος). Semmai, è per Eschilo che si può ipotizzare che concorresse allora per la prima volta; cfr. il lemma αἰ 357 = Aesch. T 2, 4 Radt ἡγωνίζετο δὲ αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ ἑθ' Ὀλυμπιάδι ἐτῶν ὧν κε', dove forse αὐτὸς è da correggere in πρῶτος (da intendere avverbialmente nel senso di πρῶτον, cfr. Radt, appar. ad l.).

p. 48: la citazione di *Cho.* 741-42 in realtà si riferisce a 471-72.

p. 52 «Iamblichus» (i.e. Iamblichus).

p. 66: a proposito del fr. 6 Radt delle *Etnee*, si afferma che «the chorus appears to be questioned by an unidentified speaker». In realtà che uno dei parlanti sia il corifeo è possibile, ma sarà con tutta probabilità quello che pone le domande, non quello che le riceve. Quest'ultimo è invece qualcuno che conosce la volontà di Zeus, giacché al v. 2 dice che è stato Zeus a stabilire il nome dei divini gemelli Palici, nati dalla sua relazione con la ninfa siciliana Talia, e al v. 4 ne spiega l'etimologia da πάλιν ἵκειν, “tornare indietro”; probabilmente si tratta di Hermes o di qualche altra divinità. Una situazione simile si trova nel fr. 281a R. ('Frammento di Dike'), in cui il corifeo dialoga con Dike ponendole domande a cui lei risponde.

– *ibid.*: «when her [*scil.* di Talia] time came she returned and her sons were born in the light»: come si evince chiaramente da Macrobio, non è Talia che “ritorna” ma solo i suoi figli (*Sat.* V 9, 18 *Sed ubi venit tempus maturitatis infantum quos alvo illa gestaverat, reclusa terra est, et duo infantes de alvo Thaliae progressi emergerunt appellatique sunt Palici* ἀπὸ τοῦ πάλιν ἰκέσθαι, *quoniam prius in terram mersi denuo inde reversi sunt*).

p. 95: riguardo al rimprovero di Eteocle alle donne tebane (*Sept.* 200-1), contenente l'invito a starsene a casa e non occuparsi della guerra che appartiene invece ai maschi, si cita per contrasto l'*Iliade*, in cui le donne hanno invece molta più libertà di parola e di azione. E tuttavia andrebbe ricordato che già in Omero, al termine del celebre incontro descritto nel VI libro del poema, Ettore rivolge ad Andromaca un invito simile, sia pure in termini meno bruschi (vv. 490-93): ἀλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα τὰ σ' αὐτῆς ἔργα κόμιζε / ἰστόν τ' ἡλακάτην τε, καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι κέλευε / ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεςσι μελήσει / πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοί, τοι Ἰλίου ἐγγεγάσιν. E soprattutto, che i sentimenti della maggior parte degli Ateniesi nei confronti delle donne non erano troppo diversi da quelli di Eteocle, come si può desumere facilmente dal fatto che nella *Lisistrata* di Aristofane (506ss.) la protagonista rinfaccia al Probulo come un atteggiamento usuale tra i maschi ateniesi proprio il loro modo brutale e spiccio di rispondere alle mogli ogni volta che tentavano di interessarsi agli affari della città (e non è un caso che il passo

si concluda proprio con una citazione dell'omerico πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει al v. 520!).

p. 100: se è vero che le *Supplici* rappresentano la prima testimonianza dell'istituto dei meteci, sarebbe però utile notare che il termine μέτοικος è già usato da Eschilo in *Pers.* 319 e *Sept.* 548.

p. 105 «clothing marking them as *barbarai*»: ovviamente βάρβαρος nel greco classico è un aggettivo a due uscite, quindi è più corretto *barbaroi*.

p. 204: che Galeno citi il fr. 170 R. sotto il titolo *Xantriai* e il 185 R. sotto il titolo *Pentheus* effettivamente non è una prova inconfutabile della distinzione dei due drammi; ma più che pensare alla caduta del titolo alternativo in una delle citazioni (es. <Πενθεῖ ἦ> Ξαντρίαις, come propone Sommerstein) invocherei il fatto che Galeno probabilmente citava di seconda mano (dunque, senza avere conoscenza diretta del dramma), e le informazioni che fornisce potrebbero derivare da fonti diverse in cui era usato l'uno o l'altro titolo.

p. 222 «ekkykēlma», lapsus per «ekkyklēma»; osserverei però che il suo impiego nel teatro di Eschilo, che nel corso del volume è dato per scontato più volte (es. pp. 10, 132, 217 ecc.), non è ammesso da tutti gli studiosi, cfr. almeno O. Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus*, Oxford 1977, 443; V. Di Benedetto – E. Medda, *La tragedia sulla scena. La tragedia greca in quanto spettacolo teatrale*, Torino 1997, 22-23.

p. 368: nelle *Eumenidi* la presenza scenica di Atena come personaggio parlante accanto alla sua statua sarebbe «a scene without parallels in Greek art and literature»; non è esattamente così, basti pensare all'*Ippolito* di Euripide, in cui sulla scena sono presenti la statua di Afrodite (come si deduce dal fatto che il servo di Ippolito la menziona al v. 101 τὴνδ' ἦ πύλαισι σαῖς ἐφέστηκεν, invitando il padrone a riverirla) e quella di Artemide (a cui Ippolito offre una corona di fiori di ritorno dalla caccia), e compaiono anche fisicamente le due dee (Afrodite nel prologo, Artemide nel finale della tragedia). Per quanto riguarda le arti figurative, si vedano due vasi magnogreci raffiguranti il mito di Laocoonte⁶, nei quali compare sia Apollo come 'dio vivente' sia la sua statua di culto. In proposito cfr. M. Centanni *et all.*, "Il *Laocoonte* perduto di Sofocle: una ricostruzione per fragmenta testuali e iconografici (con una digressione sulle fonti mitografiche e letterarie su Laocoonte, precedenti e posteriori alla tragedia sofoclea)", *La Rivista di Engramma* 107, giugno 2013, 79-106; e ora M. Centanni – P.B. Cipolla, *Sophocles' Laocoön*, Roma

⁶ Cratere a campana lucano del pittore di Pisticci, 430-20 a.C. (Basel, Antikenmuseum-Sammlung Ludwig LU 70); frammento di cratere apulo, cerchia del pittore dell'Ilioupersis, 380-70 a.C. (Ruvo di Puglia, Museo Jatta).

2024, 71ss.

p. 406 «Aélien»: leggasi «Aéliion».

p. 414 «Aristeas»: leggasi «Aristias» (Aristia di Fliunte, figlio di Pratina; Aristeia di Proconneso è invece il poeta epico).

p. 425: è sicuramente plausibile l'ipotesi che Eschilo componesse (soprattutto) oralmente, e che solo dopo la rappresentazione mettesse per iscritto il testo definitivo, di suo pugno o dettandolo a un copista. Tuttavia sarei meno categorico nell'escludere la possibilità che, durante le prove e l'allestimento della recita, egli prendesse qualche appunto scritto: sarebbe stato certamente scomodo farlo su un rotolo di papiro, che doveva essere srotolato in continuazione avanti e indietro, ma perché non pensare in alternativa a delle tavolette? Considerato che l'immagine metaforica della tavoletta scrittoria compare più volte nella produzione eschilea (cfr. *Suppl.* 179, *PV* 789, *Eum.* 279, fr. 281a, 21 R.) il poeta avrà avuto sicuramente familiarità con quest'oggetto. Luciano, *Adv. ind.* 15, tramanda addirittura che il tiranno Dioniso I di Siracusa si sarebbe procurato proprio la tavoletta scrittoria del poeta (πυξίον) sperando che potesse magicamente infondergli ispirazione per le tragedie che lui stesso componeva in modo maldestro; ovviamente l'aneddoto può essere inventato, e anche se fosse vero, non è detto che la tavoletta in questione fosse veramente quella appartenuta a Eschilo. Al di là di questo, la possibilità che egli abbia potuto impiegarne una come supporto alla composizione a mio parere va tenuta in considerazione.

p. 429: non tutti gli studiosi concordano sul fatto che il Laurenziano 32,9 sia il capostipite di tutti i manoscritti esistenti (per l'indipendenza dei codici **FGT** si veda ad esempio E. Medda, *Eschilo. Agamennone*, Roma 2017, 228ss.).

p. 434: il *P.Oxy.* 2256, fr. 3 non è un «documentary fragment» (se con tale definizione si intende, come di consueto, un testo di carattere non letterario ma funzionale, come un contratto, una lettera ecc.) in quanto contiene una *hypothesis* relativa a un dramma della trilogia delle *Danaidi*, dunque un testo di natura grammaticale-erudita.

– *ibid.*: non si capisce perché il fr. 44 R. sia collocato tra i «Papyrus Fragments» (è tramandato da Ateneo XIII 600 A, non da un papiro).

PAOLO B. CIPOLLA
Università di Catania
paolo.cipolla@unict.it

ALMUT FRIES, *Pindar's ›First Pythian Ode‹. Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 151, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2023, xiv+252 pp., 99,95€, ISBN 978-3-11-112600-5.

This commentary offers an account of a poem which the author describes as ‘a literary masterpiece’ as well as ‘an invaluable document for the political, social and cultural history of Sicily’ during the period when the poem was composed (ix). The book is conventionally structured, although with a greater emphasis on the manuscript tradition and philological questions than on literary interpretation and *Nachleben*. It is a welcome, if unevenly successful, addition to Pindarists’ well-stocked shelves.

The introduction gives solid guidance on various important issues. Fries provides a succinct but informative discussion of the poem’s date and historical background (8-11), and place of performance. Regarding the long-standing debate about whether a first performance in Syracuse or Aetna should be supposed, Fries takes account of Morrison’s arguments against the latter, but remains cautiously agnostic (13). However, she follows numerous scholars in giving some weight to the evidence of Σ *Nem.* 1.7b (iii 11-12 Dr) for possible performance of *Pyth.* 1 at the festival of Zeus Aetnaeus (13-14). Considerable attention is also devoted to a survey of contemporary poems with which *Pythian* 1 might have been in dialogue, such as Bacch. 4 and 20c, Pi. fr. 105a-b, and Aeschylus’ *Aitnaiai* and *Persae* (18-29). Fries’ approach to connections between these poems is, in general, cautious. She suggests possible verbal parallels between *Pyth.* 1 and Bacch. 20c (21) which ‘could have been perceived’ if the poems ‘were performed on the same day’, although she does not venture any further thoughts on the significance that might have been found in such perceptions.

As a metrician, Fries positions herself in the tradition of Boeckh, Maas, West, and Parker. She rejects the arguments of the ‘Urbino School’ that Alexandrian metrical analysis offers evidence for Pindar’s own compositional practices (58). This stance has occasional textual ramifications, as when she follows Boeckh and other modern editors in adopting μεταβάσσοντας for transmitted μεταλ(λ)άσ(σ)οντας in order to correct the metre (154), and rejects the arguments of Gentili for the validity of the respension created by the MSS reading (deemed ‘pienamente accettabile’ by Cingano ad loc).¹ After staking out the premise of her metrical analysis (the conventional Boeckhian position that the period, established by observation of word-end, hiatus, and *brevis in longo*, is the fundamental unit of composition), Fries provides readers with a metrical analysis (39-43), which includes a colometry (40) and an account of periodic division (41-3), and an description of strophic construction (43-4). Fries sees ‘rhythmical progression ... founded on thematic development’ as the hallmark of the epode, while echoes and repetitions characterize the strophe (43). In general, Fries is an informed guide

¹ In B. Gentili et al., *Pindaro: Le Pitiche*, Roma-Milano 1995, 347.

to metrical issues, but I raised an eyebrow at the claim that ‘Pindar would have viewed his D/e periods as single rhythmical systems, not as made up of smaller entities’ (40). Given our almost total ignorance of Pindar’s musical practices (in regard to which Fries shows herself sensibly cautious, 44), not to mention the cultural and intellectual differences obtaining between Pindar’s age and our own, it seems to me overconfident to claim a sure understanding of how Pindar would have conceived the relationship between periods and phrases. How can we be sure that Pindar did not imagine this relationship variously, depending on which stage of composition, rehearsal, or performance he had arrived at? Given, for instance, the length of *Pyth.* 1 s6, which accommodates multiple syntactical constructions (see e.g. μή παρίει καλά. νόμα δικάϊω πηδαλίω στρατόν· ἀψευδεῖ δὲ πρὸς ἄκμονι χάλκευε γλῶσσαν, 86), it seems at least conceivable that the relation between the period’s ‘rhythmical system’ and its constituent ‘entities’ would have been subject to considerations related to delivery (what to do with sentence end after καλά, and what weight of pause, if any, to put after στρατόν?). And what kind of mental activity is being envisaged by ‘would have viewed’ (prospective calculation, retrospective reflection, lingering on details in the act of composing or performing, or something else)?

Fries offers an extensive discussion of the manuscript tradition. Her assessment of the tradition does not differ radically from that of Irigoin, but contains numerous interesting observations and arguments. Her main focus is on the value of the manuscripts for an establishment of the text, but she also assesses the manuscripts’ intellectual contexts. She gives some weight to Irigoin’s attribution of the ‘Paris recension’ to Maximus Planudes, and entertains the possibility that a text edited (‘lightly (and perhaps incompletely)’) by Planudes might have entered the tradition (49). In her discussion of the ‘Thessaloniceis recension’, she notes that G (Gotting. philol. 29, dated to 1250-1300) is the only pre-Palaeologan codex to be furnished with prosodiacal annotation. On Fries’ interpretation, this annotation is likely to have facilitated ‘rhythmical reading aloud’ (52) as a school exercise, and thus provides valuable evidence for Byzantine education during this period. She also pays careful attention to Vi (‘a fascinating historical document’, 53), which also dates to the second half of the thirteenth century. The ‘meticulous care’ with which the text of Pindar has been written over a liturgical text, together with the copying of accompanying scholia, testifies to the value accorded to classical texts in this period. She also confirms Irigoin’s argument that U and V derive from Vi, mainly on the basis of Vi’s ‘idiosyncratic pattern of strophic indentations’, which U replicates.

There follows an assessment of the contributions made to the editing of Pindar by Triclinius and pseudo-Moschopoulos. Fries’ picture of the former is succinct and helpful. She surveys his conjectures on *Pyth.* 1 (55-6), which in her view confirm that he had a ‘superior understanding of Greek metre’ to that of his scholarly predecessors. She differs from Irigoin in arguing that ‘readings shared by Triclinius and ρ or H ... are not conjectures but paradosis’ (55; see e.g.

καὶ τελευτᾷ, 35, at ρ + C^{ac}, which Irigoin interprets as a metrical correction by Triclinius), but notes that Triclinius' recognition of these variants' value confirms his status as an editor of distinction. Against Irigoin, she endorses Günther's argument that pseudo-Moschopoulos was a contemporary of Triclinius, in order to account both for the former's not making use of the latter's text and his metrical knowledge (57). She draws her discussion to a close with an assessment of the *editio Romana* (65-5) as a witness for otherwise unattested sources.

As one would expect in the light of the relatively stable textual tradition from which our texts of Pindar derive, Fries presents a text that departs only minimally from that of canonical modern editions such as those of Snell and Race. One such departure occurs at 22, where Fries prints ἀμέραισιν in place of the ἀμέραισιν printed by, for instance, Snell, Bowra, Gentili, and Race. Her justification is that '[t]he psilotic form is regular in Doric, and even in Attic ἡμέρ- did not appear until after 450' (115); she notes that the MSS and papyri give both forms, a phenomenon she attributes to scribal normalization of unaspirated forms. Another is her rejection of Schroeder's ἥρωας at 52 (accepted by Bowra, Snell, and Race among others) in favour of MSS ἥρωας (see 155 for discussion). Her apparatus is considerably fuller than those of the most used modern editions; as she puts it (67), she aims to steer a middle course between the minimalism of Snell and Maehler and fuller treatments such as that of Turyn, although with a decided emphasis on the manuscript tradition rather than on modern scholars' conjectures. The result is an apparatus that supplies readers with much information about Byzantine texts and scholia (the note on χαλκοπάραον, 44, which records variation between -πάραον and -πάρηον in a corrector of F and a scholiastic lemma attached to the text, is fuller than many but representative of her general approach).

When turning to the commentary, readers will find numerous useful discussions of language and small-scale interpretative issues. Fries provides translations before each set of lemmata and comments, an approach which offers welcome assistance to less experienced readers of Pindar, and provides the author with a means of clarifying her interpretations. Her comments are mostly focused on exegesis, but she addresses some larger interpretative issues where these are relevant (e.g. 192 on the question of whether the final triad can be interpreted as an instance of a *Fürstenspiegel*: Fries responds in the negative). One resource she deploys with skill in pursuing exegetical considerations is a judicious use of the scholia. In her note on the poem's opening word, for instance, she points out that '[d]ivine accoutrements are regularly 'golden' or 'of gold'', and then endorses the comment of Σ 1.1b (ii 8 Dr): χρυσῇ δὲ κιθάρα ἀντὶ τοῦ τιμία, ὡς χρυσῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ (Il. 22.470). Here, as in other such discussions (e.g. her note on εὐανθεῖ δ' ἐν ὀργῇ, 204), Fries positions her approach in a tradition that goes back to antiquity, although on occasion one would like to have heard more about the differences of approach that distinguish particular exegetical orientations: the normative force of the Homeric quotation, which appears to assimilate Pindar's phrasing to Homer's,

and the programmatic emphasis of that interpretation for a reading of the poem, might both have been noted.

Another feature of this commentary is the space Fries gives to ancient Near Eastern material. She points out that the picture of the ‘drowsy war-god’ is paralleled in the late-Babylonian *Erra and Ishtum* (98), and offers an extensive account of mythical patterns in Vedic, Anatolian, and Semitic lore which might be, however distantly, related to that of Zeus and Typhos (105). As she acknowledges, the task of assessing the relation between this material and Pindar’s poem is difficult, but her inclusion of these myths is welcome, and prompts fresh consideration of what makes Pindar’s poetics and mythography distinctive. The commentary also has much to say, as expected, about the relationship between Pindar and his Greek predecessors. In these discussions, Fries often makes useful points, as when noting the Homeric antecedents of *κελαινώπιν ... νεφέλαν* (94) or commenting on the relative indirectness, when compared with Thgn. 239-41, with which Pindar treats the prospect of Hiero’s commemoration by sympotic performance (211).

Sometimes, however, the reader is left wanting more detailed exploration of the effects that Pindar’s extraordinary language and compositional decisions create. In her treatment of *καὶρόν εἰ φθέγγαιο* (81), for instance, Fries cites parallels for *καὶρόν* as adverbial and internal accusative, and then suggests that the use of the phrase to introduce a new triad, together with the initial position of *καὶρόν* ‘perhaps favours the more forceful sense of the adverbial accusative’, in the sense of ‘opportune, to the point’. What Fries does not quite bring out here is the enactive abruptness of Pindar’s phrasing: the sudden shift of attention and register which the phrase brings about, its interruption of the previous stanza’s emphasis, and its semantic compression combine to accomplish a version of the opportune that it commends. A larger interpretative consideration arises in her treatment of the opening strophe. After discussing the conventional idea that music proves ‘relief from cares’, Fries argues that ‘Pindar can hope for his own music to have the same effect on Hieron and the rest of the audience as Apollo’s has on his fellow deities (short of being truly soporific, one presumes)’ (84). But her parenthesis highlights the problem with the idea that the divine performance creates the ‘same effect’ as its human counterpart. What needs to be recognized here is the extraordinary contrast which the passage opens up between the purely material, corporeal affects (note e.g. *κεραυνὸν σβεννύεις*, 5; *εὐδαι*, 6; *ἰαίνει καρδίαν*, 11) envisaged for the divine music and the heightened state of imaginative engagement and interpretative attention required by the complex verbal event which Pindar puts before his audience. How one then interprets the thematic, metapoetic, or ethical import of that contrast is an open question,² but to efface or downplay the contrast is to misconceive the passage.

² See T. Phillips, *Pindar’s Library: Performance Poetry and Material Texts*, Oxford 2016, 147 for further discussion and references.

The interpretative sections of the introduction are the least successful part of the volume. Fries devotes just five pages to a discussion (albeit helpfully clear) of ‘structure and themes’ (3-7), and four to an interpretative discussion of the ‘strategy of praise’ which Pindar employs (14-18). Here, Fries proceeds with a straightforwardly rhetorical and functionalist interpretation of the poem (cf. ‘the purpose [of epinician] was to generate ‘imperishable fame’ ... for the honorand’, 30). Her approach is similar to that of critics such as (more recently) Pfeijffer, Morgan, and Meister;³ it adds few if any fresh interpretative insights, and indeed does not try to. Little attention is given to how the poem’s rich *Nachleben* in antiquity (33) might have affected readers’ reception of its rhetorical aims. The introduction is also methodologically and doxographically minimalist. Little sense is conveyed of how debate about epinician’s poetics has changed in the last forty years or so. Symptomatic in this respect is a footnote in which Race and Fearn are cited as offering significant treatments of ‘prayers as a structural device’ (4 n. 5). The very considerable differences between these critical treatments are not elaborated. A commentator might defend such an omission by claiming that a commentary should present information and references which readers can pursue for themselves. However, in view of the widely varying stances at work in contemporary debate, together with their hermeneutic and indeed political implications, a fuller discussion of the differences between these stances ought to have been a desideratum.

TOM PHILLIPS

University of Manchester

thomas.phillips@manchester.ac.uk

ALBA BOSCÀ CUQUERELLA, *La gnome en Eurípides. Estudio formal*, Lausanne-Berlin-Bruxelles-Chennai-New York-Oxford: Peter Lang, 2023, 498 pp., ISBN (print) 978-3-0343-4736-5; e-ISBN (pdf) 978-3-0343-4739-6; e-ISBN (ePub) 978-3-0343-4740-2; doi 10.3726/b20910.

Esta monografía dedicada al estudio de la *gnóme* en Eurípides es una versión revisada de la tesis doctoral defendida por la autora en 2021 en la Universidad de Salamanca. Partiendo principalmente de las tesis doctorales de F. Hofinger (*Euripides und seine Sentenzen*, Diss. Universität Erlangen 1896), C.W. Friedrich (*Die dramatische Funktion der euripideischen Gnomen*, Diss. Universität Freiburg 1955) y A. Lardinois (*Wisdom in Context: The Use of Gnomonic Statements*

³ I.L. Pfeijffer, “Propaganda in Pindar’s First Pythian Ode”, in K. Enenkel and id., eds., *The Manipulative Mode: Political Propaganda in Antiquity. A Collection of Case Studies*, Leiden-Boston 2005, 13-42; K. Morgan, *Pindar and the Construction of the Syracusan Monarchy in the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford 2015; F. Meister, “Hieron and Zeus in Pindar”, *CPh* 114, 2019, 366-82.

in *Archaic Greek Poetry*, Diss. Princeton University 1995) y de los estudios de J. de Romilly (“Les réflexions générales d’Euripide. Analyse littéraire et critique textuelle”, *Comptes rendus des séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 127.2, 1983, 405-18) y de G.W. Most (“Euripide ὁ γνωμολογικώτατος”, en M.S. Funghi, ed., *Aspetti di letteratura gnomica nel mondo antico*, I, Firenze 2003, 141-66), centrados específicamente en Eurípides, así como de los trabajos de H. Friis Johansen (*General Reflection in Tragic Rhesis. A Study of Form*, København 1959), que aborda a los tres autores trágicos, u otros estudios específicos sobre Sófocles y Esquilo (especialmente el de D. Cuny, *Une leçon de vie: les réflexions générales dans le théâtre de Sophocle*, Paris 2007), la autora realiza un análisis formal de la *gnóme* en Eurípides, precisamente uno de los autores que más destaca en el uso de ese elemento.

Dicho análisis comienza con una introducción, en la que, además de recoger sintéticamente los precedentes más destacados en el estudio de la *gnóme*, se ofrece una muy breve aclaración del método de trabajo y de la selección del corpus. En este último apartado, se dan explicaciones sobre las ediciones utilizadas, pero se echa en falta información sobre cómo se ha delimitado el corpus de *gnômai* que se analizan en la obra y las dificultades que se han planteado hasta llegar a establecer ese corpus. Habría sido también conveniente incluir una explicación clara de la diferenciación, por una parte, entre *gnóme* y secuencia gnómica, y, por otra parte, entre *gnóme* y otros tipos de expresiones proverbiales. De hecho, dada la dificultad para diferenciar entre *gnóme* y otras formas cercanas (fundamentalmente, aunque no solo, la paremia), una dificultad que, como la propia autora señala, es el principal problema abordado por los estudios modernos de la *gnóme* (p. 116), se echa en falta una explicación de las distintas formas aledañas a la *gnóme* y de cómo se han diferenciado todas ellas en el establecimiento del corpus eurípideo.

Tras la introducción, el análisis se articula en seis capítulos, que claramente se pueden dividir en dos bloques: el primer bloque engloba los tres primeros capítulos y se centra en cuestiones de definición y contextualización, mientras que los tres siguientes capítulos (capítulos IV, V y VI) se dedican expresamente al análisis formal del corpus de *gnômai* eurípideas.

El capítulo I, titulado “Contextualización de la γνώμη”, se centra en la definición del concepto, en la utilización del término y aparición de *gnômai* en la literatura, y en los tipos de inserción de la *gnóme* en las obras literarias. La definición continúa en el capítulo III, dedicado, como señala su título, a la “Definición de γνώμη”, pero en este caso como recurso retórico, de manera que los capítulos I y III son complementarios y ofrecen una visión de la *gnóme* fuera y dentro de los textos técnicos. En el caso del análisis de la *gnóme* en los manuales retóricos, éste se limita a los dos únicos tratados existentes de época clásica y a los *progymnasmata*. Es lógica la atención prestada a los manuales de época clásica, que son cronológicamente los más cercanos a Eurípides, aunque posteriores a él, pero no se explica con suficiente claridad por qué se llega hasta los *progymnasmata* o por qué no se presta atención a ningún otro manual retórico.

En cualquier caso, el capítulo III, dedicado en gran medida a la teoría retórica, muestra ciertas debilidades. En lo que a la definición del concepto de *gnóme* se refiere, llama poderosamente la atención la manera en que la autora indica que de las fuentes retóricas analizadas se deduce que la *gnóme* es, entre otras cosas, una afirmación breve (p. 108), porque ninguna de las fuentes retóricas aportadas menciona el rasgo de la brevedad. Por otra parte, no se refleja bien la división bipartita de pruebas que el autor de la *Retórica a Alejandro* y Aristóteles comparten (pruebas técnicas y no técnicas, según la nomenclatura aristotélica) y, en el caso de las pruebas “aportadas” de la *Retórica a Alejandro*, la autora menciona cinco (*enthýmema*, *tekmérion*, *semeíon*, *parádeigma* y *gnóme*, p. 83), aunque en realidad son siete (faltan lo probable o *eikós* y la refutación o *élenchos*). Además, no se diferencia con suficiente claridad entre el entimema y el silogismo (el entimema es un silogismo retórico), ni se muestra bien la relación entre la *gnóme* y el entimema (la *gnóme* puede entenderse como la premisa general o la conclusión de un entimema y de ahí las diferentes posiciones y funciones que puede asumir respecto a éste). Pero, sobre todo, es importante tener en cuenta que los rétores de época clásica dan indicaciones de cómo elaborar (y utilizar) *gnômai* con una finalidad persuasiva, pero no necesariamente de cómo utilizar *gnômai* generalmente reconocidas como tales y que forman parte del acervo popular, algo que no parece quedar del todo claro en la obra.

El capítulo II se titula “¿Por qué la γνῶμη en Eurípides?” y se dedica a destacar la importancia de ese elemento en el citado autor poniendo de relieve una vez más la relevancia de la *gnóme* como recurso retórico. Ahora bien, dado que los capítulos II y III del libro destacan la dimensión retórica de la *gnóme*, es curioso que en el análisis formal de la *gnóme* que se lleva a cabo en los capítulos siguientes apenas haya alusiones a la función retórica de ese elemento y no se ponga en relación la forma de la *gnóme* con dicha función retórica. De hecho, al mencionar la posibilidad de utilizar la *gnóme* con distintos fines dentro de la obra literaria, la autora afirma: “Pero este es un campo que no atañe al presente trabajo, más bien pertenece al análisis de la γνῶμη mediante metodologías literarias y propias de la pragmática para responder a preguntas como ¿cuál es la verdadera intención al pronunciar una γνῶμη?” (pp. 91-2). No es la única ocasión en la que la autora remite a estudios literarios o pragmáticos para profundizar en la funcionalidad de la *gnóme*, pero convendría señalar también la necesidad de abordar el estudio de la *gnóme* específicamente como elemento retórico y argumentativo dentro de la obra literaria. Comprender el valor retórico de la *gnóme* evitaría algunas afirmaciones banales, como, por ejemplo, cuando se afirma que “Eurípides ofrece la posibilidad de hablar correcta o incorrectamente a todos sus personajes en un contexto público” (p. 71) sin aclarar en qué consiste exactamente “hablar correcta o incorrectamente” o de qué criterios depende esa valoración.

Una vez establecidas las cuestiones de definición y contextualización, los capítulos IV, V y VI se centran en los rasgos formales de la *gnóme*. El capítulo IV, en concreto, analiza la forma de la *gnóme*, esto es, el tipo de enunciado

(enunciativo, exclamativo, interrogativo o directivo), los tipos de expresión (doble expresión, grados comparativo y superlativo, recursos estilísticos que modifican la *gnóme*) o la dependencia del contexto o el modo de inserción de la *gnóme* en el contexto inmediato de la obra. El capítulo V analiza los elementos léxicos que caracterizan a la *gnóme*, esencialmente los cuantificadores, adverbios temporales generalizadores, terminología axiológica, sustantivos de referencia genérica y abstractos, verbos que inciden en la universalidad, referentes de la *gnóme* y, por último, elementos lingüísticos que suelen aparecer junto al enunciado gnómico. Para finalizar, el capítulo VI analiza los rasgos morfosintácticos de la *gnóme*, en concreto, sus formas sintácticas más habituales, los enunciados impersonales, la inclusión de *gnômai* en oraciones dependientes, ciertas formas y construcciones sintácticas que aparecen de forma recurrente, tiempos y modos verbales más habituales, o la persona gramatical y el número que aparecen en la *gnóme*, así como los nexos que unen la *gnóme* con el marco lingüístico.

En esos tres capítulos en los que se analiza formalmente la *gnóme* (capítulos IV, V y VI) se realiza un análisis detallado y minucioso, que hace aportaciones interesantes al estudio formal de la *gnóme* eurípidea. No obstante, hay varias cuestiones que llaman la atención. De un lado, no siempre se cuantifica (aunque habría sido información útil para el lector en muchos casos) y, cuando se hace, hay una tendencia a enfatizar la imprecisión de las cifras que se ofrecen. Así, en la p. 131 se llega a afirmar que las *gnômai* extraídas de las tragedias de Eurípides son “ca. 595”. Esas *gnômai* están recogidas y enumeradas en el apéndice de la obra y ahí queda claro que el corpus lo forman 595 *gnômai* y 69 secuencias gnómicas (también se deja claro el número exacto de *gnômai* en el capítulo introductorio, concretamente en la p. 22). Afirmar que las *gnômai* son “ca. 595” se puede entender como señal de que el corpus formado es discutible, pero, si así fuese, se debería explicar claramente. El empleo de “ca.” para indicar la imprecisión de las cifras es habitual en la obra, tanto cuando se trata de cifras elevadas (“ca. 310”, “ca. 240”, “ca. 70”, en la p. 291) como cuando se trata de cifras reducidas (en las pp. 274-6, por ejemplo, se dice que hay “unos diez ejemplos”, “unos cinco ejemplos”, “unos seis ejemplos”). Sería aconsejable dar datos exactos en todos los casos, pero con mayor motivo cuando las cantidades son reducidas. Por otra parte, en ocasiones simplemente se dice que los ejemplos son muchos o pocos, pero estos conceptos son subjetivos, por lo que no son los más apropiados. La imprecisión suscita dudas que se podrían evitar aportando las cantidades exactas y concretas (o señalando explícitamente los casos dudosos, si los hubiere).

Por otra parte, tampoco hay sistematicidad a la hora de aportar todos los ejemplos relevantes en cada uno de los puntos que se analizan. A lo largo de la obra cada uno de los rasgos formales que caracterizan a la *gnóme* eurípidea se explica y se ejemplifica con varios pasajes concretos. Esa información, con frecuencia (pero no siempre), se complementa con una nota a pie de página. Ahora bien, dicha nota en unas ocasiones se introduce con el enunciado “Otros ejemplos son” (o similares: “Algunos ejemplos son”, etc.), un enunciado que indica falta de

exhaustividad, y, en otras ocasiones, se introduce con el enunciado “Los ejemplos son” (o similares: “Los demás ejemplos son”, etc.), un enunciado que sí indica exhaustividad. Puesto que el corpus es limitado, se agradecería sistematicidad en la cuantificación de los ejemplos y también precisión y exhaustividad a la hora de indicar las *gnômai* que responden a cada rasgo formal. La autora señala que la utilidad de esta obra radica en ser punto de partida para otro tipo de análisis posteriores. Precisamente por ello, la información exacta y exhaustiva es esencial.

A pesar de esto, en general los distintos rasgos formales están claramente ejemplificados, aunque en algunos casos hay pequeños lapsus, como cuando se explica el uso de la primera persona del plural en la *gnôme* y se incluye un ejemplo (E. *Hec.* 254-5) donde se utiliza la segunda persona del plural (pp. 330-1). Otras veces hay explicaciones que pueden ser discutibles. Valga como ejemplo cuando se menciona “una cláusula adverbial temporal/condicional (...): ‘cuando/ si los dioses quieren’” (p. 306) para hacer referencia al genitivo absoluto “θεῶν διδόντων”. De forma similar, en la p. 307 se incluye como oración temporal otro genitivo absoluto (γεγραμμένων δὲ τῶν νόμων) y en la p. 308 se incluye como oración condicional una oración de relativo (αἵτινες σοφά). Aunque la traducción de esas oraciones tiene el matiz señalado por la autora, es discutible hasta qué punto conviene incluirlas en la misma categoría que las oraciones temporales o condicionales *sensu stricto*.

El análisis se centra en todos los casos en la forma, pero en alguna ocasión se derivan conclusiones que van más allá. No obstante, cuando esto ocurre, dichas conclusiones no siempre están claramente fundamentadas. Por ejemplo, tras explicar la *gnôme* negativa, la autora concluye que esa expresión en Eurípides se concentra especialmente “en personajes femeninos, normalmente en aquellos que pertenecen a las franjas etarias extremas, especialmente ancianos, en boca de personajes de poder como héroes o monarcas/tiranos y en boca de personajes de más baja clase social” (p. 134). Dejando a un lado el hecho de que los tipos de personajes mencionados abarcan prácticamente todos los posibles, la cuestión es que para demostrar esa conclusión habría que especificar cuáles son las *gnômai* que entran en esa categoría y cuántas de ellas son pronunciadas por cada tipo de personaje, pero eso no se hace y, en consecuencia, la conclusión no queda demostrada. De hecho, se agradece este tipo de conclusiones que van más allá de la forma y que muestran el potencial del análisis que se lleva a cabo. Es una lástima, sin embargo, que no se desarrolle suficientemente. Sería muy interesante, sin duda, que, en el análisis de las cuestiones formales, se incluyese información sobre si los diferentes rasgos formales se dan más en unos personajes o en otros, lo que permitiría extraer información relacionada con las técnicas de caracterización, o si los rasgos formales se dan de manera uniforme en el corpus o predominan en determinadas obras o fases del autor, lo que permitiría extraer conclusiones sobre una posible evolución a la largo de la producción eurípidea, entre otras opciones.

El análisis por lo general es descriptivo y ayuda a profundizar en el conocimiento formal de la *gnôme*. Pero apenas hay valoraciones más amplias y la obra termina

con un apartado de conclusiones, en el que esencialmente se hace una síntesis de las principales ideas de la obra. En esa síntesis global se reflejan los puntos fuertes de la monografía (el análisis formal cuidadoso y detallado), pero también se evidencian los puntos débiles. De un lado, el hecho de que no se considera la *gnóme* como un recurso retórico con todo lo que ello implica (la autora insiste en que “la presencia de γνῶμαι y de expresiones de sabiduría responde, [sic] al hecho de que este es un género que de algún modo busca reproducir la lengua hablada”, p. 342). Aunque se contempla la *gnóme* como un recurso retórico, eso se vincula exclusivamente con la definición del concepto y no parece comprenderse que las implicaciones van mucho más allá. Por otra parte, aunque se menciona el potencial caracterizador de la *gnóme* y la importancia del contexto, esto apenas se refleja en el análisis. La autora afirma que su análisis es “novedoso y exclusivo” (p. 21) porque tiene en cuenta el contexto de la *gnóme*, pero la valoración del contexto es muy secundaria y esencialmente formal (limitada, sobre todo, a la vinculación formal de la *gnóme* con el texto circundante). Al no prestar atención a las diferencias en función de la obra, o de las fases de composición, o en función del lugar que ocupa la *gnóme* (lugar en la obra, lugar dentro de una escena o de un discurso, incluso lugar con respecto al argumento del que forma parte), o en función del tipo de relación que mantiene la *gnóme* con el argumento en el que se inserta (puede ratificar el caso concreto u oponerse a él, por ejemplo), según la función que cumple la *gnóme*, o dependiendo del tipo de orador que la utiliza, etc., se pierde la oportunidad de extraer conclusiones de mayor calado. Esas cuestiones, como la propia autora señala en lo relativo al valor de la *gnóme* como elemento caracterizador (p. 346), quedan pendientes para el futuro. Así, la aportación principal del libro es la de ofrecer un estudio formal sistemático que pueda servir de punto de partida para otros estudios posteriores.

La obra se completa con una amplia y útil bibliografía y dos apéndices que contienen respectivamente el corpus de 595 *gnômai* y el de 69 secuencias gnómicas detectadas en las tragedias conservadas de Eurípides (se dejan fuera los fragmentos, aunque en ocasiones se menciona alguno, y también *Reso* debido a su dudosa autoría). En ambos apéndices se recoge el texto griego y la traducción de la autora. Las traducciones son correctas y muy apegadas al texto griego. Sin embargo, en algunos casos hay pequeños deslices. Por ejemplo, en E. *Alc.* 61-2, se traduce “Odiosa para los mortales” cuando debería ser “Odioso para los mortales” (ἐχθρός concuerda con τρόπος, “modo de ser”). El celo por hacer traducciones literales y mantener el orden del texto original en ocasiones deviene en traducciones ambiguas o poco claras. Es el caso de E. *Andr.* 230-1, donde la autora traduce “Los modos de sus malvadas madres deben evitar los hijos que tienen sensatez”. En el texto griego los casos indican cuál es el sujeto y cuál el complemento, pero la traducción resulta extraña y considero que sería más clara la formulación “Los modos de sus malvadas madres deben evitarlos los hijos que tiene sensatez” o, incluso mejor, “Los hijos que tienen sensatez deben evitar los modos de sus malvadas madres”. Puesto que el castellano no tiene casos, el orden

es un elemento esencial y a veces mantener el orden del texto original no es lo más efectivo.

El estilo de redacción es en ocasiones excesivamente prolijo y adolece de repeticiones innecesarias. Por ejemplo, “En cuanto a las recomendaciones de uso que hace el autor (...), este expone diferentes recomendaciones de uso (...)” (p. 83). De hecho, es frecuente encontrar una composición en anillo, casi al estilo homérico. Por ejemplo, en la p. 202 la autora comienza una explicación afirmando “Por último, (...) hemos dispuesto en dos capítulos distintos los indicios gnómicos” y termina el párrafo afirmando nuevamente “Aunque estos indicios son los elementos que ayudan, todos, a la identificación de una γνώμη, se ha decidido presentarlos en dos capítulos diferentes”. Otro ejemplo se da en la p. 232: “Estos sustantivos pueden aparecer tanto con artículo como sin él (...) En las γνώμαι euripideas encontramos estos sustantivos de referencias genérica tanto con el artículo como sin él”. Sin duda, se agradecería un estilo más preciso y conciso que evitase las repeticiones innecesarias.

Se detectan también algunas erratas y errores. Las erratas no son muchas, lo que denota que es un texto cuidado, pero los errores son más enojosos. Hay errores o imprecisiones de tipo léxico y preposicional, como “Todo ello recobra sentido” en lugar de “Todo ello cobra sentido” (p. 41), “sin atender en” en lugar de “sin atender a” (p. 111), o “Aristóteles en su *Retórica* (...) se dedica a divagar” (p. 85), donde el verbo “divagar”, según la definición que ofrece la RAE del término, no parece que sea el más adecuado. Incluso se utiliza una segunda persona, impropia de un trabajo académico –“Es decir, cuando dices que hay (...)” (p. 220)–, una forma que debería ser sustituida por una expresión impersonal, como, entre otras opciones, “Es decir, cuando se dice que hay (...)”. También hay errores de concordancia (algunos de ellos dentro de las traducciones de las γνώμαι), como “arte retórico” en lugar de “arte retórica” (p. 83), “Este mecanismo de convertir en tradicional o canónico las palabras de un autor” en lugar de “Este mecanismo de convertir en tradicionales o canónicas las palabras de un autor” (p. 45), “Muchas cosas a partir de mucho se obtiene” en lugar de “Muchas cosas a partir de mucho se obtienen” (p. 219), “el tipo de oraciones más utilizados” en lugar de “el tipo de oraciones más utilizado” (p. 241). Y en ocasiones incluso se detectan errores sintácticos. Por ejemplo, se dice “A pesar de esa dicotomía y la dificultad que todavía hoy en día existe para decantarse por una u otra opción, el hecho de que en todos los contextos siempre es posible sobreentender un verbo εἰμί o similar, la balanza se inclina ligeramente hacia la primera corriente de estudio” (p. 292) o también “Esta última característica nos obliga a tener en cuenta en la definición las que ofrecieron los autores tardíos de manuales retóricos que, aunque no difieren en gran medida de la aristotélica, las divergencias son reveladoras” (p. 81).

En definitiva, esta obra seguramente no satisfaga los intereses de quien busque en ella una aportación que vaya más allá del aspecto formal, pero puede resultar de utilidad para todos aquellos que estén interesados en los rasgos formales de

la *gnóme* eurípidea. De hecho, el mayor valor de la obra es precisamente aportar ese análisis formal que sirva de base y punto de partida de nuevos estudios. El potencial de la *gnóme* como elemento retórico y su presencia destacada en Eurípides dejan claro que es un campo que bien merece un estudio profundo y detallado.

M. CARMEN ENCINAS REGUERO
 Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU)
 mariadelcarmen.encinas@ehu.eus

WILLIAM ALLAN, LAURA SWIFT, *Euripides: Bacchae*, Cambridge Greek and Latin classics, Cambridge-New York: Cambridge University Press, 2024, xiii+349 pp., 29,17€, ISBN 978-1-108-94838-8.

Si cada época tiene las *Bacantes* que merece, la recepción de esta tragedia nos brinda una porción de la historia cultural de occidente. A pesar de la buena acogida que tuvo desde su estreno y a lo largo de la antigüedad, después de la *editio princeps* aldina de 1503 habrá que esperar, en cambio, hasta bien entrado el siglo XIX para que la pieza sea publicada y estudiada por sí misma. Las causas, de carácter ético o estético, de este silencio, tan elocuente, son diversas. Un crítico inglés del siglo XVIII, advertía a los lectores que la “refined delicacy of modern manners will justly revolt against this inhuman spectacle of dramattick barbarity”.¹ A partir del 1800 asistimos a una ‘epifanía’ de Dioniso y del dionisismo, sobre todo en el entorno germánico, bajo el paragua del romanticismo. Pero la primera producción moderna de la que se tiene constancia no llegará hasta 1908, cuando William Poel llevó la tragedia al Court Theatre de Londres –con un éxito más bien modesto: se suspendió después de las dos primeras funciones...

Un vistazo estadístico al valioso Archive of Performances of Greek and Roman Drama (actualizado online), de la Universidad de Oxford, es muy revelador: hasta el 1970 hay documentadas un total de 58 producciones teatrales de las *Bacantes* (incluidas las adaptaciones al inglés, italiano, francés, alemán, castellano y portugués). En cambio, para el período de 1970 a 2024 la cifra es de 202.² Parece que estamos ante una fractura epocal alrededor de esa fecha. Un momento crucial en la historia del arte dramático contemporáneo tiene las *Bacantes* por protagonistas. En 1968, en Nueva York subió al escenario la sonada producción *Dionysus in 69* dirigida por Richard Schechner con su Performance Group. En el contexto de la revolución sexual y de la eclosión de la cultura popular,

¹ Richard P. Jodrell, *Illustrations of Euripides on the Ion and the Bacchae*. Vol. II, London 1781, 550.

² <http://www.apgrd.ox.ac.uk/>

pero también de las convulsiones sociales y de la contestación por la guerra del Vietnam, esa *performance* estaba llamada a convertirse en un hito insoslayable de la dramaturgia contemporánea.³ Los grandes temas de las *Bacantes* (la violencia, la locura, el éxtasis, la liberación de las pulsiones sexuales, las relaciones entre el individuo y el grupo, el desafío a la autoridad, las transgresiones de las normas y las convenciones) sugerían unas analogías inquietantes con los grandes conflictos sociales y las guerras culturales del momento. En el mundo globalizado y multipolar que ha seguido a la caída del Muro, las *Bacantes* han tenido una presencia constante en los teatros y han saltado entusiastas a los escenarios de todo el mundo, como lo demuestra el estudio de Erika Fischer-Lichte.⁴ La Tebas del mito dionisiaco se ha convertido, en definitiva, en un espejo poliédrico en el que se han reflejado las profundas inquietudes y preocupaciones contemporáneas.

Parece que Dioniso está de moda. Sin embargo, el Dioniso del siglo XXI va más allá del Dioniso del siglo XX. Bajo el signo de las proclamas de Nietzsche, el siglo pasado insistió, se diría que algo demasiado, en el elemento puramente destructivo y anarcoide de Dioniso y del dionisismo. Esta perspectiva fue hegemónica bajo el paraguas de los movimientos contraculturales del momento: Dioniso era la garantía de la liberación expresiva y de la eclosión del inconsciente reprimido. Esta perspectiva, un tanto tendenciosa, tendió a difuminar y a borrar las ambigüedades y las contradicciones que son propias del dios y de su identidad fluida.⁵ La presente edición de William Allan y Laura Swift (A&S) se nos antoja como un feliz punto de encuentro de las distintas tendencias hermenéuticas que han suscitado las *Bacantes* desde el siglo XIX y que las han situado en el corazón de las guerras culturales desde entonces.⁶ En la introducción los editores recuerdan que la pieza de Eurípides “also underlines the importance of achieving a balance between order and liberation, so that ecstasy does not veer off into insanity or mass emotion into irrational violence” (p. 18). A&S asumen con naturalidad que

³ Froma Zeitlin, “Dionysus in 69”, en E. Hall; F. Macintosh; A. Wrigley (ed.), *Dionysus Since 69. Greek Tragedy at the Dawn of the Third Millennium*, Oxford 2004, 49-75; Fabrizio Deriu, *Dionysus in 69 da Euripide per Richard Schechner e il Performance Group*, Pisa 2022.

⁴ Erika Fischer-Lichte, *Dionysus Resurrected: Performances of Euripides The Bacchae in a Globalizing World*, Chichester 2014.

⁵ Véase, para una perspectiva amplia, Massimo Fusillo, *Il dio ibrido. Dioniso e le «Baccanti» nel Novecento*, Bologna 2009, 1-79.

⁶ Esta tragedia —en especial desde la segunda mitad del siglo XX— atrajo una atención creciente y se interpretó desde distintos puntos de vista teóricos: estructuralista, psicoanalítico, ritualista, metateatral... Algunos de los filólogos clásicos más destacados publicaron ediciones, comentarios y estudios monográficos que abordaban la obra desde diversas perspectivas: Wilhelm Nestle, Gilbert Murray, Reginald Winnington-Ingram, Eric Dodds, Geoffrey Kirk, Charles Segal, Hendrik Versnel, Richard Seaford, Jean-Pierre Vernant, Albert Henrichs, Vincenzo Di Benedetto, y tantos otros. El número de ediciones, traducciones y comentarios ha crecido a un ritmo exponencial durante las dos primeras décadas del presente siglo. La de A&S es la última de largo un catálogo de ediciones, entre las cuales: Kovacs (Loeb, 2002), González Merino (Córdoba 2003), Di Benedetto (Milán, BUR, 2004), Guidorizzi (Milán, Lorenzo Valla, 2020), Macías Otero (Madrid 2020), Pàmias (Fundació Bernat Metge 2022), Turra (Rusconi Libri, 2023).

“the maenadic behaviour portrayed in the play is a typically poetic elaboration of real-life Dionysiac worship” (p. 19). Quizá sería demasiado fácil y manido decir (¡en este contexto!) que los editores echan agua al vino...

En todo caso, el péndulo ha recuperado, tras unas oscilaciones, una cierta verticalidad. En efecto, los editores advierten (a mi modo de ver, con sagacidad) que algunos filólogos habían reaccionado con demasiado escepticismo a los excesos de Dodds (en su edición de las *Bacantes* de 1944 y sobre todo en su célebre *The Greeks and the Irrational* de 1951), hasta el extremo de negar “the evidence for ecstatic women in Athenian cult” (p. 19, n. 70). En la introducción, A&S recogen de modo escueto y ecléctico algunas de las grandes líneas interpretativas que se han proyectado sobre esta tragedia, como por ejemplo la lectura metateatral o el análisis de la obra como trasunto del ritual de iniciación mística (una apuesta muy comprometida en el caso de Richard Seaford).⁷ Más combativos, con toda la razón, se muestran contra las interpretaciones acerca de Penteo en clave psicoanalítica, tan habituales en las lecturas de la tragedia de la segunda mitad del siglo pasado. Por ejemplo, la reacción del rey de la ciudad a la vista del extranjero exótico (vv. 235-236: ξανθοῖσι βοστρύχοισιν εὖσμος κόμην, / οἰνωπός, ὅσσοις χάριτας Ἀφροδίτης ἔχων) “has often been misread in a Freudian manner as a token of his own suppressed (homo)sexuality” (p. 143). Del mismo modo, la escena crucial del travestismo de Penteo “has been widely misread as one of ‘psychic invasion’” (p. 216).

No hay que olvidarlo: la presente edición aparece en el seno de los célebres *green and yellow* de Cambridge (es el séptimo Eurípides).⁸ Esta colección nació con el firme propósito de “provide the student with the guidance that he needs for the interpretation and understanding of the book as a work of literature”.⁹ Este posicionamiento, llano y directo, ayuda a entender por qué las ediciones de la colección no aspiran a una revolución hermenéutica. En una reseña de la colección para el *Times Literary Supplement* (ya en abril de 1995) Jasper Griffin se declaraba satisfecho por los principios exegéticos que por el momento se respetaban. Y polemizaba: “The British reader, unless contaminated by Continental notions, will generally feel well content”. Su blanco, claro está, eran los filólogos alineados con la “French Theory”, en sus palabras “the side of Cambridge classics which seems so close to Paris”.¹⁰ En definitiva, los *green and yellow* han tendido a privilegiar una lectura ponderada y bien sedimentada de los

⁷ Rainer Friedrich, “Dionysos among the Dons: The New Ritualism in Richard Seaford’s Commentary on the *Bacchae*”, *Arion* 7, 2000, 115-52. Véase, por ejemplo, A&S acerca de τελετάς (v. 22): “not ‘initiations’ (pace Seaford) but ‘rites’” (p. 107); cf. p. 124: “[the] primary focus throughout the play is on the benefits of Dionysiac worship now rather than in the afterlife”.

⁸ Después de *Cyclops* (Hunter & Laemmle), *Hecuba* (Battezzato), *Helen* (Allan), *Ion* (Gibert), *Iphigenia in Tauris* (Kearns) y *Medea* (Mastronarde).

⁹ Véanse las “Notes for Editors” (1971) de E.J. Kenney y Pat Easterling, reproducidas por Pat Easterling, “A Note on Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics”, en C.A. Stray (ed.), *Classical Books: Scholarship and Publishing in Britain since 1800*, London 2007, 178.

¹⁰ Jasper Griffin, “The Guidance that we Need”, *Times Literary Supplement* 4.4.95, 14.

textos, sin innovaciones rupturistas, intentando ofrecer lo mejor y más aquilatado de la *scholarship* de cada obra.¹¹ Estas *Bacantes* no son una excepción.

En el prefacio del volumen (p. ix) se anticipan las razones para abordar una nueva edición de la tragedia de Eurípides después de que no haya habido ningún “large-scale commentary in English on the play since E. R. Dodds’ edition, first published in 1944” –con lo cual A&S ignoran de plano la edición para Aris & Phillips de Richard Seaford.¹² Las categorías culturales y científicas desde la publicación de aquella edición han sufrido una mutación sensacional, lo que invita a reexaminar la tragedia de Eurípides: las concepciones de género y sexualidad; del coro trágico y el canto ritual; la separación de creencia y práctica en la religión griega; o la distinción de mito y ritual. La introducción, de 52 páginas, está bien informada: un capítulo dedicado a la producción de la obra (con detalles útiles sobre la escenografía, los actores...); un capítulo de poco más de dos páginas, algo esquemático, sobre la relación de las *Bacantes* con la tradición mítica precedente; el capítulo fundamental sobre la obra (“The play”: p. 15 a 38), en que A&S condensan las principales inquietudes dionisiacas (el vino, la fiesta, la locura, el sexo, la música y la danza), que explican el conflicto entre Dioniso y su oponente, pero también refuerzan el vínculo entre sus adeptos. La siguiente sección (que lleva por epígrafe el verso 114 de la tragedia: “Immediately the whole land shall sing and dance”) está dedicada al canto, la música, la métrica (no olvidemos que las *Bacantes* incluyen el más alto porcentaje de canto coral, con más del 24%, de toda la producción de Eurípides), el lenguaje y el estilo: todo ello se detallará en el comentario; y muy especialmente la métrica aparece registrada, verso por verso con la escansión y la descripción de cada uno de ellos, también en el apartado dedicado al comentario. Finalmente, la última sección de la introducción está dedicada, como corresponde, a la transmisión del texto (no hay ningún capítulo dedicado a la recepción de la obra).¹³ Las *Bacantes* han llegado a nosotros por medio de dos manuscritos: el célebre *Laurentianus* (L, ca. 1300-1320), que sin embargo contiene sólo los primeros 755 versos de nuestra tragedia; y el *Palatinus* (P, ca. 1320-1325), que es copia (¿de una copia?) de L. Contamos, además, con

¹¹ “There is no doubt, however, that commentaries – particularly those that have some role in the classroom or seminar – tend to partake in, and reinforce, a generally conservative hermeneutics. And the characteristic focus of the CGLC series [*scil.* los *green and yellow*] on the book unit rather than the themed selection, can act to privilege a rather traditional way of reading a text” (Roy Gibson, “Fifty Years of Green and Yellow: The Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics Series 1970–2020”, en S. Harrison & Ch. Pelling (ed.), *Classical Scholarship and Its History. From the Renaissance to the Present. Essays in Honour of Christopher Stray*, Berlin- Boston 2021, 202).

¹² Cf., en cambio, *supra*, n. 7: Richard Seaford, *Euripides: Bacchae*, with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary, Warminster 1996: su comentario abarca 111 páginas; se puede comparar con las 212 de la edición de A&S y las 181 de la (segunda) edición de Dodds (1960).

¹³ Cf. p. 52, n. 189: “The *Bacchae*’s rich history of reception, ancient and modern, is beyond the scope of this volume”. Véase, en cambio, el rico ensayo que constituye la introducción al volumen de Valeria Turra (ed.), *Euripide. Baccanti*. Saggio introduttivo, nuova traduzione e commento, Santarcangelo di Romagna 2023, XI-CLXXXIV.

algunos testimonios papiráceos, que ocasionalmente permiten mejorar el texto medieval. Así A&S toman de un papiro de Oxirrincos (*P.Oxy.* 2223; cf. *infra*) la lectura *πλευροῖσιν* (v. 1126), que corrige *πλευραῖσιν* de *P.*¹⁴

Y, finalmente, para las partes finales, desaparecidas, de la tragedia es una guía valiosa el cotejo con el centón bizantino *Christus Patiens* (siglos XI o XII), que recicla porciones de las *Bacantes* para adaptarlas a la dramatización de la pasión de Cristo.¹⁵ Por ejemplo, después del verso 1300 —en el que Ágave, desolada ante el cuerpo descuartizado de su hijo, pide a Cadmo si todos los miembros han sido localizados y recompuestos (ἧ πᾶν ἐν ἄρθροις συγκεκλημένον καλῶς;)— los filólogos han identificado una laguna en el texto. Y es que no se compadece bien con el v. 1301 en el que Ágave vuelve a hacerse una pregunta, esta vez sobre qué relación guardaba Penteo con su locura (Πενθεῖ δὲ τί μέρος ἀφροσύνης προσῆκ' ἐμῆς;). Según puede colegirse de los datos de la tradición indirecta, la respuesta de su padre a la primera pregunta de Ágave sería negativa, o parcialmente negativa.¹⁶ Entonces, entre lamentos, la madre recogía los trozos del cuerpo de su hijo en la escena. O, tal vez, Ágave se limitaba a añadir la cabeza al cuerpo, que ya estaba recompuesto en el ataúd que arrastraban Cadmo y los sirvientes. Esta es una escena algo incómoda para el lector contemporáneo, hasta el punto que algunos críticos han cuestionado que se hubiera ejecutado ante los ojos de los espectadores. Y parece que una *compositio membrorum* a la vista del auditorio, un procedimiento macabro, va a contrapelo de la sensibilidad teatral griega. También para A&S, “the Grand Guignol effect of such a scene seems much more typical of Senecan tragedy” (p. 297), y en efecto pueden traerse aquí a colación los versos 1256-1268 de la *Fedra* de Séneca, en que Teseo recompone los *disiecta membra* de su hijo Hipólito, un “grisly jigsaw”, como lo tildó Barrett.¹⁷ Sin embargo, no hace falta insistir en que lo que para nosotros se antoja un sensacionalismo grotesco, podría parecer perfectamente serio y conveniente para los antiguos.¹⁸

Igualmente se ha perdido, en nuestros manuscritos, la epifanía como *deus ex machina* de Dioniso —o, mejor dicho, la primera parte de la intervención del dios (a partir del verso 1329). Para ayudarnos en su reconstrucción echamos mano, nuevamente, del *Christus Patiens*, pero también de la hipótesis de las

¹⁴ A&S siguen a Diggle, que en su edición da *πλευροῖσιν*, aunque en otro punto, a propósito de *Heracl.* 824, admite que las variantes entre el neutro y el femenino son equipolentes: “the forms are constantly interchanged” (James Diggle, *Euripidea. Collected Essays*, Oxford 1994, 228).

¹⁵ Véase el “Appendix III: *Christus Patiens* as a Source for the Missing Part in the Exodos of *Bacchae*” del volumen de Georgia Xanthaki-Karamanou, *‘Dionysiac’ Dialogues. Euripides’ Bacchae, Aeschylus and Christus Patiens*, Berlin & Boston 2022, 209-216.

¹⁶ Además del *Christus Patiens*, las fuentes indirectas relevantes son: el escolio a *Ar. Pl.* 907; el papiro de Antinoópolis 24 fr. 2a y 2b; y, sobre todo, el orador del siglo III d.C. Ápsines (*Rh.* p. 322 Hammer): τοῦτον τὸν τόπον κινήθηκεν Εὐριπίδης οἶκτον ἐπὶ τῷ Πενθεῖ κινήσαι βουλόμενος. ἕκαστον γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῶν μελῶν ἢ μήτηρ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ κρατοῦσα καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν οἰκτίζεται.

¹⁷ W. S. Barrett (ed.), *Euripides. Hippolytos*, Oxford 1964, 44.

¹⁸ Véase Pat Easterling, “Putting together the pieces: a passage in the *Bacchae*”, *Omnibus* 14, 1987, 14-16.

Bacantes (A&S no reproducen en su edición, lamentablemente, las hipótesis de la tragedia).¹⁹ En este punto, Dioniso anunciaba el establecimiento de su culto en Tebas, tal como lo ha anticipado en los vv. 39-40 y 47-50 del prólogo.

Además de la importancia para los compases finales de la tragedia, en ciertos lugares el *Christus Patiens* ofrece un texto mejor que *L* o *P* (cf. p. 51, n. 185).²⁰ Es un ejemplo de ello la forma δεῖ (que sin embargo ya aparece en la Aldina) de algunos pocos códices del *Chr. Pat.* 1154 (otros dan χρή) por δὴ *LP* en el v. 184 (ποῖ δεῖ χορεύειν, ποῖ καθιστάναι πόδα); también es comúnmente aceptada la corrección de Porson en el v. 655: σοφὸς σοφὸς σύ, πλὴν ἃ δεῖ σ' εἶναι σοφόν (σύ coll. *Chr. Pat.* 1529 : εἰ *P* : γ' εἰ *L*), que cuenta, además, con el apoyo del paralelo de *Andr.* 245: σοφὴ σοφὴ σύ· καθανεῖν δ' ὅμως σε δεῖ. Son tomadas también del *Christus Patiens* las variantes ἐξεπράξατε (v. 1161, aunque ya era una conjetura de Scaliger) por ἐξεπράξατο de *P*; πηκτῶν (v. 1213) por πλεκτῶν de *P*; λισσόμεσθ' (v. 1344), por λισσόμεθα de *P* (aunque aquella aparece ya en la Aldina). Y el paralelo del *Christus Patiens* ayuda a completar felizmente el verso 1353: <πάντες>, σύ θ' ἢ τάλαινα σύγγονοί τε σαί.²¹

Sin embargo, no me parece siempre necesario recorrer a la tradición indirecta para enmendar el *textus receptus*, como en el verso 20 (ἐς τήνδε πρῶτον ἦλθον Ἑλλήνων πόλιν), en el que A&S, siguiendo a Diggle, corrigen πρῶτον por πρῶτην a partir de uno de los mss. del *Christus Patiens*. En efecto, según reconocen los editores, su texto crítico se ha basado en lo fundamental en la última edición de OCT de James Diggle (1994), aunque el *apparatus criticus* ha quedado reducido, como es de rigor en los *green and yellow*, sólo a las lecciones y conjeturas más relevantes. Algunas decisiones ecdóticas me parecen discutibles. Por ejemplo, la posible interpolación de los nombres propios en los versos 229-230 (Ἰνὸ τ' Ἀγαύην θ', ἥ μ' ἔτικτ' Ἐχίονι, / Ἀκταϊόνος τε μητέρ', Αὐτονόην λέγω). Siguiendo a Diggle, A&S no los consideran auténticos. Pero, como recordaba Dodds, “though unpleasing to a modern taste, the lines are appropriate enough dramatically”.²² Igualmente es incierta la corrección –que A&S adoptan de Diggle– θ' ἄν (*LP*) por τὰν en el verso 406 (Πάφον θ' ἄν ἐκατόστομοι), que eliminaría la falsa coordinación copulativa de Κύπρον y Πάφον: “‘May I go to Cyprus and Paphos’ is as faulty as ‘may I go to

¹⁹ Διόνυσος δὲ ἐπιφανεῖς <...> μὲν πᾶσι παρήγγειλεν, ἐκάστω δὲ ἃ συμβήσεται διεσάφησεν... Contamos, además, con el paralelo del fragmento papiiráceo. Véase la reciente edición de Chiara Meccariello, *Le hypotheseis narrative dei drammi euripidei: testo, contesto, fortuna*, Roma 2014, 166-74.

²⁰ Una lista completa de “Readings of the Text of *Christus Patiens* Adopted in the Text of Euripides’ *Bacchae*” y de “Readings of the Text of *Christus Patiens* Cited in the *Apparatus Criticus* of the Editions of *Bacchae*” puede verse en apéndice del volumen citado de Xanthaki-Karamanou, ‘*Dionysiac*’ *Dialogues*, 217-20.

²¹ A partir de los versos 1700-1701 del centón: ὃ φίλος, ὥς εἰς δεινὰ φῆς ἔλθειν κακὰ / πάντας, κάμ' αὐτὸν συγγόνους τ' ἄρδην ἐμούς.

²² Eric R. Dodds (ed.), *Bacchae. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Second Edition, Oxford 1960, 98. También los da por buenos Guidorizzi en su reciente edición (cf. n. 25).

England and London””.²³ Sin embargo, como sugería Kamerbeek, con Πάφον θ’ se insinúa acaso una localización más precisa después de la indicación general ποτὶ Κύπρον (la partícula θ’ podría tener aquí un valor explicativo).²⁴

En total, la edición de A&S se separa de la de Diggle en 43 ocasiones (registradas, todas ellas, en la p. 52 de la introducción). Algunas de estas elecciones, a mi modo de ver con acierto, apuestan por mantener el texto de los manuscritos: no hay motivo para sospechar de la lectura ὁ δ’ ἔξαρχος (entre *cruces* en el v. 141 de la edición de Diggle);²⁵ como tampoco de corregir συγκεραυνοῦσαι (v. 1103) de *P* (que además tiene el apoyo del paralelo papiráceo: *P.Oxy.* 2223; cf. *supra*) por la conjetura συντριαινοῦσαι de Pierson;²⁶ o ἡγάλαζον (v. 1133) de *P* (con el paralelo del mismo *P.Oxy.* 2223) por la conjetura ὠλόλυζον de Diggle.

El escepticismo de Diggle le lleva a atetizar los versos 199-203, que, en cambio, A&S mantienen. Igualmente A&S defienden enfáticamente (p. 167) los versos 427-428 —condenados por Diggle: σοφὰν δ’ ἀπέχειν πραπίδα φρένα τε / περισσῶν παρὰ φωτῶν (“y por alejar con sabiduría su corazón y su mente de los mortales que cometen excesos”, en la traducción de Sara Macías): el texto se compadece bien con los fundamentos dionisiacos que orientan la tragedia, puesto que, naturalmente, uno de los περισσῶν φωτῶν no es otro que Penteo. No hay que olvidar que “il dionisismo [...] è una religione di massa, dei φαῦλοι in cui si annullano le distinzioni sociali”.²⁷ Es también innecesario corregir en el verso 479 κούδεν por γ’ οὐδέν, como hace Diggle siguiendo la conjetura de Burges; o, en el verso 496, Διονύσου por Διονύσῳι, siguiendo a Collmann. En su conjunto, se percibe una tendencia a limpiar el texto de las *cruces desperationis* que ensombrecen la edición de Diggle (He contado hasta trece casos en que A&S renuncian a la atétesis: “no obeli”, p. 52). E igualmente A&S rescatan y dan por buenos hasta seis pasajes (“line(s) retained”, p. 52) condenados por Diggle. En definitiva, estamos ante un texto crítico razonablemente conservador, que rehúye los excesos del hipercriticismo. Lo decíamos más arriba a propósito del comentario y de las distintas tradiciones exegéticas acerca de la pieza de Eurípides, pero vale también para el establecimiento de la edición crítica: estas nuevas *Bacantes* recogen e integran los mejores logros de la ecdótica y de la *scholarship* precedentes.

JORDI PÀMIAS

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

jordi.pamias@uab.cat

²³ Diggle, *Euripidea*, 466, n. 112.

²⁴ Cf. J.C. Kamerbeek, “Deux passages des *Bacchantes* d’Euripide”, *Mnemosyne* 6, 1953, 195.

²⁵ Véase Giulio Guidorizzi (ed.), *Euripide. Baccanti*, Milano 2020, 161: “ἔξαρχος: è colui che guida il rito intonando il canto sacro a cui risponde il Coro”.

²⁶ Para el valor efectista, de exageración cómica, del verbo συγκεραυνῶω, véase Daniel Mendelsohn, “Συγκεραυνῶω: Dithyrambic Language and Dionysiac Cult”, *CJ* 87, 1992, 105-24.

²⁷ Guidorizzi, *Euripide. Baccanti*, 194.

DAVID SANSONE, *Plato: Republic Book I*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, Cambridge-New York: Cambridge University Press, 2023, viii+202 pp., 26,83€, ISBN 978-1-108-97047-1.

This commented edition of the first book of Plato's *Republic* is a very welcome and valuable addition to the series of Green & Yellow commentaries on Plato. *Republic I* is interesting in several respects: on the one hand it resembles the earlier dialogues, ending with Socrates' confession of *aporia* with regard to the virtue under investigation; on the other hand it proves to be the proem to the following nine books of *Republic*. It shows us a Socrates who repeatedly confesses his ignorance with regard to the essence of justice but who also expresses his firm conviction that it is better to be just than to be unjust. As such, it is a very suitable text to read in a course on Plato with university students. Sansone's edition provides teachers and students with an excellent working tool. This does not mean that his edition exclusively or especially aims at providing beginners with the help they need to confront Plato's text; on the contrary, it also amply caters for the needs of the advanced scholar. In the following I will discuss the introduction, the text and the commentary. If I will have to make some critical remarks I do so in full appreciation of the rich and sound scholarship to which this splendid book testifies.¹

INTRODUCTION

As was only to be expected the introduction starts with a discussion of the date at which Book I was written, with special attention for the vexed question of whether Book I originally was an independent dialogue, which was later adapted to serve as the introduction to the sequel. After a judicious discussion Sansone (henceforward S.) concludes (p. 7): "In the absence of more compelling evidence and more convincing arguments it is reasonable to proceed on the assumption that *Republic* was conceived as a whole and was written at one time, likely in the 370s

¹ The book is very carefully produced and contains hardly any typos; I have noted the following. P. 2, n. 5, line 4 from top: "Gorgias" should be in italics; p. 76, ll. 16-13 from bottom: "The words' origins ... was congenial": it should be either "origin" or "were"; p. 152, l. 21 from top: 172 d-e > 172d-e (indeed the "minorest" of minor errors); p. 194, l. 11 from top: Platonische > Platonischen; p. 198, l. 4 from bottom: Sofisti > I sofisti. At p. 143, l. 7 from top, I would expect a comma after "justly" but then I am not a native speaker of English. At the end of the note on 328e7 something seems to have gone wrong. With regard to the verb ἐξαγγέλλειν the cognate noun ἐξάγγελος is mentioned, about which S. writes: "a character in a drama who reports offstage actions, not personal details about the actor playing Medea." I fail to see what this refers to. Could it be a remnant of an earlier version of this note? Another note that confuses me is the brief note at 347a3: "δεῖν: sc. ἔλεγον, at 345e6." On the basis of "sc." one assumes that a verb is to be mentally supplied in order to explain the syntax; and such an ἔλεγον is actually found at 346e7. The mention of 345e6 seems to refer to the passage in which the same content was expressed as in 347a3; but that is in fact not the case: 345e6 οὐδεὶς ἐθέλει ἄρχειν ἐκόν is referred to at 346e7-8 ἄρτι ἔλεγον μηδένα ἐθέλειν ἐκόντα ἄρχειν.

BC.” S. refrains from discussing the date of *Republic* within the group of dialogues of the middle period, such as *Phaedo*, *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*.

The second part of the introduction is devoted to the aporetic character of Book I. S. rightly draws attention to the fact that in contrast to such dialogues as *Euthyphro*, *Laches* and *Charmides* the first interlocutor, Cephalus, is not an expert with regard to the virtue to be explored.

The third part of the introduction is concerned with the setting of the dialogue. S. rightly argues that certainty about the dramatic date (429 and 413 being the prevailing proposals) cannot be reached, because each date contains chronological inconsistencies, as we find in other Platonic works as well. According to S. the main question with regard to the setting is “why Plato has chosen to set his most ambitious work in the Piraeus at the time of a newly established festival in honor of a non-Greek divinity” (p. 13). S. suggests that this indicates “that we are entering novel territory for both Plato and Socrates” (p. 14). One aspect of this novelty is Socrates’ positive teaching in books II-X. Here I might remark that other dialogues of the middle period, especially *Phaedo* and *Symposium*, also contain positive teaching on Socrates’ part, and it is not beyond doubt that *Republic* precedes these dialogues (cf. above).²

Part four of the introduction deals with the *dramatis personae*. With regard to Cephalus S. points out that this character is interpreted in very different ways, ranging from a man who is only interested in money-making to a pious and virtuous man who exemplifies justice in practice. I fully agree with S.’s conclusion (p. 19) that “Plato intends us to see Cephalus as a basically decent individual who behaves in accord with conventional moral standards, without being prepared to define or defend the intellectual foundation of those standards.” The long passage devoted to Thrasymachus includes the issue of the relation between Plato’s character Thrasymachus and the historical Thrasymachus; S. wisely abstains from a definitive verdict. As to Plato’s motives for choosing his own brothers as Socrates’ main interlocutors of the dialogue I would tentatively suggest that the cooperative attitude of Glaucon and Adeimantus reflects Plato’s assent with what he makes Socrates expound.

TEXT

The final chapter of the introduction deals with the transmission of the text, for which S. refers to the monograph by the present reviewer.³ S.’s text is based

² On p. 29 S. writes: “With *Republic* the character of Plato’s writing, and with it the persona of Socrates, enters a more straightforwardly didactic phase, while still maintaining the conversational mode for which he was noted.” To my mind this statement is over-confident in claiming that *Republic* is the first constructive dialogue.

³ G.J. Boter, *The Textual Tradition of Plato’s Republic*, Leiden 1989.

on Slings' 2003 Oxford edition,⁴ from which it deviates in a number of passages.⁵ S. has not confined himself to consulting the apparatus of the OCT, witness his text and apparatus at 349b5 **πράξεως** Richards and at 353d6 **ἐκείνου** recentiores (especially Par.1810^{pc}, as S. specifies in the note), readings that go unmentioned in Slings' edition. I will discuss some of S.'s editorial choices below, in the section on the commentary. Here I draw attention to one aspect of the text in which I wholeheartedly disagree with S., namely his decision to use *scriptio plena* throughout. Thus the reader will be confronted with **ἦν δὲ ἐγώ** and **ἦ δὲ ὅς**, for which other editions have **ἦν δ' ἐγώ** and **ἦ δ' ὅς**, etcetera. S. defends this decision as follows (p. 35): "The treatment of elision and crasis in papyri, medieval manuscripts and, consequently, in printed texts is inconsistent and incoherent and cannot be held to provide evidence for Plato's practice." I daresay that we cannot blindly assume that our sources exactly represent what Plato wrote but I think it is indefensible to make Plato use *scriptio plena* everywhere. It is true that in our sources there is no consistency in applying elision and crasis but why should we have to assume that in this respect consistency on the part of the authors is obligatory? Elision in prose texts is already found in the earliest inscriptions, especially in the case of grammatical words such as particles and prepositions.⁶ S. goes to the extreme in his policy of introducing *scriptio plena*. He not only writes **ἦν δὲ ἐγώ** and **ἦ δὲ ὅς**, as already indicated above, but he also prints **κατὰ ὅσον** where the sources have **καθ' ὅσον**, **ἔστιν ὅτι** for **ἔσθ' ὅτι**, **ἀπὸ ἵππων** for **ἄφ' ἵππων** etcetera. The collocation **καθ' ὅσον** is found 84 times in Plato; the collocation **κατὰ ὅσον** is found only twice in the whole of extant Greek literature (both times in Rufus); are we really to believe that Plato (and all the others) wrote **κατὰ ὅσον** everywhere and that this was changed into **καθ' ὅσον** in the course of the transmission of the text?⁷ To my mind it is wiser to follow our sources in this respect and to accept inconsistency on the part of the author than putting the text on the Procrustes bed of *scriptio plena*, as S. does.⁸

⁴ S.R. Slings, *Platonis Respublica*, Oxford 2003. Very often, the line numbers in S.'s edition differ from those in the OCT; in this review I will constantly use S.'s numbering. I will also quote passages from Plato as they stand in S.'s edition.

⁵ In n. 107 on p. 35 S. specifies seven textual choices deviating from the OCT which are discussed in the commentary but these are not the only passages in which S.'s text differs from the OCT nor are they the only ones discussed in the commentary. I have not compared S.'s text and the OCT systematically but other deviations noted by me include 329e4 **παραμύθια φασιν** (**φασι παραμύθια** OCT), 345a6 **πειθεις** (**πειθει** OCT; discussed in the commentary), 353a1 **μαχαίραι ἂν** (**μαχαίρα** OCT).

⁶ See A. Alonso Déniz, *Elision*, in G.K. Giannakis, ed., *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, <https://referenceworks-brill-com.vu-nl.idm.oclc.org/display/db/eglo> (accessed 1 August 2024) with bibliography.

⁷ For the opposite policy, printing elided forms everywhere, see A. Westermann, *Philostratorum et Callistrati opera*, Paris 1849.

⁸ A case in which the Plato OCT's impose uniformity on the text concerns the preposition **σύν**/**ξύν** and preverb **συν**/**ξύν**: the sources alternate between the two forms but the OCT's have **σύν** everywhere (with the notable exception of **ξύν** at R. 619b3 in Burnet's edition). Slings, *Respublica*,

COMMENTARY

The commentary is very rich and discusses every aspect of the text that calls for attention: textual criticism, language and style, structure, philosophical content, fallacies and inconsistencies in the argumentation and so on and so forth. Besides the well-known works of reference such as KG⁹ and LSJ¹⁰ it makes ample use of up-to-date tools, such as the recent *CGCG*¹¹ and the still more recent *CGL*.¹² S. has a keen eye for the narratological structure of the dialogue, as is demonstrated in his note on 340a1-d1, where he refers to the recent work by Finkelberg.¹³ In some cases I wondered how on earth S. managed to find a relevant work, as in his note on *σαρδάνιον* at 337a3, where he refers to an article in a medical journal.¹⁴

As already pointed out above, the commentary is not intended for one specific type of readers. Thus it often gives basic information on grammatical and linguistic matters of which I will give some instances. 327c5 “ὥς ἀπιόντες: here, as often with a future participle (*CGCG* §52.41), ὥς expresses purpose or intention”; 331a6 “ἀτάλλουσα = Attic ἀτάλλουσα”; 339c7 “Τὸ δὲ ὀρθῶς: sc. τιθέναι”; 348b1 “ἐν ἐκατέρῳ sc. λόγῳ”; 352d8 “δοκεῖ τί σοι εἶναι ἵππου ἔργον; the accent on enclitic τι is owed to the following σοι.” Other notes are meant for more advanced scholars, such as the note on 327b3 where the accentuation of enclitic ἐ and orthotone ἔ is discussed. S. attracts the readers' attention to the role of anacoluthon in Plato (e.g. in the notes on 352b7-d1 and 352c1-2). The note on 350b10 is an interesting lesson on the single or double use of the definite article in passages where “two different entities are named.”

S.'s brief synopses of the segments of the text are very illuminative and helpful, e.g. the notes on 338c2-339e7 and 344d1-347a5. The same goes for his analyses of the argument, as in the note on 345d3-4, where S. points out that Socrates identifies the art and the practitioner of the art whenever it suits his argument; see also the note on 353c1-2, where S. notes that “S. creates difficulties for himself by presenting this as an either/or situation”, an observation further developed in the notes on c4 and c8.

xvi-xvii, states that it is certain that Plato varied between the two forms but he nevertheless conforms to the practice of the other OCT's by printing σύν everywhere.

⁹ R. Kühner, B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre*, Hannover 1955⁴.

¹⁰ H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1940⁹ (with *Revised Supplement*, Oxford 1996).

¹¹ E. van Emde Boas a.o., *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*, Cambridge 2019.

¹² J. Diggle a.o., *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*, Cambridge 2021.

¹³ M. Finkelberg, *The Gatekeeper: Narrative Voice in Plato's Dialogues*, Leiden 2019.

¹⁴ G. Appendino a.o., “Polyacetylenes from Sardinian *Oenanthe fistulosa*: a Molecular Clue to *risus sardonius*”, *Journal of Natural Products* 72, 2009, 962-5. Out of curiosity I consulted the article itself, noting that S. slightly misrepresents its text: while S. states that “Appendino et al. (2009) propose that it refers to lockjaw caused by ingestion of a poisonous herb common in Sardinia” the authors actually write (p. 292): “It even found its way into the mainstream medical lingo as the hallmark of lockjaw (*trismus*), the spasm of the muscles of mastication.”

The commentary brims with keen observations at every level. Thus in the note on 344d3, where Thrasyarchus wants to leave the company after his monologue, S. comments: “as earlier the assembled company prevented T. from breaking into the conversation (336b), so here they will not allow him to depart.” In the note on 345b5, where Thrasyarchus asks Socrates whether he has to implant the argument into his soul, S. notes that the image of ἐνθῶ “is of masticating food and putting it in a baby’s mouth (...). T. had earlier asked S. if he has a nurse (343a3); here he continues his condescending treatment of S. with the suggestion that he has to “spoon-feed” his dull-witted pupil.” As is often the case with anglophone commentators, S. here and there intersperses his notes with dry humorous remarks, as in his note on 328c2 where he writes: “Α προσκεφάλαιον, “pillow,” is literally something on which to rest one’s head, appropriate for someone named Cephalus to sit on (...).” In the note on 329e4 τοῖς γὰρ πλουσίοις πολλὰ παραμύθια φασιν εἶναι S. shows himself a competent composer of Greek verse, suggesting “an original in the form of a trimeter such as παραμύθι’ ἐστὶ¹⁵ πολλὰ τοῖσι πλουσίοις.” Here and there S. expands an in itself helpful note so as to include material that is completely irrelevant in the context of Book I; as an instance I refer to the note on 344d2 ἀθρόον καὶ πολύν, which ends with a description of the *klepsydra* in the lawcourt. In short, the commentary is excellent and I have read it with great pleasure, learning a lot of things that were unknown to me, finding confirmation of my own views in some of S.’s comments and being challenged to re-examine or change my own views where I disagreed with S.

Before embarking on a discussion of some specific passages I would mention two general features of S.’s commentary that cause me some trouble. The first of these is a certain tendency at over-interpretation. I am well aware that it is flatly impossible to reconstruct in each and every case whether or not a reference or allusion in the text was intended by Plato or exists only in the eyes of the interpreter but all the same I think that S. repeatedly reads too much into Plato’s text. I will give some instances. At 327c4-6 Polemarchus’ remark, ὦ Σώκρατες, δοκεῖτέ μοι πρὸς ἅστυ ὠρμησθαι ὡς ἀπιόντες, is answered by Socrates with Οὐ γὰρ κακῶς δοξάζεις. In the note on c6 S. contends that the use of the words δοκεῖτε and δοξάζεις “anticipat[es] the distinction that S. will draw at the end of Book Five between δόξα, based on inference, and γνῶσις or ἐπιστήμη, accessible only to the philosopher and based on direct acquaintance with the Forms.” Now in 327c4-6 there is no distinction between the two types of knowledge but only δόξα is mentioned; what is more, the matter at stake here belongs to the world of contingency for which ἐπιστήμη is a priori impossible; finally, we are here involved in a casual conversation, which has nothing to do with philosophy. In the note on 336d6-7 S. discusses “the unthinkable eventuality of a silent S.”, claiming that “[i]n this way P. tacitly alludes to his own role in keeping S.’s voice alive even after his death.” In the note on 345a1-2, where Socrates exhorts Thrasyarchus

¹⁵ I hope I’m not too much of a wise guy when I prefer the accentuation ἔστι.

to benefit the people present at the discussion by explaining his views, S. argues that “S.’s appeal is ironic in the extreme, since he is calling upon T. to benefit his audience by explaining to them why he thinks benefiting others is something done only by simpletons.”

A second general issue on which I do not agree with S. is his way of dealing with dubious or patently fallacious reasoning on Socrates’ part. I do not mean that S. fails to signal fallacies in Socrates’ argumentation; quite on the contrary, S. is very good in pointing these out in his commentary. My reservations have to do with S.’s evaluation of these unsound arguments or downright fallacies. S.’s note on 346b1 ends with the remark that “[i]t is hard to believe that P. takes this argument seriously.” Here S. would have done well by pointing out what he thinks were P.’s motives for presenting it to his readers all the same. In the note on 346d4 S. remarks: “S. is hoping that T. – and P. is hoping that his readers – will not notice the fragility of the argument.” Did Plato really hope to fool his readers? I find that very hard to believe. In the discussion of the much-criticised argument at 349b1-350e10 S. writes: “This may allow us to infer that the argument satisfied P.”, but he then continues, “it may be an indication of P.’s gradual abandonment of the Socratic elenchus.” What are we to make of this? Did Plato find the argument satisfactory, or did he not? The reader would have been helped if S. had given a systematic account of how he interprets Plato’s use of fallacy.¹⁶

So much for my general comments on the commentary. I will now turn to a number of individual passages.

327a1 **χθές**: S. notes that *Republic* differs from other reported dialogues such as *Symposium* and *Theaetetus* in that the conversations in the latter dialogues took place some time ago, while the conversation in *Republic* was held the previous day. What S. does not mention (and what to the best of my knowledge has not been mentioned by anyone) is that the setting of *Republic* is physically impossible. The discussion in Cephalus’ house can be assumed to have started early in the evening, let’s say about 6 o’clock. Now the word count of *Republic* is slightly under 90,000; assuming that at normal leisurely speaking speed 100 words fill one minute, a simple calculation teaches us that it takes 15 continuous hours for *Republic* to be spoken from start to finish, which means that the discussion must have ended about 9 o’clock the next morning.¹⁷ But then we have to assume that Socrates almost immediately after the end of the actual conversation started reporting this conversation to Timaeus and his friends, as we read in the opening scene of *Timaeus*. It will have taken him some two hours to travel from Piraeus back to Athens and meet Timaeus c.s. there. His report to these might then have started at noon at the very earliest, and then must have lasted until about 3 o’clock in the following night. Now from the ending of *Symposium* we know that Socrates

¹⁶ The pioneer work in this field is the monograph by R.K. Sprague, *Plato’s Use of Fallacy*, London 1962.

¹⁷ In the note on 328a6 S. points out that those present at Cephalus’ house may have chosen to spend the **παννυχίς** (“all-night celebration”, 328a7) conversing.

was very strong indeed, but this would seem to be too much even for Socrates. Is this just another case of Plato's negligence with regard to the realism of his reported dialogues? Or is this a (hitherto neglected) argument in favour of the hypothesis that Book I originally was an independent dialogue after all?¹⁸ In that case there would be no logistic problem at all.

328d3: according to S. Cephalus considers having conversations "merely a pastime one pursues after the ability to enjoy bodily pleasures has waned." In reality, Cephalus states that pleasure in discussions increases in the same measure as bodily pleasures decrease, as if they were communicating vessels; that is, he doesn't imply that at an earlier age he did not like having conversations at all.

328e5: S. states that **τοῦτο** is the antecedent of **ὃ δὴ**, which I don't understand; it is better to take **ἐνταῦθα τῆς ἡλικίας** as the antecedent. **τοῦτο** refers to what precedes, namely the question of whether old age is tiresome or pleasant.

330b1-331b7: according to S. Cephalus' grandfather was "a ruthless tycoon" but this negative verdict is not supported by the text; the only thing we learn about him is that he was a very wealthy man, not that he was ruthless.

330d3: S. comments: "Cephalus' confidence regarding what S. can expect when he "is near the point of thinking he is going to die" is ironic given P.'s portrayal in *Apology*, *Crito* and *Phaedo*, of S.'s behavior when he not only thinks but is quite certain he is going to die." However, Cephalus is not speaking about Socrates specifically but about humans in general (d4 **τις**).

331b7: S. states that for Cephalus wealth is "a means of influencing the gods"; similarly, in the note on 352a10 S. refers to Cephalus' remark at 331b3 as a parallel for the hypothesis that the gods "can be bribed with sacrifices and offerings." This does not do justice to Cephalus. Making sacrifices to the gods is a religious duty; only excessive sacrifices could possibly be regarded as a way of bribing the gods.

331c6-8: S. states that in 414b-c "verbal falsehoods will on occasion be employed even by the Guardians of Callipolis"; in reality the so-called Noble Lie is not told *by* the Guardians but *to* them.

331e3: S.'s text runs as follows: **Ὅτι, ἢ δὲ ὅς, τὸ τὰ ὀφειλόμενα ἐκάστω ἀποδιδόναι δίκαιόν ἐστιν**; the other editions have **Ὅτι, ἢ δ' ὅς, τὸ τὰ ὀφειλόμενα κτέ.** S. explains his punctuation by stating that "the indirect form of the interrogative repeat[s] the direct form used by the interlocutor." He adduces some parallels, such as *Euthphr.* 2c2 **ἦντινα**. But for **ὅτι** unpreceded by a preposition this idiom is very rare, probably because **ὅτι** is also a conjunction, which might

¹⁸ In the note on 328a6 (already mentioned in my previous note) S. mentions the fact that "the torch-race, the dinner and the **παννυχίς** are lost sight of (...)." S. comments that the thwarted expectations with regard to these elements of the setting of the dialogue should not be ascribed to "absentmindedness on P.'s part or as evidence for inadequate revision when the independent dialogue that is now Book One was recast as the poem to *Republic*." But he does not seem to be aware of the chronological problems mentioned by me.

lead to confusion.¹⁹ According to S. the article **τό** places the phrase **τὰ ὀφειλόμενα ἐκάστωι ἀποδιδόναι δίκαιόν ἐστιν** in quotation marks, for which he refers to *Phlb.* 48c10 **τὸ γινῶθι σαυτόν**; but that is a very well-known phrase, which is not the case with **τὰ ὀφειλόμενα ἐκάστωι ἀποδιδόναι δίκαιόν ἐστιν**. Finally, S.'s claim that "when an infinitive is the subject of the copula, as below at 335e2, the infinitive normally has no article" is not true: the article can be present or absent; see KG 2.37-39.

332a11: S. interprets the phrase as "I understand (the point you are making), because it is not *what is owed* that one returns to a friend if it is to the friend's detriment."²⁰ I would rather stick to the traditional interpretation, "I understand that it is not what is owed." On S.'s reading, the statement a11-b3 **οὐ-ἀποδιδούς** is presented as Socrates' opinion, whereas in fact Socrates asks Polemarchus whether this is the way in which he (i.e. Polemarchus) thinks we should interpret Simonides' saying (b3 **οὐχ οὕτω λέγειν φῆς τὸν Σιμωνίδην**);).

332c2: S. states that in **τὸ προσήκον ἐκάστωι ἀποδιδόναι** the article **τό** does "double duty (...) serving to nominalize both **προσῆκον** and **ἀποδιδόναι**." Thus S. contradicts his own (wrong) statement quoted in my note on 331e3. And in itself the concept of an article "doing double duty" appears very unlikely to me. S. proposes the same interpretation of **τό** representing **τὸ τό** for 340c3-4 **τὸ τοῦ κρείττονος συμφέρον δοκοῦν εἶναι τῷ κρείττονι**, which is different from the present passage: there the article **τό** belongs to **δοκοῦν εἶναι**, "*that which* to the stronger *seems to be* the interest of the stronger."

334c10: S. calls the dative **τούτοις** a "dative of possessor", which is wrong. S. is led astray by his own translation, "Then they have good men as enemies?", which in itself is correct; but, as the translation shows, "as enemies" is predicative with "good men", and this is impossible with a *dativus possessivus*. If a label is to be used, I would vote for *dativus iudicantis* or *dativus incommodi*. Similarly, at 334e2 S.'s translation "for they have depraved friends" is misleadingly wrong; the real meaning is "their friends (i.e. the people who are **χρηστοί**, cf. c1-3) are depraved in their opinion."

335b2: S. labels **δικαίου ἀνδρός** as a "genitive of quality"; in fact it is a special use of the *genitivus possessivus*, as in Latin *patris est filios amare*; see KG 1.372-374. This genitive expresses the one who possesses a certain quality, not the quality itself.

336b4: rightly stating that **ἡσυχία** can refer to motionlessness or to silence, S. argues that "[w]e are thus kept in suspense over the nature of T.'s assault, whether it will be physical or verbal." This borders on nonsense: nowhere in Plato do interlocutors launch physical attacks on their opponents; moreover, two

¹⁹ I have checked the TLG for **ὅτι**; The only occurrence in Classical Greek is Eupolis fr. 128 **ὅτι**; **τὸ πυριατήριον**, where **ὅτι**; probably refers to a question that has not been preserved. but here confusion with the conjunction seems to be impossible.

²⁰ S. proposes a similar reading of **μανθάνω ὅτι** at 351b6; there too his interpretation appears unlikely to me.

lines before we read that Thrasymachus repeatedly tried to “attack the argument” (**ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τοῦ λόγου**), not the interlocutors.

337b7: S. argues that the usual **πότερον-ἢ** construction shifts to “but (instead) should I say something other than the true (answer)?” I don’t agree. The **πότερον** sentence ends at **τοῦ ἀληθοῦς** and is picked up by **ἢ πῶς εἶπω. ἀλλά** is used apodotically; see Denniston²¹ 11-13.

337b7: according to S. the subject of the sentence is “the answer”: “not even if it (the answer) is actually one of these”. I’d rather take the phrase to mean, “not even if justice is actually one of these.”

338b3: S. comments: “**χάριν ἀποδιδόναι** “show appreciation,” i.e. pay the fee for tuition.” The “i.e.” puzzles me, because it implies that “showing appreciation” and “paying a fee” are the same thing. S. rightly goes on to point out that “[s]ophists expect their pupils to give them a large monetary payment and also to be grateful for their willingness to share improving wisdom.”

338e3-4: S. states that **ἀπέφηναν τοῦτο δίκαιον τοῖς ἀρχομένοις εἶναι** is ambiguous, meaning either “they proclaim that this (**τὸ σφίσι συμφέρον**) is just for their subjects” or “they proclaim to their subjects that this is just.” S. opts for the second interpretation; I prefer the first one. To start with, the word order favours taking **τοῖς ἀρχομένοις** with **δίκαιον**; and this interpretation is also supported by such passages as 339d6-7 and 341a2.

341a1: S. argues that **μὴ** before **ἀμαρτάνοντα** “marks the participle as conditional.” I don’t agree. In the preceding clause it is stated as a fact that the ruler qua ruler doesn’t make mistakes; the following clause means “and given the fact that he doesn’t make mistakes, he establishes what is best for himself.”²² To my mind **μὴ** with **ἀμαρτάνοντα** is due to perseveration of **μὴ ἀμαρτάνειν**.

341e4: for the phrase **νῦν ἡύρημένη** S. quotes as a parallel *Euthd.* 285b4 **τέχνην ... τὴν νεωστὶ ἡύρημένην**. He then comments: “It is not clear (...) why S. introduces the notion of novelty, which is, in any event, irrelevant to his argument.” S. appears to confuse the present passage with the parallel passage from *Euthydemus*, because in the present passage Socrates does not state that the art of medicine was recently invented. **νῦν ἡύρημένη** means: “the art which, having been invented (at some time in the past), we presently have at our disposal.” Therefore S.’s conjecture **ἀνῆυρημένη** for **νῦν ἡύρημένη** is superfluous.

343a7: according to S., the implication of Thrasymachus’ question whether Socrates has a nurse is that she, “after all her efforts, has given up looking after S. since he (...) is ineducable and cannot even (**οὐδέ**) identify “for her” the difference between sheep and shepherd.” But of course Thrasymachus’ question whether Socrates has a nurse is not serious. The fact that, according to Thrasymachus, Socrates doesn’t see the difference between sheep and shepherd is an indication

²¹ J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1954².

²² Rewriting the sentence in direct speech results in something like **ὁ ἄρχων, καθ’ ὅσον ἄρχων ἐστίν, οὐχ ἀμαρτάνει, οὐχ ἀμαρτάνων δὲ τὸ αὐτῷ βέλτιστον τίθεται**.

that he is as stupid as a toddler; his way of expressing his contempt is asking after his nurse.

343e3: according to S. “it is unclear whether this (= **τά γε οἰκεία**) is to be taken as subject of **ἔχειν** (...) or as an accusative of respect (*CGCG* §30.14), with the just man as subject.” In the next note, S. takes **μοχθηροτέρως ἔχειν** as “being in a worse condition”, in accordance with the frequent use of **ἔχειν** with adverb. To my mind, it is preferable to interpret the phrase as “have his affairs in a worse condition”, with the just man as the subject of “have”; cf. *LSJ* s.v. **ἔχω** A.II.13.

345a6: S. prints **πείθεις** with *Vind.phil.gr.* 89 (in all probability a conjecture) and Ficino (who translates *suades*) instead of the reading of the primary mss., **πείθει**. If **πείθεις** were the transmitted reading I would not have difficulties in accepting it but the fact that it is not makes me suspicious. As possible subjects for the transmitted **πείθει** S. mentions “**ἀδικία** or **τις** or the hypothetical unjust man.” The last one would do very well, to my mind. We need not imagine the perfectly unjust man being actually engaged in a discussion with Socrates; the sense is “the concept of the perfectly unjust man does not persuade me etcetera.”

345d2: S. states that “the “antecedent” of the relative pronoun is **τούτοι** in the following clause.” This is impossible because **τούτοι** is in the final clause which depends on the main clause of which **ἐπὶ ᾧ τέτακται** is a constituent. **ἐπὶ ᾧ** is a relative with embedded antecedent, <τούτου> **ἐπὶ ᾧ τέτακται**. **τούτοι** in the final clause picks up <τούτου> **ἐπὶ ᾧ τέτακται**, but that doesn’t mean that it is the syntactic antecedent of the relative pronoun.

346c1: S. prints **Οὐκ, ἔφη**, against **Οὐκ ἔφη** of the other editions, noting: “whether this or **Οὐκ ἔφη** more accurately represents P.’s intention cannot be determined. It seems, however, that S. changes from direct quotation of T.’s responses to indirect only at c11, where the change is marked by S.’s editorial **μόγισ**.” Although this is a keen observation I think we should rather stick to the usual **Οὐκ ἔφη** here. The formula occurs frequently, both in Plato and elsewhere. On the other hand, when in Plato an interlocutor starts his answer with **οὐκ** it never stands alone but it is always followed by one or more other words, e.g. **Οὐκ, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο, ἔφη** (*Phd.* 64c9); **Οὐκ, ἄν γε ἐμοὶ πείθῃ** (*Phd.* 89b7); **Οὐκ, ἔφη, ἔγωγε** (*Chrm.* 167e9).²³

347c1: with regard to **αὐτοῖς** S. remarks that “its position marks it for contrast.” In fact, the *casus obliqui* of **αὐτός** behave like enclitics and as such are regularly found in Wackernagel position.

347d1: S. is puzzled by the addition of **οὐδὲ ὁμοίως**, “seemingly contradicted by what is said next.” I think the phrase can be explained by assuming that Socrates is talking here about the complete group of rulers (the later philosopher-kings) as

²³ For alternating direct and indirect answers cf., e.g., *Euthd.* 286c9-d10 *Συνεχόρει*. — Πότερον οὖν ψευδῇ μὲν λέγειν οὐκ ἔστι, δοξάζειν μέντοι ἔστιν; — Οὐδὲ δοξάζειν, ἔφη. — Οὐδ’ ἄρα ψευδῆς, ἦν δ’ ἐγώ, δόξα ἔστι τὸ παράπαν. — Οὐκ ἔφη. — Οὐδ’ ἄρα ἀμαθία οὐδ’ ἀμαθεὶς ἀνθρώποι· ἢ οὐ τοῦτ’ ἂν εἴη ἀμαθία, εἴπερ εἴη, τὸ ψεύδεσθαι τῶν πραγμάτων; — Πάνυ γε, ἔφη. — Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστιν, ἦν δ’ ἐγώ. — Οὐκ ἔφη.

such. There is no group which is superior to this class nor is there another group which has the same capacities as the group of the philosopher-kings.

351a3-5: with regard to **δικαιοσύνη** and **ἡ ἀδικία** S. notes: “as is often the case with abstract nouns, it is not clear why the article appears with one but not the other.” In this specific case I think there is an explanation. In a3 there is no article with **δικαιοσύνη** because it is preceded by two nouns (**σοφία τε καὶ ἀρετή**) which together constitute the predicate. At a5, **ἐπειδήπερ ἐστὶν ἀμαθία ἡ ἀδικία**, the article is needed to make it unambiguously clear that **ἀδικία** is the subject and **ἀμαθία** the predicate; without the article the syntactic roles of the two could easily be interchanged.

351e3: S. thinks that this refers to “two cities or other groups”; in the note on 351e9-352a1 he states that Socrates “will begin to ask about injustice in individuals only at 352a5.” I don’t agree. In the first place, I don’t see why Socrates should speak about injustice between “two cities or other groups”; cities or groups do not necessarily have to cooperate, and the whole argument is based on the assumption that injustice makes effective cooperation impossible. In the second place, the concept of injustice working within one individual, which is entirely novel and which is the cornerstone of the argument of *Republic* as a whole, is carefully prepared. Injustice at work within a larger group (d5-e1) is easily understood; the same goes for injustice creating discord between two people (e2-3). But before sketching the effects of injustice within the individual Socrates first makes Glaucon concede that injustice **ἐν ἐνί** does not lose its power (e6-7). The three steps are subsumed in 351e9-352a3, where **ἄλλωι ὅττωι** is neuter (as S. rightly notes) and stands for “anything you can think of”, including the “one.” Now that the ground has been sufficiently prepared Socrates can take the final step and explain that the effects of injustice within the individual are the same as those within a group. The unjust man is in discord with himself, which robs him of the capacity to be effective in his actions.

CONCLUSION

Although I do not agree with S. on each and every issue I hope that I have made it abundantly clear that I have great admiration for S.’s work. His learned and judicious commented edition will be an indispensable and much appreciated working tool for Platonists for many years to come.

GERARD BOTER
VU University Amsterdam
g.j.boter@vu.nl

RAPHAEL WOOLF, *Plato's Charmides*, Cambridge studies in the dialogues of Plato, Cambridge-New York: Cambridge University Press, 2023, x+271 pp., ISBN 978-1-009-30819-9.

In Plato's *Charmides*, Socrates narrates a conversation about σωφροσύνη (translated by Woolf as "temperance") that he had held in a wrestling gym just after returning to Athens from the Battle of Potidaea. His chief interlocutors were a beautiful youth, Charmides, and the youth's older cousin, Critias, both relatives of Plato and both eventual leaders of the infamous oligarchy that ruled Athens in 404-403. Although the *Charmides* had been rather neglected in comparison with more "constructive" dialogues, in the last decade it has been the subject of monographs by T. Tuozzo, D. Levine, V. Tsouna, and I. Cohen-Taber, of a translation and commentary by C. Moore and C. Raymond, and of a host of papers.

Raphael Woolf now offers us a new reading. It is not a traditional line-by-line philological/philosophical commentary *cum* translation but rather an original interpretation, to which Woolf invites readers to "formulate, as I hope they will, their own critical responses" (256). Throughout, the book raises problems I had not considered and challenges various assumptions. At times, though, I felt that I was being given assertions or speculations, and I do not share all Woolf's methodological principles. Nevertheless, students of the *Charmides* and of Plato's communicative strategies will profit from Woolf's carefully thought-out analysis.

The first of Woolf's methodological principles is Agnosticism: "the idea that we attempt to read the *Charmides*, and in particular the character of Socrates, as independently as possible from what we (think we) know about what goes on in other works of Plato" (253), lest we fall prey to a question-begging and/or vicious circularity (5). The second, the principle of Separation, stipulates that "we should not assume that what is said or done by any of Plato's characters is necessarily endorsed by Plato himself, or identifiable with Plato's own views or motivations (11)."

After years of debate about Plato's authorial voice, some version of Separation is by now widely accepted. The principle of Agnosticism, however, opens up controversy. Woolf allows for some dialogues to refer to other ones (e.g. *Phaedo* to *Meno*, *Timaeus* to *Republic*), and in fact, he enlists the *Apology*, *Lysis* and *Symposium* in places to support findings that he seeks to ground first in the *Charmides*. The good reader will seek to take a work on its own merits, but I would contend that we may understand it better in confrontation with other works of the author.

Woolf posits two central elements of our dialogue's structure. Its horizontal structure is formed by the sequence of events from beginning to end. Its vertical structure consists in "a series of compositional levels": Plato composes; Socrates narrates a first-person monologue to an unnamed companion; conversations and events, some of them recalled from anterior time frames, make up Socrates' narrative (16-17).

From the way Socrates comments on the thoughts and feelings he had during the events he narrates, and in line with the principle of Separation, Woolf distinguishes Socrates' and Plato's goals. Socrates' "critical inquiries into temperance do not have as their ultimate goal the discovery of the truth about temperance. Rather, that goal is subordinate to his desire to attain a vision of beauty ... his enquiry is in the service of his erotic drive" (18). Woolf proffers this solution as the best explanation for what he sees as a seeming lack of coherence between two halves of the dialogue, viz. Socrates' interactions with Charmides and his intricate discussion with Critias. For Woolf, Socrates' aim in the Critias half is to "seduce" the listening "Charmides into baring his soul once more" (26). Socrates' erotic interest in Charmides' soul, then, is the unifying element of the story. On the other hand, Plato's goal in writing the dialogue is to "use his portrayal of Socrates' pursuit to instil in his readers ... the stance of enquiry" towards what Socrates says and towards propositions in general (18, cf. e.g. 28-9, 31, 40-3, 225). As Plato's goal, this is too thin; surely any Platonic dialogue challenges our critical engagement. Woolf does suggest as well that despite the dialogue's aporetic ending, readers may discern a valid sense of temperance. He proposes "the art of self-realisation" throughout a whole life as that valid sense (165, 233), inasmuch as temperance is defined by Critias as "self-knowledge" and then, in response to Socrates' questioning, as a species of ἐπιστήμη, which can include knowing how (17-19).

Alongside their different goals, notes Woolf, Socrates and Plato also have different modes of communication: Socrates' is oral, Plato's written. Woolf submits that Plato gives us Charmides mutely taking in Socrates' discussion with Critias, and Socrates' unnamed listener mutely taking in the entire story, in order to invite us "to reflect upon what our own engagement with the written work should be" (29). The same message, he speculates (cf. "may have set up," 149), is conveyed by Critias' taking more care than Socrates to interpret discourse (159-64, 182-4, 240, 255-6). I incline more toward Harvey Yunis' conclusion, however, that "Plato's Socrates can be considered the critical reader par excellence."¹

Woolf tackles the narrative proper by enlisting his principle of Separation to urge us to "maintain ... a certain critical stance towards Socrates' perspective" as narrator. To assume that Socrates' outlook is normatively privileged "is simply fallacious," for some narrators in literary works are unreliable (31), as testimony often is (40-1). Woolf enlists his principle of Agnosticism to say that "Socrates' featuring as a *recurrent* [W.'s emphasis] leading character in the corpus" does not license us to privilege his "perspectival viewpoint" (32-3). A "certain oddness" in Socrates – his "eerily calm reaction" to what happened in the battle; his "startling level of nonchalance" to questions about it; his suppression of details from before and after he arrives at the wrestling gym – leads Woolf to emphasize that Socrates

¹ H. Yunis, "Thucydides, Plato, and the Emergence of the Critical Reader," in H. Yunis, ed., *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge 2003, 189-212, at 206, a paper not cited by Woolf.

“is *curating* [W.’s emphasis] his narration” (40). Woolf strikes me as toying with but stopping short of considering Socrates an unreliable narrator; compare “we may wish to exercise caution about taking on trust Socrates’ description of Critias here” (127) with “The effect is spoiled if we label ... Socrates’ self-characterization as ‘dishonest’” (141 n. 142). Woolf tells us what some characters think: e.g. Charmides is “stung” (134), “humbled” (137), is “a willing player of the game. He knows that he is being seduced by Socrates ...” (250). Information about Charmides, though, comes only from narrator Socrates, toward whom, Woolf says, “Plato may not be adopting an uncritical stance” (28). On Woolf’s principles, it remains mysterious how Woolf knows these thoughts of Charmides. Overall, I remain hazy about what Woolf’s problematization of Socrates as narrator accomplishes.

Accordingly, I am convinced neither that Socrates’ *primary* goal is “to look at a beautiful soul” (128) nor that Socrates’ “deployment of erotics” toward Charmides (on which cf. below) “is for the benefit of himself” (137 n. 128, cf. 251). Readers are likely to agree with the late Jerry Press that Socrates is “one of the most well-formed characters in the history of Western literature”.² Who is that character? The standard view is that the Socratic writers depict a man whose primary goals were to try to figure out and live out the qualities that make a person’s life good and to benefit others by taking them into the search. In the words of one early voice, “Socrates was occupying himself with the ethical virtues and was the first to seek to make general definitions about these” (Arist. *Meta.* 1078b17-19). Another editorialized, “Socrates throughout his whole life, spending the greatest part of what was his, was benefitting all who were willing; for he sent away better those who consorted with him” (X. *Mem.* 1.2.61). In a dialogue, Socrates says of his love (*erōs*) for Alcibiades, “although I know no subject matter which I could teach a person to his benefit, yet I thought that, by being together with him, I could make him better through love” (δὲν τὸ ἐρᾶν, Aeschin. Socr. 11.c). Socrates exhorts his fellow citizens young and old to live virtuous lives (cf. e. g. *Ap.* 29e–30a, *Grg.* 521d, 526e). In Plato, Socrates is described as hanging around wherever there is some piece of learning or undertaking that can benefit youth (*La.* 180c2-4). In *Lysis* 223a1-2, Socrates has in mind to “stir up” one of the older bystanders when his discussion with two boys has failed to reach a definition of “friend,” as though philosophical discovery is his goal. The principle of Agnosticism rules out interdialogic connections only if that principle is obligatory. In the *Charmides*, Socrates would “much more gladly” (πολὺν ... ἥδιον) examine with Critias than with Charmides whether the definition of temperance as “doing one’s own things” is true or not (162e4-5). Woolf describes Socrates’ tactic here as “to fall back to the position that merely discovering the truth is what they are after” (124). “Merely” ignores Socrates’ “much more gladly.” Socrates soon reiterates his concern for

² J. Press, “The *Elenchos* in the *Charmides*, 162-175”, in G. Scott, ed., *Does Socrates Have a Method? Rethinking the Elenchus in Plato’s Dialogues and Beyond*, University Park, PA 2002, 252-65, at 265.

seeking the truth because he himself does not know (165b8-c2, 166d1-4). He adds that he does the same for his friends' (ἐπιτηδείων) sake, and he gains Critias' agreement that "it is a common good for practically all people for the way each thing is to become evident" (166d4-6). Woolf does not confront these passages' implications for Socrates' primary goal.

Woolf has many insights into Socrates' erotic drive and its immediate object, (prospective) beauty in Charmides' soul. His presentation of Socrates as though practicing an "erotic art," however (61, 93), is not anchored in the text. Woolf argues (19, 93) that it is likely ("hinted at") that Socrates claims an erotic art, since Socrates considered (ἐνόμισα) Cydias to be wisest in respect to erotic matters (155d5). For Socrates to have a belief about erotic matters, however, does not require him to have or claim an art, τέχνη, about erotics. An art would presumably rest on knowledge, ἐπιστήμη, and neither of these epistemic states about erotics is claimed for Socrates in the text; Socrates only talks about lovers and loving (*Chrm.* 154-155) and has belief about Cydias. Is Woolf inadvertently importing, against his own Agnosticism, what he has read in other dialogues about Socrates' claims to have an art (*Phdr.* 257a) and knowledge (*Lys.* 204b-205a, *Smp.* 177d) about *erōs*?

By now it should be clear that I fall into Woolf's group of "readers who find the principle of agnosticism uncongenial" (12). [1] Traditional literary characters are invested with a certain coherence when they are presented to audiences in new works. Audiences receive such characters with attitudes already conditioned by tradition. In the earlier fourth century, "dialogical unities" about Socrates were being produced, on average, one per month.³ While we do not know how soon the character, Socrates, became traditional enough to acquire "coherence," it seems probable that consumers of a new Socratic dialogue would import expectations about the Socrates character into their experience. We do not have evidence that fourth century audiences held the principle of Agnosticism. [2] Woolf already acknowledges some intertextuality within the Platonic corpus. Moreover, some passages call for illumination from other dialogues: e.g. the "dialecticians" remain opaque in the *Euthydemus* (290c5), but their craft is described in presumably later dialogues. [3] As a principle, Agnosticism can needlessly restrict. Deeds and words in one work can be enhanced by comparison with those in other works of the same author, in which the same characters appear. Think of Euripides' portrayals of Menelaus, or of Shakespeare's Prince Hal plays, Faulkner's Snopes novels, or Alcott's *Little Women* and *Little Men*. [4] Agnosticism rules out interdialogical investigation of salient philosophical issues, such as the elenchus, virtue as knowledge, definitions and universals, or the nature of relative terms. Readers who wonder what the *Charmides* contributes may chafe at Woolf's narrowing of the inquiry.

³ L. Rossetti, "Le dialogue socratique *in statu nascendi*," *PhilosAnt* 1, 2001, 11-35 at 31-2. On an intertextual, "standard Socrates" see Rossetti's "The Sokratikoi Logoi as a literary barrier. Toward the identification of a Standard Socrates through them," in V. Karasmanis, ed., *Socrates. 2400 Years Since his Death*, Athens 2004, 81-94.

On the other hand, as I followed Woolf through the dialogue, many times I wrote “good” opposite analyses of particular passages, e.g. that: tensions between Socrates’ story about the soul-body doctrine of the Thracian doctor and his offers to apply it to Charmides’ headache are resolved if Socrates cares about the well-being of soul over body (98-100); Charmides’ first definition of temperance as “doing everything ... in an orderly and quiet way,” despite its limitations, does appear to picture temperance as “capable of suffusing a whole life” (232); if knowledge of knowledge is “directed at internal relations between propositions,” we might be able to flesh out the scaled-back benefit Socrates envisions for it in 172b-c (204); if our self consists in what we think, by testing propositions we contribute to realising ourselves (223). Woolf lays bare many discontinuities in Socrates’ narrative. The reader comes away with much over which to ruminate about this challenging dialogue.

Woolf writes with an engaging style. The book is well produced, and I noticed only one typo. The extensive and current bibliography, mostly of works in English, is followed by an index of ancient passages and a short, general index of topics and names ancient and modern. I recommend Woolf’s reading especially to those interested in the relationships that Plato represents between Socrates and interlocutors, in Socrates’ attitudes toward those individuals, and in Plato’s strategies for pushing us to deeper critical responses.⁴

DAVID J. MURPHY

New York

david.murphy20@verizon.net

OLIVER PRIMAVESI, CHRISTOF RAPP, BENJAMIN MORISON, *Aristotle: De Motu Animalium. Text and translation*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2023, 256 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-887446-1.

The book under review comes at the end of a long and truly remarkable scholarly journey punctuated by the dissemination of several outstanding research products and involving, at every stage of the process, serious and unselfish teamwork. Let me recall, briefly, the main lines of this journey. Everything started with the discovery of a small group of recent manuscripts that preserve a pure, that is uncontaminated, version of the Greek text of the *De motu animalium* (hereafter *De motu*). The discovery was made by the late Pieter De Leemans and made available to the public in his edition of the Latin translation of Aristotle’s *De motu*

⁴ I am grateful to Chris Raymond for comments on an earlier draft of this review.

produced by William of Moerbeke.¹ De Leemans's main concern at the time was the Latin text of Aristotle's *De motu*, so he did not pursue the implications of his discovery for the establishment of the Greek text. The potentially transformative value of his discovery was understood by Oliver Primavesi, who along with his research team established that we are dealing with a second, independent branch of the manuscript tradition. Primavesi and his team named this branch 'family β '. Besides being uncontaminated, the manuscripts that belong to this family were not used by any of the previous editors of the Greek text of Aristotle's *De motu*, from Imanuel Bekker (in his edition of Aristotle's works published in 1831) to Martha Nussbaum.² They all (no one excluded) only availed themselves of manuscripts belonging to what is now labeled 'family α '.³

Since the variant readings transmitted by these two families have equal stemmatic value, it became clear very early on that most decisions on which variant to print could not be taken on purely philological grounds. In dealing with a philosophical text such as Aristotle's *De motu*, even the expert philologist needs help from historians of philosophy. In this particular case, help came in two ways. First, Oliver Primavesi teamed up with Klaus Corcilius, who at the time was still teaching at UC Berkeley. Their collaboration resulted in a new critical edition of the text accompanied by German translation, philological and philosophical introduction plus running commentary.⁴ This volume is not superseded by the one under review. On the contrary, it contains the most in-depth and most useful philosophical commentary in any modern language on the text of Aristotle's *De motu*. Primavesi was able to find additional expert feedback under way: a version of his Greek text was presented at the 19th Symposium Aristotelicum, which took place in Munich in 2011. Among the participants at the Symposium were a few noted specialists of Aristotle's philosophical thought (Pierre-Marie Morel, the author of the most recent translation of the *De motu* and the *Parva Naturalia* into French, and the late John Cooper, among others). This Symposium Aristotelicum was also the occasion for a collective, in-depth look at the historical

¹ P. De Leemans, *Aristoteles, De progressu animalium, De motu animalium: Translatio. Guillelmi de Morbeka*, Aristotles Latinus XVII 2.II-III, Turnhout 2011

² M. Craven Nussbaum, *Aristotle's De motu animalium: Text with Translation, Commentary and Interpretative Essays*, Princeton 1978, 1985².

³ While no pure β -manuscript was used by any of the modern editors of Aristotle's *De motu*, some of the distinctive β -readings were known, since they had been adopted by contamination by the scribe of *Vaticanus gr.* 1339 (P) and by William of Moerbeke. It is the presence of these apparently extra-archetypal readings in the otherwise insignificant manuscript P, as already documented by Bekker (I. Bekker, *Aristoteles graece*, 2 volumes, Academia Regia Borussica, Berlin 1831), that was the driving force behind the gradual discovery of hyparchetype β .

⁴ Oliver Primavesi, Klaus Corcilius, *Aristoteles. Über die Bewegung der Lebewesen / De motu animalium*, Philologische Einführung, neuer griechischer Text von O.P., philosophische Einführung, Übersetzung und Kommentar von K.C., Hamburg 2018 [Durchgesehene und korrigierte Lizenzausgabe der Wissenschaftlichen Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 2019].

and philosophical implications of the new Greek text. The proceedings of the Symposium were published by Christof Rapp and Oliver Primavesi.⁵

The book under review is a special reprint of the following components of the Symposium volume: the philosophical introduction by Christof Rapp, the philological introduction plus Greek text by Oliver Primavesi, and the facing English translation based on the Greek text by Benjamin Morison. The three co-authors have tried to make the volume more user-friendly by adding a detailed table of contents which can serve as a useful guide for the perusal of the philosophical and philological introductions. The Greek text printed in this volume differs from the one offered in the Symposium Aristotelicum volume in two cases. Primavesi explains why he changed his mind in those cases in the Foreword (page viii). It is worth stressing that this volume is not the final product of this endeavor, let alone the end of this scholarly journey. An *editio maior* of Aristotle's *De motu* is announced at pages 70 (footnote 26), page 90 (footnote 167), and 126 (footnote 262). This edition will document all the readings as well as the stemmatic position of all the *codices descripti*. In this way it will provide the *apparatus lectionum omnium* with all the relevant materials for a full *Überlieferungsgeschichte*.

One thing that should not be left unmentioned in this attempt to highlight the transformative value of this new edition is that the work done on the manuscript tradition of Aristotle's *De motu* has prepared the way for a radical reassessment of the Greek text of the following writings: *De sensu*, *De memoria*, *De somno*, *De insomnis*, and *De divinatione per somnum*. It has become customary to refer to this corpus of writings with the acronym *PN1*.⁶ As Primavesi makes it clear at the outset of his introduction, our *De motu* is part and parcel of this corpus of writings, not only in the mind of Aristotle but also for its textual tradition. We have, therefore, every reason to expect the stemma of Aristotle's *De motu* to be confirmed by the stemma of *PN1*. Here let me only say, in the interest of space, that the most recent research on this front has put beyond any reasonable doubt the existence of a β -text for the whole of *PN1*.⁷

⁵ C. Rapp, O. Primavesi, *Aristotle's De motu animalium*, Proceedings of the Symposium Aristotelicum, Oxford 2020.

⁶ To the best of my knowledge, the first to employ the notations *PN1* and *PN2* to distinguish the two groups of texts that jointly forms our *Parva naturalia* was Marwan Rashed (in M. Rashed, "Agrégat de parties ou *vinculum substantiale*? Sur une hésitation conceptuelle et textuelle du corpus aristotélicien", in A. Laks, M. Rashed, eds., *Aristote et le mouvement des animaux. Dix études sur le De motu animalium*, Villeneuve d'Ascq 2004).

⁷ In addition to Appendix IV in the volume under review, which is entirely devoted to the study of the stemmatic position of *Berolinensis Phill.* (B^e) for the text of *De insomniis*, the reader who wants to learn more on this point should look at the following research products: (1) Primavesi's new edition of the quotation of Empedocles's simile of the lantern as reported in Aristotle's *De sensu* 2 (= O. Primavesi, "Zitatfragment und Textkritik: Empedokles' Theorie der Augenfunktion und der Text des Laternengleichnisses", in A.K. Bleuler, O. Primavesi, eds., *Lachmanns Erbe: Editionsmethoden in klassischer Philologie und germanistischer Mediävistik*, Berlin-New York, 427-562); and (2) the PhD dissertation in two volumes on the text of the *Parva Naturalia* 1 by J. Winzenrieth (J.

I sketched out the scholarly context in which this special edition of Aristotle's *De motu* has to be placed for two main reasons. To begin with, this critical edition is the outcome of more than ten years of innovative, cutting-edge scholarly research. Moreover, it shows that real progress is possible in our discipline provided that we work as part of a competent team in which philological, historical, and indeed philosophical skills are joint together. Let me elaborate further on this second point. Many still think that we are barred from making real progress in the study of ancient philosophy because there is an insurmountable gap separating us from ancient texts. This is especially true for Plato and Aristotle whose works have been known, read, and commented upon for millennia. What can we possibly add to what has already been said on and around those works?

Let me try to answer this question with a focus on Aristotle. For a number of reasons, including the complicated reception of Aristotle's works in Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic times, we will never be able to close up the gap that separates us from his works. But we can reduce this gap as far as possible with the help of all the information in our possession. The edition produced by Primavesi has achieved this goal. In the case of Aristotle's *De motu*, the earliest accessible state of the text is represented by Alexander of Aphrodisias and his paraphrasis and verbal quotations of the text toward the end of his own *De anima*. Here Alexander violates the strict division of labor that Aristotle envisioned, and indeed enforced, between study of the soul and study of what he regarded as being common to soul and body. We do not need to discuss why Alexander chose to violate this division of labor. What matters here is that by so doing he affords us glimpses of the state of the Greek text at a relatively early stage (beginning of the third century AD). To be sure, we are still more than 500 years removed from Aristotle, with no way to close the gap any further. But this does not take anything away from what is achieved by Primavesi in his critical edition of Aristotle's *De motu*. For the first time in the history of scholarship, we have a text that is based on a full collation of the forty-seven extant Greek manuscripts that constitute our direct tradition for the text of Aristotle's *De motu*. The additional information provided by the hitherto unknown family **β** allowed Primavesi to print a Greek text that differs from the one established by Martha Nussbaum in 120 cases. This is a staggering number especially if one keeps in mind that Aristotle's *De motu* is a rather short text (six Bekker pages, from 698^b1 to 704^b3).⁸

Primavesi has provided his edition with two critical apparatuses. In addition to an *apparatus plenior* placed at the end of the Greek text, where all the significant readings of all the independent manuscripts, Primavesi has printed an abridged and simplified apparatus at the foot of each page. This second apparatus only registers where the two hyparchetypes **α** and **β** diverge from one another. This is

Winzenrieth, *Les Parva naturalia d'Aristotele. Édition et interprétation*, PhD Dissertation Sorbonne Université Paris 2023, 2 vols, defended in July 2023).

⁸ All divergences are conveniently registered in an *ad hoc* appendix to the Greek text (Appendix III: 142-6).

a most welcome innovation. As Primavesi explains in the Forward to the volume, (1) the variant readings transmitted by α and β have stemmatic equal weight, and (2) the users of the Greek text are unlikely to agree in every case with the editor on their respective merits. This abridged and simplified apparatus lets them free to decide for themselves what text to use in all cases of α/β divergence. Readers do not have to be trained philologists to be able to use this apparatus. But if they are, they will be also able to appreciate the unabridged information for the two branches of the direct tradition provided in the *apparatus plenior*. Primavesi relied on this information to draw his *stemma codicum*, which is printed on page 133.

What Primavesi has accomplished has a significance that goes beyond the narrow boundaries of scholarship on and around Aristotle. His edition illustrates, in a vivid and remarkable way, the truth conveyed by the dictum: *recentiores, non deteriores* ("later [witnesses], but not inferior [ones]"). Quite tellingly, Primavesi has chosen this very dictum as the epigraph for his philological introduction. This dictum is forever associated with Giorgio Pasquali, the great Italian classical scholar, who used to stress that the value of a witness does not depend on its age. A young manuscript may be a direct copy of an old and very good witness. While we may have lost the latter, we still have access to its valuable readings thanks to the young manuscript. This is exactly what happened in our case. The manuscripts that are crucial for the newly discovered branch of the tradition (family β) are all late (that is, fourteenth- or even fifteenth-century) but very good copies of an old manuscript that goes back to late antiquity. They are *Berlin Phill.* 1507/I (= B^e) and *Erlangen Univ. Bibl.* A 4 (= E^r). Their close relationship is explained by positing that an early, perhaps ninth-century, manuscript produced by transliteration. This lost manuscript was copied twice. While B^e is a late uncorrected copy of this manuscript, E^r depends on another carefully corrected copy of this manuscript which was also used by William of Moerbeke for his revisions of the Latin translation of Aristotle's *De motu*.

It is time to turn to the philosophical introduction by Christoph Rapp. There are at least two ways to write an introduction. Some writers like to give precise instructions on how to navigate a difficult text, thereby imposing a strong structure on the text and keeping their readers on a very short leash. Others, by contrast, design their introduction so as to leave the reader open to explore a text, no matter how difficult it is. Christof Rapp belongs to the second group of writers. That does not mean that his introduction is thin, or that it lacks philosophical ambition. Quite the opposite. Scholars have not been able to see how the first part (*De motu* 1-5) and the second (*De motu* 6-11) form a coherent unity. In the first part of his introduction, Rapp provides an expert and lucid analysis of the overall argument of Aristotle's *De motu*. He argues for its integrity and thematic unity and shows that the second part of the treatise can be seen as a natural continuation of the first. He also defends the authenticity of the work, which has been doubted by a few scholars (especially in the nineteenth century). By my lights, however, the most valuable contribution of this introduction consists in all the careful work done to

remove a few incorrect assumptions that have historically hampered our ability to appreciate the contents of Aristotle's *De motu*.

Let me illustrate this point with the help of one example. Take the putative incompatibility of cardiocentrism and psychological hylomorphism. By 'psychological hylomorphism' I mean the thesis that the soul is the form of the organic body. The theoretical framework for this view is found in Aristotle's *De anima* II 1. The argument of Aristotle's *De motu* ends up with the view that the soul is located at the center of the living body. In the most developed (most perfect) animals, which are blooded animals, this center is the heart. In the less developed (less perfect) animals, which are all bloodless, this is to be identified with something that plays an analogous function. We do not need to elaborate further on this Aristotelian doctrine, which gives rise to a few idiosyncratic results. What matters is that the view defended in Aristotle's *De motu* is also promoted in the short essays that are traditionally known as *Parva Naturalia*. Scholars have often felt that cardiocentrism, as defended in Aristotle's *De motu* and *Parva Naturalia*, and psychological hylomorphism, as embraced in his *De anima*, belong to different, indeed incompatible, ways to conceive the relation between soul and body. It has been difficult for scholars to see how it is possible for Aristotle to claim that the soul is the form of the whole organic body and at the same time to claim that the soul is located in a specific bodily part. As a result, they have dealt with what they perceived as a tension between cardiocentrism and psychological hylomorphism mostly by means of a developmental approach. Very briefly: while Aristotle would have endorsed cardiocentrism at an early stage of his intellectual development, he would have later settled for psychological hylomorphism (Nuyens 1948, endorsed with minor modifications in Ross 1955, 1-18 [his introduction to Aristotle's *Parva Naturalia*] and Ross 1961 [his *editio maior* of Aristotle's *De anima*]).⁹ Rapp shows, convincingly and expertly, that cardiocentrism is compatible with the main tenets of psychological hylomorphism. He highlights various strategies that can be adopted to downplay, or even to outright dismiss, the perceived tensions. Without telling his reader how to read Aristotle's *De motu*, let alone Aristotle's *De anima*, Rapp provides the exegetical resources that allows us to integrate cardiocentrism and psychological hylomorphism into a coherent philosophical position.

Other topics that are discussed by Rapp in his introduction include the use Aristotle makes of the so-called practical syllogism in *De motu* 7, the role that both *phantasia* and desire play in Aristotle's explanation of animal motion, and his treatment of animal motion as a case of self-motion. All in all, Rapp has been able to produce a comprehensive and well-argued overview of the contents of Aristotle's *De motu* combined with an accurate appraisal of the scholarly

⁹ D.W. Ross, *Aristotle's Parva naturalia*, Oxford 1955; F.J.C.J. Nuyens, *L'évolution de la psychologie d'Aristote*, Éditions de l'Istitut supérieur de philosophie, UC Louvain 1948; D.W. Ross, *Aristotle's De anima*, Oxford 1961.

debates on and around them. In my view, this is exactly what is expected from an introduction which does not want to impose itself on its reader.

Let us move on to the final component of this special edition of Aristotle's *De motu*: the English translation of the Greek text by Benjamin Morison. Any translator of Aristotle's *De motu* has to confront Aristotle's difficult, and at times convoluted, prose style. How does Morison get by in his translation of the Greek text? I will answer this question by concentrating on the first two sentences of the treatise. There, Aristotle is trying to accomplish a few things at once: he not only announces the main topic of the treatise but also gives us an idea of how the investigation is to be conducted. More directly, it is not sufficient to explain swimming, flying, walking, and the like. Apparently, this has already been done elsewhere.¹⁰ At this point, one has to supply an account of animal motion that maps on all animal motion. Two salient features of this account are announced. First, this is a causal account that will explain animal motion by pointing to a common cause. Second, this account will say in general what the common cause is. At the very least, we can safely say that these features are meant to demarcate the investigation to be launched and explain how it contributes to the overall study of animal motion. Here is the Greek text followed by Morison's translation:

Περὶ δὲ τῶν ζῴων κινήσεως, ὅσα μὲν αὐτῶν περὶ ἕκαστον ὑπάρχει γένος—καὶ τίνες διαφοραὶ καὶ τίνες αἰτίαι τῶν καθ' ἕκαστον συμβεβηκότων αὐτοῖς—ἐπέσκεπται περὶ πάντων ἐν ἑτέροις. ὅλως δὲ περὶ τῆς κοινῆς αἰτίας τοῦ κινεῖσθαι κίνησιν ὁποιαοῦν—τὰ μὲν γὰρ πτήσει κινεῖται τὰ δὲ νεύσει τὰ δὲ πορεύει¹¹ τῶν ζῴων, τὰ δὲ κατ' ἄλλους τρόπους τοιούτους—ἐπισκεπτέον νῦν. (*De motu* 698a1-7)

Concerning the movement of animals, those features which apply to each kind of them—what their differences are, and for what reasons they each have their particular features—have all been investigated elsewhere. What needs investigation now is, quite generally, the common cause of this moving, whatever type of movement it is, for some animals move by flying, some by swimming, some by walking and some in other such ways. (*De motu* 698a1-7)

A good translation must achieve the following results: (1) preserve, as much as possible, the word order; (2) recreate the impersonal style self-consciously adopted

¹⁰ Most likely, Aristotle has in mind his investigation into animal locomotion which has come down to us under the Greek title Περὶ πορείας (rendered into Latin with the less-than-ideal title *De incessu animalium*)

¹¹ In his edition, Primavesi follows our most ancient manuscript, namely *Parisinus gr.* 1853 (E) in printing *iota adscriptum*.

by Aristotle at the outset of the treatise; and (3) capture the salient markers that are meant to give an idea of the kind of investigation that is announced. Morison has accomplished, elegantly and effectively, all the above *desiderata*. His translation of the two sentences of Aristotle's *De motu* turns out to be not only faithful to the Greek text but also very readable. This is emphatically no small achievement.

The volume under review is, as a whole, an outstanding piece of scholarship. The new Greek text, coupled with an English translation which is not only reliable but also readable, and supplemented by two masterful introductions, one philosophical and the other philological, is a more than fitting replacement for what was accomplished by Martha Nussbaum in her edition of Aristotle's *De motu* (Nussbaum 1978 [1985²]). It is a must-have for all libraries.

ANDREA FALCON
Concordia University (Canada)
Università degli Studi di Milano
andrea.falcon@unimi.it

SANDRA ZAJONZ, *Demosthenes, Gegen Aristokrates. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Texte und Kommentare 71, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2022, viii+688 pp., €139.95, ISBN 978-3-11-079267-6.

Die klassische Philologin Sandra Zajonz ist bereits seit langem als Expertin zur griechischen (bzw. attischen) Rhetorik insbesondere des 4. Jh. v. Chr. bekannt.¹ Nun legt sie eine umfangreiche deutschsprachige Monographie (mit Einleitung, griechischem Text, deutscher Übersetzung und Kommentar) zu Demosthenes' in der älteren Forschung zuweilen unterschätzten Rede *23 Gegen Aristokrates* vor.² Im Vergleich zu anderen und bekannteren demosthenischen Gerichtsreden wurde nicht selten an dieser Rede die "rabulistische 'Beweisführung'" und eine "absichtsvolle Obskurität" (V) mancher Passagen kritisiert. Für diese kann jedoch die Kommentatorin aus der rhetorischen Strategie des Demosthenes, der als Logograph diese Rede für seinen Mandanten Euthykles schrieb (vgl. die

¹ Siehe neben verschiedenen Artikeln und Rezensionen und vor allem ihre gründliche Monographie *Isokrates*, Enkomion auf Helena. *Ein Kommentar*, Hypomnemata 139, Göttingen 2002.

² Zu älteren Ausgaben, Kommentaren und Übersetzungen siehe Zajonz 635-6. Für philologische Erklärungen behalten erstaunlicherweise, wie auch Zajonz verdeutlicht, die in manch anderer Hinsicht inzwischen veralteten Kommentarnotizen aus dem 19. Jh. von Weber, Westermann, Schaefer, Weil oder Rosenberg weiterhin ihren Wert. Aus dem 20. Jh. sei neben den knappen Lesehilfen von Leone Volpis, *Demostene, L'orazione contro Aristocrate, introduzione, traduzione e note*, Mailand 1940, und Louis Gernet, Jean Humbert, *Démosthène, Plaidoyers politiques. II. Contre Midias, Contre Aristocrate*, CUF, Paris 1959 (repr. 2003) besonders auf die wertvollen 'notes' in Edward M. Harris, *Demosthenes, Speeches 23-26. Translated with introduction and notes*, Austin 2018, verwiesen.

hypothesis des Libanios zur Rede), und aus den besonderen Umständen dieses Falles einleuchtende Erklärungen vorschlagen.³

Zajonz beginnt mit einer kurzen Einleitung (1-10) über Demosthenes, Athen und die außenpolitischen Brennpunkte der 350er Jahr v. Chr. Die im Sommer / Herbst 352v. Chr. im Archontat des Aristodemos vorgetragene Rede (29-32) gehört in das Umfeld der heftigen politischen Auseinandersetzungen, die statt in Demegorien vor der Volksversammlung oder dem Rat der 500 in Athen damals oft auch vor den Gerichtshöfen des athenischen Volkes ausgetragen wurden. Es ging dabei um eine erfolgversprechende Innen- und Außenpolitik in der labilen Lage der Polis nach dem 355 v. Chr. verlorenen Bundesgenossenkrieg in den frühen Jahren der Ära des Eubulos von Probalinthos. Im vorliegenden Fall wird nach einer vorherigen *hypomosia* ein Antrag des Aristokrates auf außergewöhnliche Ehrungen für den Strategen und Söldnerführer Charidemos durch Euthykles, den Mandanten des Demosthenes, mit einer öffentlichen Anklage bekämpft, einer *graphe paranom* (Anklage wegen Widergesetzlichkeit eines beantragten *psephisma* oder *nomos*, 10-17). Den angegriffenen Inhalt des Antrages des Aristokrates erfahren wir aus der Einleitung der Rede 23, daß nämlich jede Person, die zukünftig den Charidemos etwa töten sollte, sofort in allen Territorien von allen Verbündeten Athens festgenommen und abgeführt werden dürfe (*agogimos* sein solle). *Paranomon*-Klagen unter den öffentlichen Verfahren (*graphai*) gehörten zu den sogenannten *agones timetoi*, in denen die Geschworenen nach einem ersten Urteil (schuldig / unschuldig) in einem zweiten Verfahren noch separat über die Höhe der Strafe entscheiden mußten. Während die Anklage gegen Aristokrates formaljuristisch auf schwachen Fundamenten stand (23-8), richtete sie sich öffentlichkeitswirksam unter Einsatz eines großen Arsenal rhetorisch-stilistischer Techniken eigentlich und im politischen Sinne gegen die Person des zu ehrenden Charidemos und gegen ihn als zentralen Strategen als den Exponenten einer bestimmten Politik Athens in der Nordägäis gegenüber Makedonien, Thrakien und dem Hellespont.⁴ In dieser stand Charidemos für möglichst gute Beziehungen zum Thrakerkönig Kersobleptes, in dessen Dienste er inzwischen getreten war. Dagegen vertritt die demosthenische Rede den fundamental anderen Ansatz, daß Athen im Norden Griechenlands wie auch andernorts (vgl. z.B. die demosthenische Rede 16 *Für die Megalopoliten*) stets ein Mächtigegleichgewicht

³ Siehe zur rhetorischen Strategie des Demosthenes vor Zajonz insbesondere T.L. Papillon, *Rhetorical Studies in the Aristocratea of Demosthenes*, New York 1988.

⁴ Zu einigen notorischen Problemen der Chronologie und der politisch-militärischen Ereignisgeschichte der Nordägäis und Thrakiens vor dem Tode des odrysischen Königs Kotys und während der Herrschaft seiner Söhne siehe Kiril Jordanov, „The Wars of the Odrysian Kingdom against Philip II 352-339 BC“, *Balkanica* 26, 1995, 153-73, J. Heskell, *The North Aegean Wars, 371 - 360 B.C.*, Historia Einzelschr. Heft 102, Stuttgart 1997, sowie Peter Delev, *Thrace from the Assassination of Kotys I to Koroupedion (360-281 BC)*, in J. Valeva, Emil Nankov, Danver Graninger, eds., *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*, Oxford 2015, 48-58.

und eine Konkurrenz unter den Gegnern Athens (bzw. auch bei Gelegenheit wieder späteren potentiellen Partnern) fördern solle.

Textgrundlage für Zajonz griechischen Text dieser Rede 23 bildet die Ausgabe der Reden des Demosthenes von Mervin R. Dilts von 2005⁵ mit etwas über 50 Abweichungen von dessen Text und ca. 70 Addenda und Corrigenda zu dessen kritischem Apparat, die Zajonz vorab in nützlichen Listen aufführt (40-4) und dann im Einzelfall in ihrem *apparatus criticus* und im Kommentar erörtert. Die deutsche Übersetzung folgt präzise dem griechischen Text, bemüht sich aber zugleich um eine flüssige Lesbarkeit in moderner deutscher Prosa.

Eine Besonderheit dieser Rede stellen zahlreiche in den Text der Rede eingefügte Dokumente (Gesetze, Briefe, Verträge) dar, von denen im ersten Hauptteil der Rede mehrere Gesetze im angeblichen Wortlaut eingefügt sind, während andere vor Gericht vorgelesene Dokumente lediglich durch einen Platzhalter (z.B. 'nomos') angedeutet werden (32-6). Zajonz vermutet, daß die ausgeschriebenen Dokumente wohl bereits in einer sehr frühen Sammlung der Reden des Demosthenes (ev. schon derjenigen seines Neffen Demochares) zu Anfang des 3. Jh. v. Chr. beigegeben waren. Wie bei anderen Demegorien oder Gerichtsreden des demosthenischen Corpus, bleibt allerdings die allgemeine Frage nach dem Umfang von Überarbeitungen zwischen dem Vortrag der Originalrede und ihrer schriftlichen 'Publikation' und folgenden Überlieferung abgesehen von einigen wenigen Stellen kaum zu beantworten. Ein überzeugendes Beispiel nennt Zajonz (426) mit Par. 107-9, die sie vermutlich zu Recht für einen späteren Nachtrag hält.

Der Schwerpunkt ihrer Kommentare liegt auf philologischen und stilistisch-rhetorischen Erläuterungen, aber der komplizierte politisch-militärische Kontext der Gerichtsrede in der athenischen Geschichte der 350er Jahre des 4. Jh. v. Chr. wird ebenfalls berücksichtigt. In manchen Kommentaren zu althistorischen und rechtshistorischen Problemen der Rede faßt sich Zajonz allerdings dabei (nach dem Eindruck des Rezensenten als Althistoriker) zu kurz mit ihren Verweisen auf einschlägige Fachliteratur. Beispiele bieten ihre Erläuterungen z.B. zu den Gründen der im 4. Jh. deutlich zunehmenden Anzahl und politischen Bedeutung von *graphe paranomon* und *eisangelia*-Klagen, zum Heliasteneid, oder zu den Viten und politisch-militärischen Aktivitäten zahlreicher prominenter, in der Rede erwähnter Strategen, Rhetoren, oder auswärtiger Potentaten (insb. zu Par. 102-43, siehe das Namensregister). Zajonz führt die wichtigsten antiken literarischen Quellen fast immer gründlich auf, vermeidet leider aber durchgängige Hinweise auf neuere prosopographische Werke.⁶ Auch mehrere Inschriften sind für den

⁵ M.R. Dilts, *Demosthenis orationes*, Oxford 2005, vol. II.

⁶ Siehe insbesondere John Traill, *Persons of Ancient Athens*, 21 Vols., Toronto 1994-2012 = PAA; vgl. auch Nachträge hierzu online in www.attica.artsci.utoronto.ca oder die verschiedenen relevanten Bände des *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol.II Oxford 1994 rev. 2007 (zu Attika), IIIB 2000 (zu Thessalien, Zentralgriechenland) und IV 2005 (u.a. Makedonien, Thrakien) = LGPN und vgl. auch hierzu Nachträge online unter www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk. Zu Iphikrates und Chabrias siehe

Kontext der Rede bedeutend, um die komplizierten nordägäischen Verhältnisse und Athens Politik besser zu verstehen. Zajonz verweist auf die wichtigsten Inschriften (vgl. Register 685-6), aber diese sollten in jedem Falle nach den heute führenden modernen Editionen zitiert werden.⁷ Par. 62 (p. 318-19) behandelt die attische Strafe der vollen oder partiellen *atimia*, den Verlust bestimmter bürgerlicher Rechte und Freiheiten. Die ‘Abmilderung’ der Folgen der *atimia* im 4. Jh. im Vergleich zu schärferen früheren Formen zur Zeit Dracons oder Solons ist nun zwar unbestritten, aber Bedeutung dieses Strafmittels auch im 4. Jh. bedarf sicherlich noch weiterer Diskussion.

Die drei Hauptteile im Aufbau und in der Argumentation der Aristokrates-Rede können nach Terry Papillons Analysen den drei Hauptgattungen der klassischen attischen Rhetorik zugewiesen werden. Noch bedeutsamer als diese drei Gattungen sind jedoch Zajonz zu folge (23) drei große Themenbereiche, die die gesamte Rede durchziehen, der Aspekt des Rechtes (*to nomimon*), des Nutzens (*to sympheron*) und des Verdienstes bzw. der Angemessenheit der Ehrungen aufgrund von Verdiensten (*to dikaion*). Teil 1 der *argumentatio* handelt über die Gesetzwidrigkeit des Antrages aus der Sicht der Ankläger (par. 22-99). Dem Ankläger Euthykses zufolge verstieß der Antrag des Aristokrates gegen nicht weniger als 11 bestehende attische *nomoi*, darunter fünf besonders ehrwürdige, bereits drakonische Gesetze über Mord und andere Tötungsdelikte. Hier hätte man sich noch etwas mehr jüngere Fachliteratur zu den drakonischen und solonischen Gesetzessammlungen und ihrer Rekodifizierung nach 403 v. Chr. gewünscht.⁸ “Im Allgemeinen wurde, wenn man von den ‘Gesetzen Dracons’ oder den ‘Gesetzen Solons’ sprach, nicht zwischen der ‘Urfassung’ und späteren Ergänzungen bzw. Revisionen unterschieden” stellt Zajonz fest (290 mit Verweis auf Hansen 1995, 170). Aber aus Sicht der Juroren im Jahre 352/1 v. Chr. war doch in jedem Falle nur diejenige Fassung drakonischer oder solonischer Gesetze gemäß ihrem Eid relevant, die bei der Neukodifizierung der weiterhin gültigen athenischen Gesetze in den 390er Jahren v. Chr. als ‘amtlich’ akzeptiert und erneut veröffentlicht worden war.

Genauso unbedenklich wie andere zeitgenössische athenische Redner (vgl. z.B. die *Rede gegen Athenogenes* des Hypereides) instrumentalisiert Demosthenes verschiedene echte athenische Gesetze im Sinne seiner Persuasionsstrategie, ohne

z.B. auch Alexander Schachner, „Die Schule Konons: Karrieren athenischer Feldherren am Beginn des 4. Jahrhunderts“, *C&M* 67, 2019, 91-107.

⁷ Z.B. IG II² 127 = Tod 157 jetzt siehe Rhodes - Osborne R-O 53 (bzw. online als *Attic Inscriptions Online* AIO 816, www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/AIO/816) oder IG II² 126 jetzt als www.atticinscriptions.com/inscription/IGII2/126 basierend auf der verbesserten Edition von Angelos P. Matthaiou, *Exi epigraphes tou 4ou aionos p. Ch.*, Athen 2019, 97-116.

⁸ Siehe jetzt als – erst nach Zajonz erschienene – Zusammenfassung die gründliche Sammlung von Winfried Schmitz, *Leges Draconis et Solonis* (= *LegDrSol*). *Eine neue Edition der Gesetze Dracons und Solons mit Übersetzung und historischer Einordnung*, 2 Bde. Stuttgart 2023 mit reicher weiterer althistorisch-juristischer Fachliteratur und ausführlichen Kommentaren als Ergänzung zu Zajonz.

hiermit ‘objektiv’ die sehr schwache juristische Basis seiner Anklage entscheidend verstärken zu können. Bereits den Kern des Ehrenantrages des Aristokrates referiert Demosthenes mehrfach absichtlich verfälschend. Ferner führt Demosthenes seine Mitbürger als Juroren geradezu absichtlich hinters Licht, indem er mehrere Gesetzesklauseln aus unterschiedlichen Gesetzen über die Behandlung bereits gerichtlich verurteilter Personen (Mörder, Totschläger) zitiert und auf den Antrag des Aristokrates mit einem hypothetisch angenommenen zukünftigen Angriff auf die Person des Charidemos anwendet. Doch nach dem Antrag wäre ja zunächst die Person des Angreifers auf Charidemos nur zu ergreifen und sie müßte danach erst vom Gericht verurteilt werden. Ähnlich verhält es sich mit dem siebten Gesetz über die Tötung in Situationen der Selbstverteidigung gegen Raubüberfälle, das offensichtlich auf den Antrag des Aristokrates gar nicht zutrifft.

Demosthenes unterbricht die langwierige und manche Juroren inzwischen wohl bereits überfordernde (langweilende?) Vorlesung und Kommentierung von Gesetzen, um als einen Exkurs oder Einschub – vor den letzten drei Gesetzen – ein Kolleg über die fünf Blutgerichtshöfe Athens einzuschieben. Es sagt einiges über den hohen Stellenwert von altüberlieferten Institutionen auch noch in der spätklassischen, gegenüber Reformen der Institutionen auf vielen Gebieten doch durchaus affinen Demokratie der Ära des Eubulos und Lykurg aus, daß man damals die fünf nebeneinander seit alter Zeit existierenden Blutgerichtshöfe Athens weiter bestehen ließ, und nicht etwa im Zuge der Renaissance der Kompetenzen des Areopages auch als Gerichtshof nach 355 v. Chr. diesem Gericht Kompetenzen anderer seltener tätiger Gerichtshöfe übertrug. (Vgl. Par. 63-81 Kommentar 321-67). Der demosthenische Überblick soll sicherlich auch die Hörer entspannen und erbauen sowie ihre patriotischen Gefühle und ihren Stolz auf die guten Institutionen Athens evozieren. Zugleich nutzt der Redner die Gelegenheit, um angebliche Verstöße des Aristokrates gegen an den fünf Gerichtshöfen übliche Verfahrensweisen anzuprangern (321-2). Der Redner beginnt mit dem Areopag (Par. 65-70)⁹, dann folgt der Gerichtshof beim Palladion Par. 71-3, pp. 342-8, der Gerichtshof beim Delphinion Par. 74-5, pp. 348-53, der Gerichtshof beim Prytaneion Par. 76, pp. 353-6 und zuletzt der auch heutigen Kennern der Institutionen der attischen Demokratie kaum mehr bekannte Gerichtshof ‘in Phreatto’ Par. 77-9, pp. 356-61 einem Ort an der Meeresküste Attikas, wo der Angeklagte sich von einem Boot aus zu Wasser verteidigte und die Ankläger und Richter auf dem Ufer zu Lande tagten. Die genaue Zuständigkeit und insbesondere der Ablauf dieser Verfahren bedürfen meines Erachtens noch weiterer Untersuchungen, soweit es unsere hierüber sehr schmale

⁹ Zajonz 326-8 hätte hier noch nachdrücklicher auf die Renaissance auch der juristischen Kompetenzen und des Ansehens des Areopages zwischen 355 und 322 eingehen sollen, siehe hierzu Rezensent, *Das Eukratesgesetz und der Prozeß der Kompetenzerweiterung des Areopages in der Eubulos- und Lykurgära*, ZPE 74, 1988, 181-209 oder Odile de Bruyn, *La compétence de d'Aréopage en matière de procès publics. Des origines de la polis athénienne à la conquête romaine de la Grèce (vers 700 - 146 avant J.-C.)*, Historia Einzelschr. Heft 90, Stuttgart 1995.

und problematische Quellenlage zuläßt (außer Demosthenes 23 insbesondere Aristoteles *Athenaion Politeia*, Pausanias und Pollux).

Für die Beurteilung, ob der Antrag des Aristokrates überhaupt gegen bestehende Gesetze verstieß, ist nicht zuletzt eine möglichst genaue Diskussion der sogenannten *apagoge* (des Weg- oder Abführens) als Verfahrensweise unverzichtbar (vgl. 21 und 361-7 zu Par. 80-1). Allem Anschein nach verstieß die Variante der *apagoge*, die im Falle der Annahme des Psephismas des Aristokrates bei einem potentiellen zukünftigen Angriff auf die Person des Charidemos zur Anwendung gekommen wäre, aber gar nicht gegen bestehendes athenisches Recht, wie das Demosthenes in seiner Rede insinuiert. Denn der Status eines *agogimos* bedeutete offenbar keine vollständige Ächtung im Sinne einer völligen Vogelfreiheit, sondern lediglich, dass jemand innerhalb des im Beschluss festgelegten Gebietes verfolgt, festgenommen und abgeführt werden, aber eben nicht, daß er auch ungestraft bereits vor einem Gerichtsurteil mißhandelt oder gar getötet werden durfte. Es folgen die letzten drei verlesenen und erläuterten Gesetze. Auch sie haben bei strenger juristischer Betrachtung keinen unmittelbaren Bezug zum Antrag des Aristokrates.

Mit der Erinnerung an mehrere Musterdekrete für aus Sicht des Anklägers 'wahre' Wohltäter der Bürger Athens (Par 88-9, pp. 384-9) endet der lange erste juristische Teil der *argumentatio*. Da Charidemos zuvor bereits – das genaue Jahr bleibt nach Zajonz 223 unklar – ehrenhalber das athenische Bürgerrecht erhalten hatte, würde der rabulistischen Formulierung der Anklage zufolge jede weitere, zusätzliche Ehrung eine Geringschätzung der Verleihung des athenischen Bürgerrechtes bedeuten.

Es folgt der Versuch des Anklägers (Par. 90-9, pp. 389-99) weitere mögliche Gegenargumente der Partei des Aristokrates vorausgreifend zu entkräften. Hierzu beruft sich Demosthenes in seiner Rede mit hohem Risiko auch auf mehrere Präzedenzfälle bereits vom Volk formal korrekt gebilligter Anträge, in denen er deren Unrechtmäßigkeit nachweisen möchte. Doch in diesem Versuch konnten die Jurymitglieder auch einen Angriff auf ihre an diesen Entscheidungen beteiligten Mitbürger sehen (398-9).

Der zweite Hauptteil (Par. 102-43, pp. 412-87) argumentiert anders als der erste primär 'juristische' Teil insbesondere mit historisch-politischen Argumenten in einer Analyse der strategischen außenpolitischen Interessen Athens und einer ausführlichen Diabole des Charakters und der bisherigen Karriere des Charidemos. Demosthenes versucht den Richtern plausibel zu machen, daß anstatt der Polis zu nutzen das von Aristokrates vorgeschlagene Dekret zugunsten des Charidemos sowohl den Geschworenen selbst (da sie mit seiner Annahme gegen bestehende athenische Gesetze verstoßen und ihren Richtereid brechen würden) als auch allen Bürgern Athens insgesamt und dem Ansehen der Polis in Hellas schaden werde.

Viele Sacherläuterungen im Kommentar sind auch hier aus althistorischer und archäologischer Sicht zu knapp. Z.B. wäre zur steigenden Bedeutung der Söldner im Militärwesen ganz Griechenlands und auch Athens zwischen 355

und 322 noch neuere Literatur wünschenswert gewesen. Das angeblich schlechte Image der *misthophoroi* lebte zwar z.B. in Redentexten wie der vorliegenden Rede noch als Topos weiter, aber die soziale und militärische Realität hatte sich davon inzwischen immer weiter entfernt.¹⁰ Die Formulierung von Zajonz (Par. 121, p. 444) Thessalien “wurde dem Oberbefehl Makedoniens unterstellt”, ist etwas ungenau. Tatsächlich regierte Philipp II. als König der Makedonen und Archon sowie Strategos des thessalischen Koinon beide Länder schließlich in einer Art von “Personalunion”. Zur *apocheirontonia* von Amtsträgern und der im Laufe des 4. Jh. immer größer werdenden Gefahr für athenische Strategen mittels einer *eisangelia* angeklagt zu werden, wäre mehr Kommentar wünschenswert gewesen. Die wenigen überlieferten hohen Geldstrafen für bestimmte Strategen sollten nicht nur in Relation zum Wehrsold für Bürgersoldaten Athens oder zu Diätanzahlungen gesetzt werden, sondern auch zu anderen bekannten Geldstrafen in Athen.

Der dritte Hauptteil (Par. 148-86, pp. 494-570) soll mit Referaten über die bisherige Aktivität des Charidemos zum Schaden Athens und seinen generell nicht vertrauenswürdigen Charakter die Unangemessenheit des Antrages darlegen. Im Epilog (Par. 187-220, pp. 571-633) schließlich werden zunächst nochmals mögliche erwartete Einwände des Prozeßgegners vorweggenommen und “entkräftet” (die verspätete Anklage, ein kleinliches Nachtragen früherer Nachteile des Anklägers als Motiv, Charidemos als für die Polis derzeit nützlicher Heerführer könnte bei Ablehnung des Ehrenantrages demotiviert werden). Hier findet sich auch ein langer historisch-patriotischer Exkurs (Par. 196-210) mit einem Vergleich der gegenwärtigen inflationären Praxis der Ehrungen in Athen auch für Leute, die sie gar nicht verdienen, mit der mustergültigen Vorgehensweise der Vorfahren, bei denen Erfolge der Strategen noch primär als Erfolge aller Bürger Athens galten. Schuld an der Verschlechterung der Verhältnisse seien aber natürlich nicht primär die athenischen Mitbürger selbst in der Volksversammlung und den Gerichtshöfen, sondern korrupte Rhetoren, die den Demos und die Geschworenen falsch beraten hätten und schlechte Anträge vorgelegt hätten wie denjenigen des Aristokrates. Beispiele für Ehrungen berühmter Strategen des 5. Jh. betreffen Themistokles und Kimon, die aber auch später wegen ihres Fehlverhaltens von der Polis bestraft wurden (601-6 zu Par. 205). Die Passagen über Kimon werfen mehrere, bislang noch nicht befriedigend gelöste Interpretationsprobleme auf, die Zajonz übersichtlich vorführt, ohne leider eine neue höchst wünschenswerte Lösung anbieten zu können.

Die Rede endet mit einer knappen Zusammenfassung der juristischen Argumente gegen den Antrag des Aristokrates und einem eindringlichen Appell an die Geschworenen im Sinne der Anklage zu urteilen.

¹⁰ Siehe zu neueren Forschungen über Söldner u.a. Patrick Sängler, Sandra Scheubler-Reiter, *Söldner und Berufssoldaten in der griechischen Welt. Soziale und politische Gestaltungsräume*, Historia Einzelschr. 269, Stuttgart 2023, darin insb. Marco Bettali, *Demosthenes, Citizen-soldiers, and Mercenaries*, 29-38.

Die buchtechnisch sehr sorgfältig produzierte Monographie wird abgeschlossen mit einem ausführlichen Literaturverzeichnis (635-53)¹¹ und drei hilfreichen Registern. Das erste Register “Stellen (in Auswahl)” blank ist das ausführlichste (655-86), während das zweite zu Sachen und Personen (686-7) und insbesondere das dritte zu Sprachlichem und Stilistischem (687-8) doch (zu) knapp bemessen sind. Leider wird nicht erklärt, nach welchen Kriterien Quellenstellen (und noch auffallender bestimmte Namen, Orte und Begriffe) aufgenommen oder weggelassen wurden.

Zajonz’ insbesondere aus philologischer Perspektive ausgezeichneten, gelehrter Kommentar stellt eine willkommene Bereicherung der jüngeren Kommentare und Forschungen zu einzelnen Reden des Demosthenes und insgesamt zur attischen Rhetorik des 4. Jh. v. Chr. dar. Diese Monographie ist allen Philologen und Althistorikern, die sich mit Demosthenes’ Reden und der Politik und dem Gerichtswesen Athens in der Ära des Eubulos befassen, nachdrücklich zu empfehlen.

JOHANNES ENGELS

Universität zu Köln

j.engelskreuzau@t-online.de

RUDOLF KASSEL, STEPHAN SCHRÖDER, *Menander. Dyscolus et fabulae quarum fragmenta in papyris membranisque servata sunt*, Poeti comici Graeci VI.1, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2022, lxxi+ 458 pp., 220€, ISBN 978-3-11-01092-3.

The appearance of *PCG* VI-1 containing the fragments of Menander transmitted on papyrus or parchment is to be welcomed in itself and as marking the completion of the *magnum opus* begun—and nearly completed—by Kassel and Austin.¹ Now neither of the original editors survives. Austin died in 2010² and Kassel continued the work in collaboration with his pupil Stephan Schröder. In fact Austin and Kassel had parted company on the *PCG* project some years earlier according to the biographical memoir of Colin Austin by Richard Hunter and Peter

¹¹ Nachzutragen wären mehrere Beiträge in G. Martin, Hg., *The Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes*, Oxford 2019.

¹ Minus Volume III 1, the manuscript plays of Aristophanes.

² 13.08.2010.

Parsons.³ Then Kassel, too, succumbed in 2020⁴ and now Schröder (Erlangen⁵) has undertaken the task of seeing that the nearly completed volume saw the light of day finally. In the preface he says he has changed little of Kassel's manuscript, making some corrections and additions in the light of new publications and added a section of *addenda et corrigenda* on previous volumes (IV, VI-2, and VII).⁶

The original *PCG* editors had decided to separate their two volumes of Menandrian fragments, saying that a single volume would be too unwieldy.⁷ I recall Austin saying in conversation that they wished to await publication of new fragments which were then in the pipeline.⁸ In itself, that seemed sensible, but since new fragments continue to appear, the waiting is never over and they might have done better, in hindsight, not to delay. The main plays of Menander are, after all, the most significant and sizeable of all the texts contained in *PCG*. It is to be welcomed that the present editors were granted access to the new Leipzig fragment of the *Georgos* by Daniela Colomo as well as new fragments of manuscript M of *Epitrepontes* by Cornelia Römer, prior to publication. Only the recently discovered Menander-Palimpsest (cod. Vat. Syr. 623), which is thought to contain parts of the hitherto unknown comedy Τίτθη ('Wet Nurse') is missing.⁹

Always committed to the highest standards of scholarly professionalism, and coming after Austin's *magnum opus*, *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*

³ "Colin François Lloyd Austin, 1941–2010", *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the British Academy* 14, 2016, 3–12 (here p. 9): "we no longer saw eye to eye about matters big and small", wrote Austin, "and the timing and format of the principal Menander volume was certainly one of those issues."

⁴ On 26th February, according to Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, "Erinnerungen an Rudolf Kassel", *Eikasmos* 33, 2022, 347–54 (here 354). Nesselrath says that of Kassel & Austin, Kassel was the 'senior editor'; senior by a few years, certainly, but not in importance for the *PCG* volumes. Kassel (in Berlin) was in fact Austin's co-director of studies, with Hugh Lloyd-Jones, at Oxford for one year when he was a graduate student.

⁵ Nesselrath ("Erinnerungen") says that Schröder had been collaborating with Kassel on the volume after Austin's death; as far as I can discern, Schröder has only published one paper independently hitherto on Menander: "Die Lebensdaten Menanders: (mit einem Anhang über die Ausführungszeit seines Ἐαντὸν τιμορούμενος)", *ZPE* 113, 1996, 35–48.

⁶ Nesselrath (see note 4) p. 353 says that Kassel sent him a note shortly before his death saying that he had completed his work on the Menander volume. The *addenda and corrigenda* are, presumably, notes which Kassel had been making before his death.

⁷ See R. Kassel, "Aus der Arbeit an den *Poetae Comici Graeci*", *ZPE* 114, 1996, 57–9. Kassel announced that VI-1 was going to appear after VI-2: "Bis danach (sc. the appearance of VI-2) VI-1 druckfertig ist ... wird es noch eine Weile dauern" (57): it turned out to be a 'while' of twenty-four years!

⁸ For confirmation of this see the 'Biographical Memoirs' by Hunter and Parsons (above n. 3) p. 9: "Austin knew, for example, that there were important papyri still to be published."

⁹ Nesselrath ("Erinnerungen", p. 353) notes that the Vatican was not prepared to make the text available to the editors prior to publication. I was present at the conference convened at the British Academy in London on December 10th 2007 for Francesco D'Aiuto's first airing of the palimpsest. Only Colin Austin had had time beforehand to examine the text and he had many suggestions for the decipherment of the original Greek text. It is extremely difficult to read. Since then no parts of the palimpsest have been published.

in *Papyris reperta* (CGFPR)¹⁰ which set the standard and most of the format, *PCG* represented a bastion of learning with its meticulous presentation of the fragments, all comment, *apparatus*, *subsidia interpretationis*, reduced to a kind of concentrate of learning—in Latin.¹¹ Excellent as a reference work and encyclopedia, impenetrable for the learner and interested outsider.¹² Now, this last, culminating volume—which clearly had to stick to the format and style of its predecessors—is undoubtedly a tower of the same bastion, whose austere grandeur one can still admire but whose bare and, in many places, crumbling ruins nowadays look pretty inhospitable.¹³ The presentation may not win new converts to Menander, but will, like its older siblings, serve as an invaluable and reliable *Nachschlagewerk*. A surprising omission in this respect is the complete lack of registers or indexes at the end: no register of Greek words or names; no index of passages cited in the *testimonia*; no register of papyri by collection and number. In this respect the revised edition of Koerte-Thierfelder (Pars Prior, third edition Leipzig 1953-1955) will, with its comprehensive indexes, still have its uses.

What we have then is the most complete and detailed edition of Menander's main fragments on papyrus and parchment in existence. People will want to read these remains of a great dramatic poet: will they choose *PCG* over another edition? It is certainly better documented, more up-to-date, better printed and presented and more complete than Sandbach's revised *OCT* (1990) but heavier and more expensive (around 200 Euro). If the planned new *OCT* materializes,¹⁴ it may be serious competition for *PCG* VI-1. Readers needing a facing-page translation, will prefer either Blanchard's very complete three-volume Budé (2009-2016) or Arnott's Loeb (1979-2000), which is, for most people, still the go-to English language Menander reader (although now lacking some important new fragments).¹⁵ So the *PCG* volume will represent the standard reference work for Menander specialists (who don't mind deciphering scholars' Latin) for years to come, even if most copies will have to be consulted in libraries.

All editions of texts involve multiple choices and decisions according to the priorities of editors, readers and publishers. *PCG* VI-1 is aimed at (and attains)

¹⁰ Berlin 1973.

¹¹ Only scholars' names are—mercifully—not Latinized. Nesselrath, "Erinnerungen", 352 n. 16 gives a digest of the positive reviews greeting the volumes of *PCG*.

¹² A good example is the note on the Pompeian illustration of *Theophroumenē* on pp. 207-8: only the initiated will be able to decipher all those Latinized abbreviations.

¹³ By 'crumbling' I refer to the state of preservation of most of the papyrus/parchment fragments of Menander. That marks a distinction from VI-2 and other volumes of *PCG* which contain many 'book' fragments; these are usually preserved whole, even if on occasion adapted to the context of their citation.

¹⁴ This is the volume which was being prepared by Colin Austin, then Peter Parsons, and now has been taken over by Lucia Prauscello. Following Austin's death a volume appeared *Eleven Plays* (Cambridge Classical Journals Supplement, vol. 37, 2012, edited by R. Hunter and P.J. Parsons) with Austin's work on the shorter plays.

¹⁵ In the Aris and Phillips series of classical texts with facing-page translation only *Dyskolos* (Stanley Ireland, Warminster 1995) and *Aspis* with *Epitrepontes* (*idem* 2010) have appeared to date.

the most professional possible standards. The fragmentary remains of Menander's plays—nineteen of them, in (Greek) alphabetical order—are meticulously documented, not omitting any dots or brackets where there is doubt. The editors state their intention in the preface of fully recording scholars' conjectures and supplements. This mostly holds true, although some recent editions receive scant attention.¹⁶ The corollary to that is that the text itself is conservative in nature, avoiding supplements and guesses which are open to doubt. Theoretically that means that the reader who wants to *read* a passage of Menander has to take in the printed text then digest the choice of supplements and conjectures for the gaps which are collected in the *app.* and return to the main text with his/her supplement of choice in mind: in fact an impossible mental process. This does not invalidate the presentation as a work tool—far from it—but does mean that the Menander of Kassel-Schröder is not a reader.

The *prolegomena* contains useful bibliographies up to 2021, divided into editions and commentaries on Menander, then articles, monographs and *varia*, followed by a *conspectus* of manuscript fragments (papyrus and parchment), then detailed remarks on the more significant of these. Below the Greek text itself there follow collected *testimonia* (if any), below that by far the fullest *apparatus* of existing editions.¹⁷ Speaker names are helpfully given in bold print. Lunate sigma is standard. There are many marginal indications of which manuscript is the source of the printed text. Line numbers in the *apparatus* are helpfully set in bold print. Where one ms. does not have a reading it is noted as e.g. [L].¹⁸ All fonts are large enough for comfortable reading, and spacing on the page is generous. In the sections I read, I noticed virtually no typos (one accent missing in *Dis Exapatōn* line 61 καλῶς τε μοι; Barigazzio *app.* on *Sik.* line 205). What follows are a few observations and reservations about points of detail, concentrating on new suggestions in this volume.¹⁹

Georgos. Useful to have preview of readings from the new papyrus P. Lipsiensis 402 (1-71), ed. Daniela Colomo. P. Genav. now begins at 44.

Dis Exapatōn 57 ὅ[περ εἰ]ς Schröder²⁰ perhaps marginally better than Handley's τὸ δὲ πρὸς (because of repetition of πρὸς). || P.Oxy. 4407 lines 64-88

¹⁶ William Furley's updated edition of *Epitrepontes* to include the new fragments published by Cornelia Römer (London 2021), and his new edition of *Misoumenos* (London 2021) appeared after Kassel's death, and receive only sporadic mention in this volume of *PCG*, presumably for that reason. On the other hand, it also holds true for Furley *Perikeiromene* (2015) so perhaps that is not the sole reason.

¹⁷ Particularly good for the early editors of the Cairo Codex of Menander—the 'old heroes', as E. Handley used to call them.

¹⁸ Personally I am not familiar with the abbreviation 'subs.' frequently used in the *app.* (e.g. *Aspis* 468 'ap. Austin subs. p. 104'), nor is it listed in a full list of common abbreviations used in textual criticism.

¹⁹ Numbers are line numbers of the plays, not page numbers.

²⁰ Schröder's suggestions are given in the *app.*

Handley in P.Oxy. LXIV 1997 (not in Arnott or Sandbach) are now included in *PCG* (and Blanchard).

Dyskolos 91-5 none of Kassel's suggestions in *ZPE* 114 on these lines is adopted in the main text (but recorded in the *app.*). Kassel's suggestion there for 94-5 ἐξώλ[εις ἄρα, / Σώστρατ', ἀπολο[ύμεθ'] now appears as ἐξώλ[ης ἄρα / [Σώ]στρατ', ἀπολο[ίμην]. || 724 Kassel's suggestion for this line in *ZPE* 114 «καὶ προσιέναι ('auch nur') is now adopted in the main text.

Epitrepontes. Bibliography not included: R. Ireland's Aris and Phillips edition (with *Aspis*) 2010. || A.H. Sommerstein, *Menander: Epitrepontes*, Bloomsbury Ancient Comedy Companions, London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. || W. Furley, "Revisiting some questions in the text of *Epitrepontes*", in A. Casanova, ed., *Menander e l'evoluzione della commedia greca: atti del Convegno internazionale di studi in memoria di Adelmo Barigazzi nel centenario della nascita* (Firenze, 30 settembre–1 ottobre 2013), Firenze: 2014, 25-39. 210 Schröder's suggestion δεινῆς does not match clear lamda (δειλῆς) of Π. || 211 fin. προσκ[όπει σύ γε Schröder (cf. 752 σκόπει τὸ σόν) possible. || 498 K-S omit Furley's (2009) supplement οὐ νῦν [δ]ρα[μεῖ:] at line end. || 576 τοὺς, τὸ δεῖν' K-S now incorporates Kassel's suggestion in *ZPE* 114; Furley's (2021) τοὺς ἰδόντας (i.e. 'eyes', for ms. ὁδ[ο]ντας) is ignored. || 786 ἐπιβουλαί Schröder, a possibility. || 787 K-S overlook the objection to αἰτουμένη μὲν οὐδὲ ἐν / ἐνέγκασθαι (Gronewald) (should be μηδὲ). Gronewald later suggested οὐσίαν at line end to counter that objection, but it is palaeographically unsatisfactory. Furley's reading ληξομένη is ignored. || 792-3 Schröder's suggested punctuation ... σχῆμα, κατακεκλειμένη / ἐνταῦθα, παραλύσει σε is perhaps possible, but (i) why should 'having the appearance of a wife' be something negative? (ii) The assumption of 'nominativus pendens' in σὺ δέ κτλ. is risky. || 799-823 little consideration of Furley's (2021) reconstruction, in particular line 813, which has now been satisfactorily restored. K-S give Furley's ὁ τυχών without crediting it. || 809 τίθει Schröder possible. || 818 [μηκέτι Furley wrongly cited (should be μηκέτι)]. 819 αὐτῶι προῖδωμι' (Furley) uncredited. || ἄτοπον σὺ με νοῦ[θετ]εῖς. [ἐγὼ] Schröder ignores 714 where ἄτοπον is clearly Charisios. || 912 ἔδειξ' if this is 3 p.s. (subj. τὸ δαιμόνιον), it cannot be a verb of saying.

Herōs 6 why a question-mark at end of line?

Theophoroumenē. K-S do not give an opinion on whether lines 31-57 (PSI 1480) were correctly attributed to the play by Handley. They give no information on the divergent metre of 36-41, 50-7, nor the character of the lines as integral to Mētēr worship.

Misoumenos 88 φίλος ἅπαξ Schröder possible. || 401 what's the point of beginning Turner's original line-numbering here when he also published the prologue subsequently? || 418 π[α]ράγω (at line end) Schröder, unlikely metrically (split double short in penultimate foot). || 573 in. φέναξ Schröder possible. || 626 [πορευθεῖς] [Mette] 'tūm ὅγομαι τὸν δεσπότην' Schröder, not likely after Getas' question 'where've you come from?' || 650-2 complex distribution of speakers.

I defy anyone to understand issues from K-S' *apparatus*. || 790ff. (Thrasonides' monologue). K-S do not seem to have seen Handley's unpublished paper 'A bow at a venture: Menander *Mis.* 387-403', Institute of Classical Studies. Graduate Summer School in Greek Drama 8-12 July 1996, but cite his suggestions only 'ap. Arnott' or 'ap. Maehler'. Thrasonides' great speech becomes unintelligible presented like this. || 766ff. K-S choose to number the following lines 766a-f instead of renumbering in the light of (their) O¹⁰.

Perikeiromene 5 κακ τ]οῦ Schröder is all right with τοῦ πολέμου but not with καὶ τῶν Κορινθιακῶν κακῶν / αὐξανομένων (must be gen. abs.). || Before 976 (398 K-S) Furley's suggestion (following Turner's lead) that P.Oxy. 2658 could be placed here omitted.²¹ || 1013 πατέρα ... συνηδόμην Furley ignored.

Samia 98-101 K-S give these lines to Demeas (against Sandbach and others) citing Kassel's argument in *ZPE* 114 that πενήτων ἀγαθά is proverbial, and not unlikely to be said by the well-off Demeas. || 698 ἔ[γωγε] Schröder possible.

Sikyonios Kassel's own edition appeared in 1965, for which Austin, according to the preface, provided a '*collatio exactissima*' of the Sorbonne papyrus, and his 'prudent advice on many matters', so that work was already an early fruit of their collaboration. Kassel's later suggestions made in *Eranos* 63, 1965, 1-21 (= *Kleine Schriften* 272-90), have partly entered the main text of K-S, e.g. lines 130, 141 φέρω, 142 ἐκείνη. Two contributions by F. Favi (i) "The title(s) of Menander's *Sikyonioi*", *Mnemosyne* 72, 2019, 335-9 and (ii) 'The Staging of Menander's *Sikyonioi*', *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 67, 2021, 51-65, have not been considered (this applies particularly to his analysis of staging in act four). || In the *dram. personae* K-S identify the 'messenger' ('*nuntius*') as '*Eleusinius quidam*' but in the text the speaker is called Ἐλευσίνιος (rather than, say, Ἀγγελος), as if Kassel's own suggestion on lines 187-8 (*Eranos* 63, p. 9) to read γάρ εἰμ', ἐπώνυμος / κληθεῖς Ἐλευσίνιος had been adopted. || Fr. 13 (P.Oxy. inv. 33 4B 83E (8-11)) is included but not placed as Handley tentatively suggested (in act two).

Phasma Silence on Cusset's edition (2019); e.g. 9 K-S print a supplement by Koerte τίς ὁ [βίος σου σκοπῶν and omit Arnott's τί σο[ι τὸ δυσχερές;] which is adopted in Cusset's edition; 41 reading δ' ἄχ]θεῖσα Austin *ap.* Cusset omitted; 91 [ἐρή]σομαι Cusset omitted; 85 (106 Cusset) ἐκτρ[οπήν Cusset omitted (likewise ἐκτροπᾶς Barbieri [2001]).

WILLIAM FURLEY
Institute of Classical Studies, London
Universität Heidelberg (emer.)
bill@williamfurley.com

²¹ The suggestion is contested by L. Prauscello, P.J. Parsons, "P.Oxy. 2658: Menander's *Perikeiromene*? A reassessment", *ZPE* 214, 2020, 25-9.

P. SCHIERL, *Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta. Vol. III: Pacuvius*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2023, xlii+520 pp., ISBN 978-3-525-25030-3.

J. SCHULTHEISS, *Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta. Vol. IV: Accius*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2023, xli+858 pp., ISBN 978-3-525-25031-0.^{1*}

The end of 2023 saw the publication for the first time of Volumes 3 and 4 of the *Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta* series (henceforth *TrRF*), devoted respectively to Accius and to Pacuvius, as well as updated editions of Volumes 1 (Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Tragicci minores, Adespota; edited by Markus Schauer) and 2 (Ennius; edited by Gesine Manuwald), first published in 2012 and now both revised by Manuwald (with the assistance, where Volume 1 is concerned, of Jochen Schultheiß and a team of student helpers and research assistants).² Volume 3 on Pacuvius is edited by Petra Schierl, who returns to that poet after her 2006 edition of his work which stemmed from a Munich PhD dissertation, while Jochen Schultheiß takes charge of Volume 4 on the tragedies of Accius. For reasons that will be detailed below, readers will still find it profitable to consult Schierl's earlier edition on Pacuvius alongside her new *TrRF* contribution. But regarding Schultheiß's Accius volume, it will now replace the 1995 Budé edition by Jacqueline Dangel and become the standard critical edition. Before examining these volumes in greater detail, it should be stated from the outset that both editors abide by certain editorial principles which have been decided on in collaboration with the series editors, Wolfgang-Widu Ehlers, Gesine Manuwald, Markus Schauer, and Bernd Seidensticker. Accordingly, Schierl and Schultheiß should not be made to bear full responsibility for the difficulties that stem from some of these editorial principles. Although some will disagree with some aspects of the methodology and quibble about the text of certain fragments, it was a momentous undertaking, and the results are highly impressive. Both editors have performed a truly tremendous service to all scholars who take a serious interest not only in Roman Republican tragedy, but also in Early Latin literature and indeed in ancient drama more broadly.³

The two volumes under review both have a similar layout. Most of the prefatory material will be familiar to users of the first editions of Volumes 1 and

^{1*} I wish to thank all the members of the 'Experiencing Fragments' project at Leiden University for many stimulating discussions, from which this review has benefited greatly.

² The second edition of Volume 1 (to be referred to as *TrRF*² I) bears a new sub-title which reflects the addition of the fragments of *fabulae praetextae* not written by Ennius or Accius (a list of *testimonia* had been included in the first edition, but this was not mentioned in the title): 'Testimonia tragoediae Romanae, Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Poetae tragicci minores, Fragmenta tragica adespota, Fabula praetexta'.

³ Some desiderata still remain because Dangel's edition is still the most recent edition of Accius' non-dramatic works, and while users of these two editions will benefit from the introduction to both Pacuvius' and Accius' lives and careers in Manuwald's 2011 monograph *Roman Republican Theatre* (Cambridge, pp. 209-15 and 216-25 respectively), we still lack, as Timpanaro pointed out in his 1996 review of Dangel (*Paideia* 51, 218), a full, recent commentary on Accius.

2, including the important explanation of how a fragment is presented according to *TrRF* norms ('Specimen fragmenti et partes apparatus'). New to Volumes 3 and 4 are an addition to the prologue of the first editions, written by Ehlers and Seidensticker, and a preface pertaining specifically to each of these two volumes, written by its respective editor. Both volumes contain a lengthy 'Subsidia' section which contains useful material such as a rich, and in fact so far as I can see almost comprehensive, bibliography; a 'Conspectus metrorum'; concordances relating to major editions of each author; and indices. One detail worth noting is the presence of a section in Volume 3 containing dubious fragments which are perhaps to be attributed to the tragedies of Pacuvius ('Fragmenta dubia tragoediis Pacuvi fortasse tribuenda', 3.316-21), and of one in Volume 4 containing fragments of uncertain works which are perhaps to be attributed to Accius' tragedies ('Operum incertorum fragmenta tragoediis fortasse tribuenda', 4.592-602). Schultheiß has made the significant contribution of compiling a total of fifty-nine *testimonia* to Accius' life and œuvre, which is a significantly higher number than those collected by Stärk in 2002 (twenty-two: '§122 L. Accius' in Volume 1 of Suerbaum's *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*) and before that by Funaioli in 1907 (nineteen: *GRF*, p. 22-5). The fragments themselves are arranged according to the alphabetical order of the title of each play, as in Ribbeck's editions. Dangel's arrangement of the Accian fragments according to the mythical 'cycle' to which each play is assumed to have belonged (e.g. 'Cycle des Pélopidés' or 'Cycle de la guerre de Troie') has thus not been replicated. But *TrRF* employs a different numbering system to Ribbeck's, whose system was adopted by most later editors. Ribbeck used two different numbering systems: one in Roman numerals representing the putative order in which the fragments appeared within any given play, and another in Arabic numerals counting in sequence each surviving line of a poet's tragic output. *TrRF*, however, attributes an Arabic numeral to each fragment of a poet's dramatic works from the first to the last, and if a fragment consists of more than one line, each line receives a separate Arabic numeral. To give an example, the line *sermone indecorans turpi fama differet*, which is the second line of a two-line fragment, technically should be referred to, in Ribbeck's system, as Accius *Meleager* F XV, v. 459 (though in practice the numeration by Roman numeral is often omitted), but according to *TrRF*'s system as Accius *Meleager* F 269.2.

In keeping with the usual practice of the *TrRF* series, the editors aim, to the extent that it is possible, for exhaustiveness and neutrality in presenting the fragments. Literal exhaustiveness is of course unattainable, but the term is rather to be understood in the sense that each fragment is given a complex, four-part critical apparatus designed to provide a full list of variant manuscript readings, conjectural emendations, and parallels.⁴ In the words of Sander Goldberg in

⁴ The lists of parallels are useful, though occasionally the definition of what constitutes a 'parallel' is stretched: does the twelfth-century John of Salisbury's misattribution to Ennius of a

his BMCR review of Volume 1 (2013.02.12), the series ‘strives to put between hard covers as complete as possible a record of evidence and analysis’. As for the matter of how *TrRF* strives for neutrality, the preface, as in the previous volumes, states that ‘a characteristic feature of this new edition (in contrast to most preceding ones) is the arrangement of the fragments, which follows the chronological sequence of the transmitting authors for each tragedy as well as for the fragments that cannot be ascribed to individual plays; such a structure does not imply specific interpretations or suggest particular reconstructions for the dramas’ (*TrRF* III and IV, xxv). This feature of the edition will be discussed in greater detail below, but first I shall demonstrate how these principles of exhaustiveness and neutrality can be witnessed in the way in which *TrRF* handles the fragments at the level of establishing the text.

Of the 295 fragments of Pacuvius in the *TrRF* edition, I have counted twenty-five fragments in which the text printed differs from Schierl’s previous edition, and of the 461 *TrRF* fragments of Accius, eighty-nine that differ from Dangel’s 1995 edition.⁵ On some further occasions, a change of punctuation results in a change of meaning: this is the case, for example, in Pacuvius *F inc.* 225.10-11 *TrRF* and in Accius *Medea siue Argonautae* F 248 *TrRF*. Here I shall point out some general trends and discuss only a few examples in detail, but for readers interested in seeing how these new editions relate to the existing standard editions of Schierl and Dangel, I have included at the end of this review a full list, with brief commentary, of all these changes. The concordance offered by Schierl relating to her own earlier edition (3.484-929) helpfully sets out most of the differences that arise owing to the differences in policy. For example, Schierl in this edition prints as two different fragments (*Antiopa* F 2; *F inc.* 234 *TrRF*) lines which in her earlier edition she had combined within one single fragment (F 7 Schierl 2006): this is because F 234 *TrRF* is technically an *incertum* which she had combined with a fragment which is securely attributed to the *Antiopa*. A similar case is *Teucer* F 202 *TrRF* (= 241.2 Schierl), where she does not, as she had done in her first edition, accept the combination, originally proposed by G. Hermann (‘De Aeschyli tragoediis fata Aiacis et Teucris complexis’ in *Opuscula*, 7.386), of this fragment with another Pacuvian fragment preserved by Servius Auctus (*Aen.* 9.667, p. 96.7 Murgia-Kaster = Pacuvius F 220 *TrRF*) and an *adespoton* preserved by Marcus Caelius Rufus (*apud* Cic. *Fam.* 8.2.1 = Pacuvius F 288 [*dub.*] *TrRF*). Some of the changes that Schierl makes are improvements which are due to advances in research which have been published since 2006, for instance Gaertner (2015, ‘Pacuvius poeta comicus’, *Hermes* 143, 24-56 and 426-46) on the reliability of Fulgentius (see below); Welsh 2015 (‘Verse Quotations from

fragment of Accius found in Cicero (*Off.* 3.104) at *Policraticus* 6.18 really count as a ‘parallel’ to Accius *Atrius* F 106 *TrRF* (IV.179)?

⁵ Of the thirty or so conjectures made by Dangel, Schultheiß endorses only one, her addition of *si* at F 134 *TrRF* (= v. 26 D), *qui <si> hinc superescit, Spartam atque Amyclas trado*, ‘if he survives then(?), I surrender Sparta and Amyclae’.

Festus', *HSCP* 108, 403-65) on the parameters according to which Republican Latin is quoted in Festus (cf. Pacuvius *Armorum iudicium* F 14 *TrRF* and *Teucer* F 207 *TrRF*); and Calboli's 2020 De Gruyter edition of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (cf. Pacuvius F *inc.* 225).

It is noteworthy that the Pacuvius edition includes a new fragment which was identified by Deufert in 2023, though Deufert's article, which appeared in *Hermes* 151, 298-316, seems not to be listed in the bibliography. This fragment, which seems to have been known to Remigius of Auxerre, is transmitted in a Bamberg manuscript (Staatsbibliothek, Msc. Class. 18) which contains a syncretism of Plato and Plautus by an anonymous author, and it now becomes 'Pacuvius F 286 *TrRF*', featuring among the fragments from uncertain plays. Another noteworthy novelty is that in the *TrRF* edition, Schierl includes among the list of plays of Pacuvius an *Orestes*, a *Protesilaus*, and a *Thyestes*, three plays of which the existence and/or attribution to Pacuvius is of uncertain attestation (in her previous edition she had discussed them only in the introduction, pp. 6-10). Only for the *Thyestes* is a fragment actually transmitted, and it is preserved by Fulgentius (*Serm. ant.* 57, p. 125 Helm). Citing the argument in its most recent formulation by Gaertner (2015, 29-37) that Fulgentius is a reliable source regarding Pacuvius, Schierl considers the fragment genuine (Pacuvius *Thyestes* F 223, pp. 253-4: *Thyeste* having been proposed for the manuscripts' *Tietis* by Hadrianus Iunius in his 1565 edition of Nonius, p. 591). Some, most influentially Jocelyn in his edition of Ennius' tragedies (1969², 412), had suggested that what would be the solitary witness to the existence of a *Thyestes* by Pacuvius, which does not feature in Ribbeck's or Warmington's editions, might be a mistake and in fact refer to the play of the same name by Ennius, though Jocelyn did not go so far as to include it among the fragments of that poet. D'Anna had, perhaps more prudently, considered the fragment as being of uncertain authorship, and Schierl herself previously listed it as a *testimonium*. One might of course disagree with Schierl's decision, but her outline of the problem is commendably succinct and informative.

The changes that have been made often, but not always, make the *TrRF* text more conservative than the previous reference edition, with a tendency, especially in Schultheiß's Accius edition, to obelise rather than to adopt conjectural emendations. In the Accius volume I have counted seventeen occasions on which Schultheiß obelises a part of the text that Dangel had sought to mend by adopting a conjecture. Occasionally, the changes made might be considered too conservative. Consider, for example, Accius *Chrysippus* F 135 *TrRF*, *melius pigrasse quam properasse est nefas*, 'it is better to hang back than to hasten towards crime'. In Schultheiß's text, for the line to scan as an iambic senarius, a hiatus must be posited between *properasse* and *est*, whereas accepting Lucian Müller's suggestion of *quoniam* or *quando* for *quam* would solve this problem.⁶ Another example is Accius F *inc.* 437 (= Schol. Bern. Verg. *Georg.* 1.502, pp. 883-

⁶ Müller 1888, I.224: see the discussion in Timpanaro, *Paideia* 51, 1996, 208-9.

4 Hagen), where the text as printed is difficult to construe, particularly if Accius' account of Trojan genealogy is thought to correspond to that at Hom. *Il.* 20.236-9: on another note, if we suppose that what lies behind the Bern scholion's prose are not iambs but hexameters, might we not entertain the possibility that the fragment belongs to Accius' *Annales*? Schierl, however, does not share this tendency to the same extent, and to cite some examples: in Pacuvius *Armorum iudicium* F 19.1 *TrRF*, *qui sese adfines esse ad causandum uolunt...* ('those who want to be involved in pleading a cause...' = F 22.1 Schierl 2006, *qui sese †adfinem† esse ad causandum uolunt*), Schierl goes back on her earlier decision to obelise the paradosis *adfinem* and now prints instead Iunius' *adfines* (1565, 290), which she previously had relegated to the critical apparatus. And at *Dulorestes* F 83 *TrRF*, *oro min<im>e flectas fandi me prolixitudine* ('I implore you to influence me as little as possible with your prolixity' = F 93 Schierl 2006, *oro †mi† ne flectas fandi me prolixitudine*), instead of obelising the paradosis, she prints a conjecture made by Ribbeck in the *corollarium* of his second edition of the comic fragments (1871-1873², II.cxx).

As to the critical apparatus, the nature of the project makes it impractical for the editors to consult manuscripts consistently, and so *TrRF* compensates by listing manuscript readings which they have not verified by autopsy according to how these readings are reported by earlier editors. In citing manuscript readings according to previous editors, *TrRF* makes large-scale use of a technique which seemingly derives from that employed by Lindsay in his 1913 edition of Festus and which consists of using superscript abbreviations to refer to manuscript readings as they have been reported by earlier editors.⁷ *TrRF* puts these superscript abbreviations between square brackets, so for example at Accius *Aegisthus* F 7 *TrRF* (*cui manus materno sordet sparso sanguine*, 'whose hand is soiled by his/her mother's spattered blood'), a fragment preserved by Nonius, the notation 'cum (manus) L^[Ri.1-2,Mu,On, Ri.3,Da]' means that the reading of the L manuscript of Nonius (= Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLF 73) is reported as *cum* by Ribbeck in his first and second editions, Lucian Müller, Onions, Ribbeck in his third edition, and Dangel. While the decision not to consult manuscripts systematically is justifiable, it results in making the editor's claim to 'collate, document and verify the information found in editions and scholarly works that concerns the text of the tragic fragments' a questionable one (*TrRF* III and IV, xxiv, emphasis added): *TrRF*'s report of the manuscript readings in the 'Conspectus codicum' is only as accurate and as thorough as the recension of the editions on which they base their text.

If judged according to traditional norms, the critical apparatus of the *TrRF* edition is certainly unusual. Cluttered critical apparatuses are customarily singled

⁷ Lindsay uses this technique to report readings of the badly damaged F manuscript of Festus (Farnesianus, Naples IV.A.3) made by various other editors (e.g. F^u indicates the reading of the F manuscript as reported by Ursinus): see Lindsay 1913, xxvii.

out for criticism (R.J. Tarrant, *Texts, Editors, and Readers*, Cambridge 2016, 124-44'), and, despite the helpful list of the manuscripts that preserve the fragments (3.342-418; 4.641-718), a user interested in finding out about the relations between these manuscripts will likely want to consult the relevant critical edition anyway. In one extreme case, the critical apparatus extends to five pages' worth of variants (Accius *Philoctetes* F 334 *TrRF*), which some users might well consider excessive (compare the similarly lengthy apparatus of Ennius *Iphigenia* F 84 *TrRF* in Volume 1, pp. 177-82). But what the *TrRF* editors have given us is not a critical apparatus in the traditional sense. It could rather be described as the aggregate of the critical apparatuses of earlier editions, followed by what essentially amounts to a repertory of conjectures (one might compare the work of Billerbeck and Somazzi in their *Repertorium der Konjekturen in den Seneca-Tragödien*, Brill 2009). When viewed from this perspective, the momentous service that the editors have performed can be appreciated properly. A particularly positive aspect of the critical material appended to each fragment are the doxographical notes that summarise questions of interpretation and/or attribution relating to each individual fragment. These notes are to be found in the so-called 'CS' ('Conspectus studiorum'): concise yet thorough, they arguably constitute one of the most valuable contributions made by these editions. It must be nevertheless said, for the reasons outlined above as well as because it is written in Latin, the apparatus makes the user do a lot of work (I say more on this below).

I now turn to *TrRF*'s practice of presenting fragments according to 'the chronological sequence of the transmitting authors for each tragedy'. In abandoning any pretences of reconstructing plots and instead ordering the fragments by chronological order of the fragment's source, *TrRF* editors follow a practice which was invented, so far as I have been able to find, by Jocelyn. This method of presenting the fragments, which Jocelyn explains succinctly ('testes cuiusque tragoediae ratione fere temporum ordinaui', 1969², 66), represents a fundamental difference in approach to that canonized in the nineteenth century by Ribbeck, and was not adopted by editors of the Roman tragic fragments subsequent to Jocelyn (cf. e.g. Schierl 2006, 73-4). It has the significant advantage of curtailing the bias, inherent in attempting to reconstruct the plot of a lost Roman Republican tragedy, of making certain assumptions, for example about the degree of correspondence between these Roman plays and Greek tragedies, and, more generally, about the parameters of a genre of which not a single play survives in its entirety. In general, *TrRF*'s aim is, as Schierl formulates it, to 'refrain as far as possible from interpreting the fragments' (*TrRF* III.xli). Yet the approach of Jocelyn and *TrRF* is not without some problems of its own. One problem concerns fragments preserved by Cicero, and arises when lines by the same poet are quoted in close proximity on two or more occasions. One example of this is Accius *Atreus* F 103 and 104 *TrRF* (others are *Medea siue Argonautae* F 236 and *Philoctetes* F 331 and 334 *TrRF*). Each of these two fragments, which combined contain twenty lines of text, is subdivided into several parts numbered with Roman numerals (103.I, II, and III; 104.I and

II), the order of which corresponds to the chronological order of Cicero's works. For instance, lines which are quoted in the *Pro Sestio* (102), written in 56 BC, are presented before lines quoted in the *De officiis* (1.97), written in 44 BC. In the case of Atreus' famous statement *oderint, dum metuant*, which is quoted in both texts, the testimony of *Pro Sestio* trumps that of *De officiis*.

It must be said that this method of grouping fragments avoids having to reproduce in full the same passages of Cicero several times in a volume which, at 858 pages, is already large enough. But whether or not the quotation by Cicero of the same Accian lines within a single passage on more than one occasion warrants grouping those lines together within one and the same fragment is debatable. This method perhaps involves lending more weight to the testimony of Cicero than strictly necessary. Cicero may have had various purposes for quoting certain passages from tragedy together and we cannot assume that he had any regard for reflecting the order of lines in a dramatic script when doing so. Moreover, as Timpanaro already observed in his review of Jocelyn's Ennius, this method has the disadvantage of not taking into account information about the plot of Accius' *Atreus* which can be ascertained with a high degree of plausibility.⁸ For example, Schultheiß presents, within F 104 *TrRF*, first lines which must surely be spoken or sung by Thyestes after he has devoured his children (*ipsus hortatur me frater, ut meos malis miser | manderem natos*, 'My brother himself incites me, miserable, to chew my own sons with my jaws', F 104.I), and then what is clearly a speech by Atreus in which he is formulating a revenge plan, and which thus surely occurred earlier in the play (F 104.II). This way of presenting the evidence differs radically from earlier editions, in which the text had been printed as separate fragments (e.g. fr. II-V, v. 29-41 and fr. XVI, v. 57-8 Dangel), is potentially confusing for the reader, and problematic in so far as it does not reflect information about the plot which the editor himself endorses as plausible ('Hi versus e locis fabulae diversis hausti esse debent. Cum *I* verba Thyestis de cena contineat, *II* sunt versus Atrai de fratre', 4.174). Although this way of presenting the fragment conforms to *TrRF*'s policy, a middle ground between the excesses of plot reconstruction and such scepticism as that practised by *TrRF*, while difficult to achieve in practice, nevertheless appears desirable.

Overall, these new *TrRF* volumes highlight the challenges of presenting the fragments of Roman Republican tragedy (and to an extent those of any corpus of fragmentary ancient literature) in book format, and of doing so in a way which is accessible to a wider audience and not only to the experienced scholar. The creation of a critical apparatus which is as exhaustive as possible seems designed to counterbalance the conservative nature of the text, and to encourage users to think critically based on the fullest possible collection of evidence. But what

⁸ Timpanaro, *Gnomon* 40, 1968, 670 uses the expression 'indirizzo antiricostruttivistico' to describe Jocelyn's method, which G. D'Anna also comments on in his review of Jocelyn's edition (*Athenaeum* 47, 1969, 364-5).

exactly is the profile of the user *TrRF* has in mind? Even scholars who have experience in working with fragmentary Early Latin literature will struggle to use these editions, and furthermore their steep price will discourage many potential users. And yet despite these drawbacks, the thoroughness and quality of these editions spell a bright future for the study of Roman Republican tragedy. Since the editorial principles adopted by the *TrRF* series were conceived in 2012, the idea of producing digital editions of Classical texts has sparked the interest of many scholars. Much thought and constructive discussion has gone into identifying how exactly digital editions can enrich and make more accessible the study of Classical literature (Keeline, *CJ* 112, 2016, 342-63; Olson, *CJ* 114, 2019, 330-44; and Huskey and Cayless, *CJ* 117, 2022, 337-55), and, when it comes to the study of fragmentary literature, the value that a digital edition can add has been highlighted as particularly significant (Keeline 2016, 354-6). Presenting the fragments of Roman Republican tragedy in a digital format would enable a more digestible handling of the critical apparatus, and unlock its interactive potential by allowing users to visualise easily and quickly what the fragment would look like with a given conjectural emendation. The wealth of material that has been assembled supplies readers with, to borrow a phrase from E.J. Kenney, a ‘do-it-yourself kit’ to put together just about any version of the text (*CR* 19, 1969, 184). But beyond that, it could potentially have much greater benefits and contribute to enriching our understanding of some aspects of this almost entirely lost genre. For example, it could, depending on the level of flexibility built into the technology, enable users to bring together with the fragments of certain attribution those which are of uncertain play or even of uncertain authorship, giving them the liberty to arrange, modify, and compare fragments as they see fit. Fragments that have traditionally been assigned to other genres, such as comedy, could also be included, with the aim of fulfilling the objective, outlined recently by Deufert (*MD* 91, 2023, at 41-63) of achieving a more nuanced appreciation of the frontiers between different genres of Republican literature. These *TrRF* editions have laid crucial foundations by providing a remarkably reliable basis on which those who might wish to take an innovative approach to these fragments can rely.

Both volumes are well produced. I noticed only a couple of small mistakes: at 4.160, ‘F 435’ should presumably read ‘F 437’; and at 4.165, the list of witnesses to Accius *Atreus* F 103.I.1 should read ‘a, b’ and not ‘a, b, c’. As indicated above, I include here, for the benefit of those readers who are interested, a list of differences between these two new *TrRF* editions and the previous standard editions of Pacuvius and Accius by Schierl (2006) and Dangel (1995) respectively. When referencing conjectural emendations I cite by name, year of publication, and page number: full references can be found in the various bibliographies of the volumes themselves.

Pacuvius: *contulit* L F 1.6 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 170 M = 250: *contuit* F 3.6 Schierl, a conjecture by Vossius (*apud* Scriverius 1620, 5-6); *frendo* F 10 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 447 M = 717 L; *frendendo* F 11 Schierl,

a conjecture by D'Anna (1967, 52); *sin* F 14 *TrRF*, with Welsh's (2015, 441) conjecture: *si non* F 30 Schierl; *adfines* F 19.1 *TrRF*: †*adfinem*† F 22.1 Schierl, here Schierl has gone back on her decision to obelise and accepted Iunius' (1565, 290) conjecture; at F 56.1 *TrRF*, Schierl decides to include at the beginning of the text of the fragment the words †*proaerenda*† *gratia*, which in her previous edition (F 72 Schierl) she had considered as belonging to Festus; *propteruo* F 71 *TrRF*: *proteruo* F 101 Schierl; *minime* F 83 *TrRF*, adopting a conjecture made by Ribbeck in the *corollarium* of his second edition of the comic fragments, 1871-1873, II.cxx: †*mi*† *ne* F 93 Schierl; at F 106 *TrRF* (= 142 Schierl), she decides against printing *refutant* as she had done in her earlier edition on the basis of Festus' testimony (p. 346 L) that Pacuvius used that verb in this fragment; at F 117 *TrRF* (= 120 Schierl) she removes the obeli from *subaxet* (in spite of her explanation at 2006, 291 that the expected form would be *subaxit*, by analogy with *axim* = *egerim*, used by Pacuvius at F 184 *TrRF* = Nonius p. 812 L = 505 M); at F 130 *TrRF* (= 143 Schierl), she does not print *ab eo* <...> at the beginning of the text of the fragment as she had done previously and instead now considers these to be the words of Festus; at F 163 *TrRF* (= 180 Schierl) she removes the obeli from *exa*<...>; *inde aduenio montem Aetnam* F 172 *TrRF*, reflecting the word order in the manuscripts of Nonius, p. 329 L = 223 M, despite, as Schierl notes, the fact that it violates Meyer's law: *inde Aetnam montem aduenio* F 194 Schierl (the text of Ribbeck²⁻³); at F 207 *TrRF* (= 246 Schierl), though she had previously printed the fragment over two lines, she now she prints the fragment as one single iambic octonarius, accepting the argument of Welsh (2015, 440-1) regarding Festus' tendency to quote metrically complete verses; at F 208.1 *TrRF* (= 240.1 Schierl), another fragment preserved by Festus, she chooses to print, and to obelise, the paradosis, whereas in her earlier edition she had accepted the solution proposed by Bücheler-Ribbeck (*apud* Ribbeck², I.119); *perrogitando* F 222 *TrRF*: *perrogitando* <*est*> F 231 Schierl; at F 225 *TrRF* (= 262 Schierl), she prints the order of lines 4-5 found in the manuscripts of *Rhet. Her.*, whereas in her earlier edition she had adopted the transposition proposed by Ribbeck¹, 105; at F 225.8 *TrRF* she prints the paradosis *sed temeritate omnia regi*, whereas in her earlier edition she herself had decided to remove *sed*; at F 225.11 *TrRF* (= 262.11 Schierl), whereas in her first edition she had obelised †*nempe re ergo id fructu*† *Forte*..., she now removes the obeli, deletes *rem* (the reading of the best manuscripts at *Rhet. Her.* 2.23.36, 1.219.5 Calboli according to Calboli's 2020 recension), and, following Calboli, adds Marx's (1923², 56) conjecture *hau* before *Forte*; *atque* F 233 *TrRF*: *ad* (a conjecture by Ribbeck², 123) F 267 Schierl; at F 240 *TrRF* (= 272 Schierl), she prints the manuscript reading *neque* rather than Lachmann's conjecture *nec*, and removes the obeli from the unmetrical *reficere* (printing an interrogation mark next to the identification of the metre as *tr*⁷); at F 253 *TrRF* (= 278 Schierl), she prints the fragment in one line rather than in two; *plures* F 266 *TrRF*: <*com*>*plures* (a conjecture by Bergk 1874, 273) F 175 Schierl; at F 269 *TrRF* she does not print D'Anna's *Cepheo* but instead obelises

the paradosis †*Calefo*†; she prints F 281 *TrRF* (= 297 Schierl) within one line and marks the metre as uncertain rather than printing it over two lines as an anapaestic quaternarius. I have also observed a punctuation change which impacts meaning at F 225.10-11 (...*modo* | *naufragio*.) = 262.4-7 Schierl (...*modo*. | *naufragio*...).

Accius: at F 10 *TrRF* (= v. 314-16 D), Schultheiß prints the monosyllabic *sic* at line end, which had been bracketed by D (after Vossius *apud* Scriverius 1620, 127), as the first word of the fragment; <*m*>*eorum nulla est liberum* F 22 *TrRF*, with Bothe's (1837, 252) *simitu* and Vossius' <*m*>*eorum* for the manuscripts' *simeta* and *eorum* respectively: *horum* <*me*> *ulta est liberum* v. 632 D, *horum* and *ulta* are Dangel's conjectures: she translates 'quand, conjointement, la pitié même, éprouvée pour ces enfants, m'a vengée', whereas Schultheiß's text would translate to 'when at the same time there is no pity for my children'; *tuo* F 29 *TrRF*, the manuscript reading at Festus p. 208 L: *suo* v. 634 D, a conjecture by Agustín; *cedo*, | *ecquid hic redhostit* †*uiam*, *quo metem*† *obiectet facilius* F 30 *TrRF*: *cedo!* *ecquid hic redhostit* <*in*> *uicem?* *comitem obliget* | *facilius*, v. 649-50 D, Schultheiß, sceptical as to both text and metre, prefers to obelise what cannot be reconstructed with a high degree of plausibility from the testimonies of Nonius and Festus combined; *circos* F 42 *TrRF*: *circlos* v. 380 D, Schultheiß sides with Mercier's *circos* (at Nonius p. 20 M = 30 L) rather than with *circlos*, a conjecture attributed by Ribbeck² (148-9) to Bücheler, for transmitted *circulos*; *ad*<*ductum*> *dubitare* F 47 *TrRF*: *ad*<*ire*> *dubitare* v. 392 D, Dangel had accepted Bücheler's *ad*<*ire*> (*apud* Ribbeck², 150), but Schultheiß prefers Onions' (1895, 214) *ad*<*ductum*> *dubitare*: the manuscripts of Nonius (p. 175 M = 256 L) are split between *aut dubitare* and *addubitare*, but two more syllables are needed if the line beginning with *aut* is thought to be an iambic senarius; †*immanitate habet*† F 49 *TrRF*: *immane te* v. 384 D, Dangel accepts the reading *immane te* found in the Aldine edition of Nonius, but Schultheiß prefers to obelise the paradosis; *piget* F 52.2 *TrRF*: *pudet pigetque* v. 390 D, Dangel prints *pudet pigetque* which she claims to have found in the *P* manuscript of Nonius, Parisinus lat. 7667 (but, having checked a digitised version of that manuscript, its reading is in fact clearly only *pudet*, f. 89v, so Dangel appears to have inserted *pigetque* on the basis of an incorrect MS reading), while Schultheiß prints *piget*, a reading found in the 1513 Aldine edition of Perotti's *Cornucopia* (col. 1385), for *pudet*, apparently on the grounds that otherwise the text of the fragment does not contain the word *piget*, which features in the lemma; at F 55 *TrRF* (= v. 393 D), Schultheiß chooses not to print, as Dangel does, *peream* as the last word of the line, an addition by Ribbeck² (149); *huc id uenio* F 57 *TrRF*: *hucin uenio* v. 250 D, Schultheiß prints Vossius' conjecture (*apud* Scriverius 1620, 134) instead of transmitted *huc inuenio*, which cannot stand as a verb of motion is needed, and thus rejects Dangel's proposition *hucin uenio*, which would turn the sentence into an interrogation; *deum summus rex hominibus curat* F 66.2 *TrRF*: *deum supremus rex* <*res*> *curat hominibus* v. 582 D, Schultheiß follows Kaster's edition of Macrobius in printing *deum supremus*, the reading of the N manuscript (Naples,

V. B. 10), rather than *deum summus* with the rest of the manuscripts, as Dangel does; Schultheiß prefers Bücheler's conjecture (*apud* Ribbeck², 154) *hominibus* to the transmitted *omnibus*, which is accepted by Kaster; and whereas Dangel had accepted Ribbeck²'s (154) addition of *res* and inversion of *curat* and *hominibus* so as to turn the line into a complete trochaic septenarius, Schultheiß prefers to keep the transmitted word order and the line as metrically incomplete; the text and metre of F 68 *TrRF* are different to that of v. 179-80 Dangel: whereas Dangel considers the fragment a trochaic septenarius, Schultheiß prints it as a trochaic octonarius, and whereas Dangel accepts Quicherat's *ubi...ubi...* (1872, 73), Schultheiß prefers the paradoxis *ubi...ibi...*; Dangel had printed *acerbast* <*incerto*> *tibi*, adopting Bücheler's *acerbast* (*apud* Ribbeck², 156) and Soubiran's addition of *incerto* (*apud* Dangel 145), but Schultheiß prints *acerba*, [t]ibi, following the removal of *t* in the 1513 Aldine edition of Perotti's *Cornucopia*, col. 609; and finally whereas prints *fortuna sit* which has manuscript authority, Schultheiß accepts Lindsay's conjecture *fortuna* <*hae*>*sit*; at F 71.1 *TrRF* (= v. 177 D), Schultheiß obelises the paradoxis †*ocule*†, whereas Dangel prints Hermann's ([1838] 1839, 372) conjecture *occulta*, and whereas Dangel considered the first line of the fragment as a trochaic septenarius and the second as a trochaic octonarius, Schultheiß lists both as trochaic octonarii; the text of F 77 *TrRF* (*sed it*<*a*> *Achilli inclutis armis uesci studet*, | *ut ea cuncta optima [achilli inclyto] leuia prae illis putet*) and v. 161-2 D (<*Dicto*> *sedit* <*ita*> *Achilli; armis incletis uesci studet* | *ut [ea] cuncta optima atque illata leuia* <*iam*> *prae illis putet*, 'Il s'en est tenu ainsi à la décision d'Achille ; il brûle de manier les célèbres armes, au point de considérer toutes les autres, qui sont excellentes et qu'on lui a proposées, désormais sans valeur, comparées à celles-là !') differ quite substantially: Dangel, for example, prints her own suppletions *dicto* and *ita*, as well as her own conjectural emendation *illata leuia* for the paradoxis *achilli inclyto* (obelised by Schultheiß); and whereas Dangel had innovatively turned both lines into trochaic septenarii, Schultheiß tentatively endorses the more traditional interpretation of the metre as *cr*⁴; *inbutos* F 80 *TrRF*: *inbutus* v. 168 D, with Bothe's conjecture (1823, 178) on the basis of a perceived reference to Ajax; at F 81 *TrRF* (= v. 166 D), Dangel had accepted Hermann's ([1838] 1839, 369) addition *nullum* <*mi*> *est probrum; ab domu*<*m*> *itione arce tu*<*o*> *obscene omine* F 87 *TrRF*, where *domum itione* is Ribbeck²'s conjecture (158): *ab domuitione arce ex tuo obscene omine*, where *domuitione* the reading of the 1513 Aldine edition of Perotti's *Cornucopia* (col. 1360); and *arce ex* is Dangel's own conjecture; *repertus* F 89.4 *TrRF*, Mercier's conjecture (1614, II.195) for manuscripts' *repertur*: *refertur* v. 276 D, Dangel's own conjecture; *prorepens* F 95.1 *TrRF*, Bothe's conjecture (1823, 181) for the corrupt paradoxis *properantem* copied by mistake from the following line: *prope euntem* v. 279 D, Dangel's own conjecture, endorsed as plausible by Timpanaro 1996, 206; at F 97 *TrRF*, Schultheiß prefers to obelise the paradoxis †*grauem hostium*† than to accept Dangel's conjecture *granum tostum*, 'un grain torréfié' (note that Lindsay had

obelised the whole line, at Nonius p. 315 M = 493 L); *an dubito, ha* F 102 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 524 M = 843 L: *ah! dubito; ah!* v. 432 D, the text at *Cornucopia*, 1513 Aldine edition, col. 1423; *fregisti* F 106.1 *TrRF*, the reading of the ξ branch of Cicero's *De officiis* in Winterbottom's recension: *fregistin* v. 60 D, the reading of the 'Bern.d' manuscript according to Ribbeck, and although Dangel attributes the reading to Graevius, but Graevius in his 1710 edition of Cicero's *De officiis* prints *fregisti* (p. 368), the reading *fregistin* having seemingly first been adopted in a critical edition by Heusinger (1783, 772); *in focos* F 108.2 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 210 M = 310 L: *in foco* v. 52 D, the conjecture of Bergk (1835, 82), misattributed since Ribbeck¹, 139 to Vossius; †*irrideris nobis* [...] *stipe*† F 114.1 *TrRF*, the corrupt paradosis of Festus p. 214 L, metre undefined: *irridens <leniter> | nobis stupe<factis sese>* v. 418-19 D, the text of Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck², 169), who identified the metre as an iambic senarius; *ec* [...] *egum aut al* [...] *nus* F 115 *TrRF*, the corrupt paradosis of Festus p. 412 L: *ec<quem stipitem abi>egnum aut al<neum>* v. 429 D, the text of Ursinus in his 1581 edition of Festus, p. 123; †*tumultu*† F 125.2 *TrRF*, a word introduced by error which was corrected in the margin of the archetype according to Lindsay, at Nonius p. 467 M = 749 L: *turbida | insania*, Dangel's conjecture, following scholars since the 1513 Aldine edition of Perotti's *Cornucopia*, col. 1402 which attributed to Accius the word *insania* in the following quotation of Turpilius; the text of F 133 *TrRF* (v. 23-4 D), preserved by Festus (p. 320 L), is radically different in each edition. Schultheiß prints the same text as Klotz, in iambic senarii: *neque quisquam a telis uacius, sed ut cuique obuam | fuerat, ferrum, alius saxi r<a>udu<s> m<iserat>*, with Ribbeck²'s (196) *ut* for *uti*, which is misattributed to Klotz by both Dangel and *TrRF*, Müller's (1880², 264) *saxi* (or *saxeum*) *raudus*, and Ribbeck²'s (170) *miserat*: whereas Dangel prints the text as trochaic septenarii: *neque <erat> quisquam a telis uacius, sed uti cui quicque obuam | fuerat, ferrum, uallus, saxi <rodus>, rudus <sumpserat>* ('et personne n'était à court de projectiles ; mais tout ce qui tombait sous la main, soc, van, bloc rocheux, plâtras, était de mise'), with Ribbeck¹'s (143) addition of *<erat>* and his *cui quicque* for the manuscript's *cuique*, her own conjectures *ferrum uallus* for the manuscript's *ferrum alius* and *saxi <rodus> rudus <sumpserat>* for the manuscript's †*saxio rudem*† (*alius saxi raudus sumpserat* had already been proposed by Müller 1880², 264); at F 135 *TrRF* (= v. 27 D) Schultheiß rejects Bothe's (1823, 193) *quamde* for *quam*, which had been accepted by Dangel; at F 136 *TrRF* (= v. 25 D), Schultheiß attributes *certe* to speaker 1 (following Bothe [1823, 193] who first suggested that there were two different speakers), Dangel to speaker 2 (following Ribbeck¹, 144): and Schultheiß accepts Onions's (*apud* Lindsay 398) *id quidem*, whereas Dangel prints *certe idem*; at F 153.1 *TrRF* (= v. 550 D), Schultheiß prints the manuscripts' (of both Festus and Nonius) *me*, whereas Dangel prints Müller's (1861, 442) *med*; *me* †*cumago*† F 165.2 *TrRF*, the corrupt manuscript reading according to Keil at Charisius, *Gramm.* I.288 GLK: *mecum agere* v. 599 D, Bücheler *apud* Ribbeck², 175; *eloquere propere* F 167 *TrRF*, with Stephanus'

(1564, 21) *propere* for *proprie*, the reading of the L manuscript after correction at Nonius p. 16 M = 23 L: *loquere proprie* v. 600 D, with Bücheler's (*apud* Ribbeck², 176) *loquere* for the manuscripts' *eloquere*; at F 171.1 *TrRF* (= v. 586 D) Schultheiß rejects Dangel's addition of the interjection *o* at the beginning of the line (after Rosellini 1996, 116-17); at F 174 *TrRF* (= v. 601 D) Schultheiß rejects Dangel's addition of the interjection *o* at the beginning of the line (which Dangel seems wrongly to attribute to D'Antò, who had proposed to add an *o* later in the line), and Schultheiß also prints †*camo*† *collum grauem* whereas Dangel prints *camo* <*uide*> *collum grauem* ('Vois ! ce carcan qui pèse à son cou !') with the addition of Ribbeck², 176; *Martes* F 182 *TrRF*, the reading of the N manuscript of Charisius at p. 160 Barwick = 1.126 *GLK*: *Mauortes* v. 157 D, the conjecture of Ribbeck², 178; at F 187.1 *TrRF* (= v. 153 D) Schultheiß considers plausible, but does not print, Quicherat's addition of *cum* at the beginning of the line, which had been accepted by Dangel; †*studitos*† F 195 *TrRF*, the corrupt paradosis at Nonius p. 499 M = 802 L: *studiosos* v. 139 D, the conjecture of Soubiran (*apud* Dangel 1995, 136); F 197 *TrRF* (= v. 152 D) is different in both text and metre, with Schultheiß printing *lucifera lampade exurat Iouis | abietem*, with Hermann's ([1833a] 1834, 154) *abietem* for *arietem*, and listing the fragment as of uncertain metre, and Dangel printing a single iambic senarius *lucifera lampade abietem exurat Iouis*, changing the word order following Bothe (1823, 202) and Ribbeck², 179; *si me [esse]* F 198 *TrRF*, with *esse* bracketed by Del Río 1593, I.136: *si incesto* v. 320 D, Dangel's own conjecture, translating 'mais alors si Égisthe avait commis un inceste dans le même lit que son père', cf. Warmington's translation 'But if in such a case Aegisthus had companioned me in the same bed as the father'; *exangue est...mihi* F 199 *TrRF*, the text and word order in the manuscripts of Nonius at p. 159 M = 235 L: *est exangue...mi* v. 319 D, the text and word order proposed by Bothe (1823, 204); *adstituere* F 201.2 *TrRF*, the reading of most manuscripts at Nonius p. 315 M = 492 L: *adstituere* v. 322 D, the conjecture of Ribbeck¹, 120; the text and metre of F 203 *TrRF* is different to that of v. 318 D: Schultheiß lists the metre as uncertain and prints *adsentio: age nunc tu tuam progeniem ex ordine*, with *ex* the reading of Agustín for manuscripts' *et*, whereas Dangel prints <*Egone*>? *adsentio: nunc age tu tuam progeniem ede ordine*, with *egone* being her own conjecture, the inversion of the words *age* and *nunc* also her own intervention, and *ede* the conjecture of Mercier (1614, 2.202); *locorum* F 204 *TrRF*, Bothe's suggestion (1823, 204) for most manuscripts' *locronum* at Nonius p. 497 M = 799 L: *lucorum* v. 317 D, the conjecture of Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck², 142); at F 206.5 *TrRF* (= v. 364 D), Schultheiß rejects the attribution to Accius, initially suggested by Nieberding (1838, 25) and adopted by Warmington, Klotz, and Dangel, of the words *summo ingenio praeditum* (Cic. *Sest.* 121); the text at F 213 *TrRF* (= v. 325-6 D) changes in two places, *sciat* F 213.1 *TrRF*, the manuscript reading at Nonius p. 111 M = 158 L: *sciet* v. 325 D, a conjecture by Stephanus (1564, 24), and *quin* F 213.2 *TrRF*, a conjecture by Stephanus (1564, 24): *qui* v. 326 D, the reading of some manuscripts, others have *quiqui*; *inu*<*i*>*sita* | *tam* F

216.1-2 *TrRF*, a conjecture by Müller 1868, 430 (*sic*: 1888, 340) for manuscripts' *inusitatum* or *inusitatem*: *inuisto* | *tam* v. 329 D, the proposition of Bothe (1823, 208); †*diffidamantem necidere*† F 217.1 *TrRF*, the corrupt paradosis of Nonius p. 230 M = 341-2 L according to Lindsay: *discidia amantem nectier* v. 367 D, with *discidia amantem* the proposition of Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck², 181) and *nectier*, Dangel's own conjecture; F 220 *TrRF* contains two differences from v. 350-1 D: *nam ea* F 220.1 *TrRF*, the manuscript reading at Nonius p. 267 M = 408 L: *nam uana* v. 350 D, Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck², 180) and *dum id* F 220.2 m*TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 267 M = 408 L: *dum illud* v. 351 D, Ritschl *apud* Lange 1851, 5; at F 222 *TrRF* (v. 333 D), Schultheiß does not accept Dangel's addition of another *atque* at the beginning of the line, and he lists the line as '*ia/tr*' whereas Dangel lists it as an incomplete trochaic septenarius; *adstas* F 229 *TrRF*, with Mercier's proposal for transmitted *adistas*: *adsistas* v. 334 D, with Gerlach's conjecture (Gerlach–Roth 1842, 358); <ex>*ortum* F 235 *TrRF*, following Ribbeck²'s (186) proposal of adding *ex*-. <int>*ortum* v. 379 D, Dangel's own conjecture, translating 'en quelles contrées donc disaient-ils que tu as été enchaîné?'; *sicut inciti* F 236.13 *TrRF*, the manuscript reading at Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.89, though it is obelised by Ax–Plasberg: Schultheiß 345 cites D'Antò's point (1980, 363) that *inciti* can stand as long as one posits hiatus with *atque*: *sicut citati* v. 479 D, the conjecture of Warmington 2.458; *qui nos* F 241.2 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 159 M = 234 L, Schultheiß preferring the reading *qui* of *GH*² to *quis* of *H¹LFE*: *quis oues* v. 485 D, *oues* is Dangel's own conjecture, *quis oues pascet postea?*, translating 'Qui, après cela, fera paître les brebis?', cf. Warmington's 'who will pasture you ([reading *uos*] thereafter?'; *in stabuleis* F 244 *TrRF*, the reading at Nonius p. 307 M = 478 L of MS Urbin.307 adopted by Lindsay: *in stabulo* v. 489 D, a reading attributed by Dangel to MS G (= Gudianus, Wolfenbüttel 96), by Lindsay/Schultheiß to Grotemeyer (1851, 43); *horret* F 247.2 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 422 M = 638 L: *horreret* v. 487 D, Bothe's (1823, 213) conjecture; at F 255 *TrRF* (= v. 527 D), Dangel accepts Vossius' addition (*apud* Sriverius 1620, 164) of <ea>, but Schultheiß rejects it (this does not affect the metre); *cum hic* F 256 *TrRF*, the order in MSS at Nonius p. 15 M = 22 L: *hic cum* v. 537 D, Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck³, 223); *pop*<u>*lit*<um> *cursum* F 271 *TrRF*, where *populitum* is Lindsay's conjecture on the basis of the *editio princeps*' *poplitum*: *poplitum* <tuum> *cursum* v. 521 D, with Ribbeck¹'s (165) addition; at F 272.I (= v. 503 D), Schultheiß, after Klotz, obelises the paradosis †*acuum*†, whereas Dangel does not, translating *corpus acuum* 'les piquants de son corps'; *ortum* F 280 *TrRF*: *ortam* v. 398 D, Schultheiß sides with the reading of the MSS of Macrobius, Dangel with that of those of Priscian; *Atr*<ida>*e* F 283.2 *TrRF*, the conjecture of Hermann ([1833a] 1834, 141) for the corrupt MS reading *atre* or *etre* at Nonius p. 137 M = 200 L: *taetre* v. 120 D, the conjecture of Bothe (1823, 221); at F 292 *TrRF* (= v. 193 D), Schultheiß prints the line as an iambic senarius and rejects Dangel's addition of <te limo> ('mieux vaudrait te parer <de la bande de pourpre>...') at the beginning of the line to turn it into a trochaic septenarius;

the text of F 297 *TrRF* and v. 192 D are quite different in each edition: Schultheiß prints *ita ut dixi, macte his armis, macte uirtutei patris*, with Mercier's *ita ut dixi* (for a corrupt paradosis in which the beginning of the line is mixed up with the title of the play) and Ribbeck²'s (*Coroll.* 1871-1873, I.lx) *virtutei*, and Dangel *tu, ut dixi, macte his armisque macta uirtutem patris!* 'Toi, comme je l'ai dit, magnifie magnifiquement l'excellence de ton père, avec eux et avec ses armes !', with Ribbeck¹'s (167) *tu, his armisque* with Lindsay's *B*⁴ branch of Nonian MSS, Bothe's (1823, 223) *macta*, and *uirtutem*, the reading of the *D*⁴ branch of Nonian MSS in Lindsay's recension; *ascendit †hora†* F 304 *TrRF*, printing *ascendit* from a paradosis which is difficult to parse because *scindit* or *scandit* are also possible readings, and following Klotz and earlier Onions who had obelised *hora*: <etsi a>*scendit aura* v. 129 D, with her own addition *etsi* and Palmer's *aura* (*apud* Gruter 1602-1634, IV.778); the text of F 311 *TrRF* = v. 127-8 D is different: Schultheiß prints the fragment over one line and marks the metre as uncertain, *classis †aditcladitur†, feruit*, with the obelised reading of MS L of Nonius, whereas Dangel prints, over two lines marked as 'ia⁶/tr⁷', *classis adit <clam>; clauditur; | feruit* ('La flotte approche dans l'ombre ; elle est bloquée ; c'est le branle-bas') with her own addition of *clam* and the reading *clauditur* which she attributes to MS F (= Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 48.1); *fer te* F 319.1 *TrRF*: *fer te* v. 9 D, *fer te* is reported by Ribbeck as a manuscript reading, it is attributed by Dangel to Gerlach (Gerlach–Roth 1842, 268), but it is printed already by Bothe (1823, 226); at F 332 *TrRF*, Schultheiß does not consider as part of the fragment a passage of Cicero (*Fin.* 5.32) which Hermann ([1824] 1828, 121) first tried to turn into verse (*uitam sagittarum aucupio propaginat*) and which Madvig in his 1876 revised third edition of Cicero's *De finibus* (p. 663) attributed to Accius. Ribbeck³ and Warmington did not include this line as part of the fragment, but Dangel does include it, as the first line of the fragment and in the following form: *propagat uitam suam sagittis aucupans* (*suam sagittis aucupans* is Dangel's conjecture); *esse, †sam† inmani* F 343 *TrRF*: *esse usam inmani* v. 241 D, Dangel's own conjecture; *†ledo†* F 349 *TrRF*, the paradosis at Festus p. 488 L: *lecto* v. 460 D, K.O. Müller's (1880², 356) conjecture; *magna sonantibus* F 354.1 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 463 M = 742 L: *stagna tonantibus* v. 457 D, *stagna* is Bentley's conjecture (1733, 475), *tonantibus* is Bergk's (*apud* Ribbeck¹, 179)); *subit* F 367.1 *TrRF*, Ribbeck¹'s (182) conjecture for paradosis *ubi: obit* v. 571 D, Mercier's (1614, 398) conjecture, with which Dangel translates 'elle parcourt en ce moment vos remparts'; *†subidae de loide lore†* F 374 *TrRF*, the obelised paradosis (see Lindsay's apparatus): *cum subito e deliro dolore* v. 402 D, with Iunius' (1565, 364) *subito, e deliro* attributed, seemingly wrongly, by Dangel to Vossius, and Dangel's own *dolore*; *tu[a]* F 382 *TrRF*, the *a* deleted after Müller (1888, 343): *tua* v. 98 D; *mihi* F 387 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 503 M = 808 L: *Mysii* v. 93 D, Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck², 218); *nouus †nouo dabunt†* F 399.1 *TrRF*, obelised by Schultheiß after the Gatti–Mazzacane–Salvadori edition of Nonius, deleted by Lindsay: *nouus <non> notus Daulide* v. 452 D, Dangel's

own conjecture; *famam*, *nam* F 400 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 467 M = 749 L: *famae enim* v. 454 D, with *famae* a conjecture by Grotius (no reference given), and Ribbeck²'s (219) conjecture); †*quini Dircaeο fontei aduenient, mundule*† F 401.1 *TrRF*, Schultheiß follows Lindsay in obelising the first line, Lindsay even obelises *nitidantur* the first word of the next line: *quin e Dircaeο fonte aduenient; mundule* v. 399 D, with Dangel's own conjecture *quin e* and Del Río's (1593, I.185) *Dircaeο; nocturna[m]* F 402 *TrRF*, with Scriverius' (1620, 149) deletion of the *m*: *nunc tornans* v. 288 D, Dangel's own conjecture; *bigis...* | †*cepit*† *signis* F 414.2-3 *TrRF*, where *bigis* is the MS reading at Varro, *Ling.* 7.14 (for a defence of which see Timpanaro 1996, 216-17) and *signis* is Scaliger's conjecture (1565, 129): *bis qui...* | *sepit spatii* v. 712-13 D, where *bis qui* and *sepit* are Nosarti's conjectures (1976, 69-70) and *spatii* Dangel's own; *patefit* F 416 *TrRF*, the reading of MS F at Varro, *Ling.* 7.50: *patescit* v. 714 D, the reading of MS H; *rite ad patri [...]* *set* F 423 *TrRF*: <si> *rite ad patri*<am sospes rediis> *set* <suam> v. 725 D, Bothe's suppletion (1823, 250), with *suam* added by Ribbeck¹ (192); *praeferuido*<que> *fulgore* | ... *dextra* F 428.1-2 *TrRF*, with Klotz's *praeferuido*<que> *fulgore*, following Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck², 220) who proposed *fulgure*, and the manuscripts' *dextra: fulguri praeferuido* | ... *dextera* v. 702-3 D, with Ribbeck²'s (220) *fulguri praeferuido* and Scriverius' (1620, 152) *dextera*, attributed by Ribbeck² to Bücheler); *ariuga* F 434 *TrRF*: *aruiga* F inc. XXXVII D; at F 437 *TrRF*, Schultheiß rejects Ritschl's (1857, 495-6) attempt to fit in Capys as the father of Anchises, which is accepted by Dangel; †*tesauri*† F 443 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 206 M = 303 L: *tensae* <atque> *ori* v. 723 D, which is Ribbeck¹'s (191) text; *essis* F praet. 8 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 200 M = 295 L: *est is* v. 691 D, Vossius' conjecture (*apud* Scriverius 1620, 125); *ni[hi]l* F praet. 11 *TrRF*, -hi- is deleted by Agustín: *nihil* v. 682 D; *in re tanta...improuisa* F praet. 14.15 *TrRF*, where *in re tanta* is the paradosis at Cic. *Div.* 1.46, *improuisa* Bothe's conjecture (1823, 191) for *improuiso: rem tantam...improuiso* v. 665 D, where *rem tantam* is Neukirch's conjecture (1833, 86); *quod ad dexteram* F praet. 14.20 *TrRF*: *quod [ad] dexterum* v. 670 D, *dexterum* is Vossius' conjecture (*apud* Scriverius 1620, 144), but there is nothing in the apparatus regarding the deletion of *ad*; *fiat* F praet. 15 *TrRF*, the conjecture of Pomponius Laetus in his 1471 edition of Varro, f. 10r: *cluat* v. 673 D, a conjecture by Scaliger (1575, xlvii).

A few other noteworthy details: F 167 *TrRF* (= v. 600 D) is marked by Schultheiß as an incomplete cretic quaternarius (*cr^d*), a trochee missing at the beginning of the line, whereas it is marked by Dangel as a complete *cr^d*; F 174 *TrRF* (= v. 601 D) is turned by Dangel into a trochaic septenarius, but the metre is marked as uncertain by Schultheiß; F 211 *TrRF* is marked as a complete iambic senarius by Schultheiß, but as a trochaic septenarius missing its initial trochee by Dangel; F 235 *TrRF* (= v. 329 D) is marked as 'ia/tr' by Schultheiß but as an iambic senarius with an iamb missing in the first foot by Dangel; the change of punctuation at F 248 *TrRF* = v. 483 D somewhat changes the sense, too: Schultheiß prints *ego me*

extollo in abietem, alte ex tuto prospectum aucupo (cf. Warmington's translation, 'Myself into a fir-tree I uplift | And from safe vantage-point I catch an outlook', while Dangel prints *ego me extollo in abietem alte, ex tuto prospectum aucupo*, thus taking *alte* with *extollo*: 'Moi, je me hisse sur un sapin, à son faîte ; en toute sécurité, je scrute l'horizon'); F 336 *TrRF* was not included as a fragment by Dangel (= v. 561 Ribbeck³ = 569 Warmington); the same goes for F 435, a 'new' one-line fragment of Accius preserved at Varro, *Ling.* 6.80 where Kent (1938, 1.246) restored the name *Acci* based on the transmitted *atti*: this fragment is not found in Ribbeck's, Warmington's, or Dangel's editions, but Schultheiß it includes on the basis of De Melo's (2019, 880) scansion of the line as an iambic senarius; similarly, F 440 and 441 *TrRF* are in Ribbeck but not in Dangel.

BASIL L. P. NELIS
Universiteit Leiden
b.l.p.nelis@hum.leidenuniv.nl

CRISTIAN TOLSA, *The Orphic astrologer Critodemus. Fragments with annotated translation and commentary*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 155, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2023, xviii+252, pp., 99,95€, ISBN 978-3-22-132876-8.

El libro rescata de un largo olvido la obra y las aportaciones de un autor, el astrólogo Critodemo, de cuyos fragmentos no existía una edición independiente, sino que solo era accesible a través de sus fuentes, en especial Vecio Valente y el *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum*.

Cristian Tolsa (a partir de ahora T.) se ha ocupado de recopilar, editar, traducir y comentar los vestigios de Critodemo y recompone con ellos la figura de un autor órfico que consideraba la astrología como una revelación divina.

En el "Preface" (pp. xi-xiv) T. hace una primera presentación del autor, su relación con el ámbito órfico y el tipo de transmisión de los textos astrológicos, en especial el papel que desempeña en ella Vecio Valente; asimismo esboza la configuración del libro y las características de su edición, en particular, señalando la escasa adecuación a un autor como este de la tradicional distribución testimonios – fragmentos.

En la "Introduction" (pp. 1-16), concisa y bien documentada, T. sitúa a Critodemo en la tradición de textos astrológicos que se inicia en Mesopotamia (donde se producen innovaciones metodológicas cruciales, como el zodiaco y los esquemas matemáticos sofisticados para la predicción de las posiciones del sol, la luna y los planetas) y se desarrolla en el Egipto helenístico a partir de 150 a.C. T. data a Critodemo con la ayuda del *terminus ante quem* de Marco Terencio Varrón y el *terminus post quem* del poema de Necepso/Petosiris, lo que lo sitúa entre

finales del s. II y principios del I a.C. Asimismo propone como posibilidad ubicarlo en Rodas. T. dedica unas páginas (13-15) a la tradición astrológica órfica y a los aspectos en los que esta influye más sobre Critodemo: la descripción de rituales, en especial los “juramentos”, y los poemas tardíos, como las *Dodecaeterides*¹, cuya relación con lo órfico es más bien de prestigio.

La primera parte “Fragments related to contextualization” (pp. 17-89) abarca tres capítulos. En el primero de ellos “Critodemus and Berossus in Pliny, via Varro” (pp. 19-43) T. se ocupa de las referencias de Plinio a nuestro autor: el F 1 recoge y obtiene todo el fruto posible a la inclusión del astrólogo en la lista de autoridades que el erudito romano menciona en el libro II de su *Historia Natural*. Pese a que este no vuelve a citarlo en el libro II, T. está convencido (p. 20) de que “the section to which Critodemus’ work was relevant can nevertheless be determined with some confidence”. Luego, T. edita como F 2 B otro pasaje de Plinio (HN 7.193, p. 24), este sí atribuido expresamente a Critodemo, que transmite su aserto de que la duración de las observaciones del cielo por los asirios fue de 490.000 años (en el texto CCCXC, pero T. argumenta correctamente que debe sobrentenderse *milia*). T. obtiene todo el fruto posible de estos textos en el amplio y documentado comentario, que incluye testimonios de Beroso, Varrón, Cicerón, Censorino y Epígenes.

En el cap. 2 “Critodemus’ *Horasis*: the astrologers’ opinions” (pp. 45-68) T. recoge como F 3 las referencias de Vecio Valente al comienzo de la *Horasis* de Critodemo (3.9.1-6 y 9.1.5-10), en la que el autor evocaba poéticamente un viaje en el que cruzaba mares y desiertos hasta encontrar, gracias a los dioses, un puerto seguro². Vecio Valente acompaña estas breves referencias con manifestaciones de admiración y puntos de vista críticos. T. analiza detenidamente el breve texto de Critodemo, con especial incidencia en los puntos de vista métrico y literario, y relaciona el título de su obra con la tradición órfica. Luego, recoge como F 4 un nuevo juicio de Vecio Valente (8.5.9) sobre Critodemo y otros autores, y como F 5 una lista de autoridades referida por Fírmico Materno 4.5 en la que el nombre de nuestro astrólogo aparece tras el de Orfeo, para acabar comparando la organización de ambas listas.

El cap. 3 “Orphic oaths” (pp. 69-89) se hace eco de juramentos de no divulgar conocimientos a individuos no iniciados, recogidos por Vecio Valente y Fírmico Materno. Este tipo de juramentos procede de textos rituales de la tradición órfica y refleja la progresiva identificación como “iniciados” de los expertos en una ciencia y la paralela consideración de los ignaros en ella como “no iniciados” (βέβηλοι), que se refleja también en la evolución del uso de la fórmula órfica, inicialmente

¹ En ese sentido, debo entonar el *mea culpa* de no haber tomado en consideración a Critodemo en mi edición de estos textos.

² T., que considera que pueden acomodarse “approximately” en trímetros yámbicos, compara ambas menciones (que presentan pequeñas diferencias) en p. 54.

ritual, “cerrad las puertas, profanos”, para referirse a textos técnicos³. Dado que solo Vecio y Firmico acompañan a Critodemo en el uso de este recurso, T. infiere que se inspiran en él, aunque no lo citen. La presentación de los fragmentos recogidos como F 6 va acompañada de un análisis detallado de los rasgos propios de este peculiar tipo de textos.

La segunda parte “Technical fragments” incluye cinco capítulos: El capítulo 4 “The ‘distributions’: Critodemus’ innovation?” (pp. 93-121) se refiere a las llamadas ἐπιμερισμοί ο παραδόσεις de Vecio Valente, esto es, a los textos basados en la doctrina de atribución de períodos de tiempo en la vida de una persona, reglados sucesivamente por los siete cuerpos celestes. Tal teoría, que es atribuida a Critodemo por Vecio Valente muestra influencias de las *Dodecaeterides* órficas y según T. habría sido introducida por un juramento en el libro VII de Critodemo. En este capítulo se encuadran los F 7-9, se incluyen paralelos y se examinan posibles antecedentes órficos.

El cap. 5 “The ‘terms’ (F10)” (pp. 123-36) se ocupa de las referencias atribuidas a Critodemo de la práctica de los términos (ὅρια) para la confección de horóscopos, según la cual los doce signos zodiacales se dividen en secciones asignadas a cada uno de los astros en turno. Los ὅρια atribuidos expresamente a Critodemo, se encuentran en el CCAG VIII 1.247-61. T. presenta paralelos de Vecio Valente y recoge una imitación debida al astrónomo bizantino Juan Kamateros (*In astr* 1-2).

El cap. 6 “On the time and kind of death (F 11-13)” señala métodos astrológicos para diversas situaciones relacionadas con la muerte, como los niños muertos prematuramente, la determinación de la duración de la vida (doctrina de la *aphesis*) o las muertes violentas.

El cap. 7 “The *klimaktes* (F 14-15)” (pp. 157-76) se ocupa de los años críticos de acuerdo con la distancia planetaria desde la luna. El largo fragmento 14 recoge dos pasajes de Vecio Valente, mientras el F 15 (que el autor señala como “posible, but not certain”), procede de la versión árabe de Doroteo, atribuido a un tal Qīṭrñūs. T. entiende que la fuente árabe se refiere de un modo u otro a Critodemo.

El cap. 8 “Tables for calculating the length of life (F 16-20)” (pp. 177-220) examina fragmentos recogidos por Vecio Valente, de algunos de los cuales, los que se refieren simplemente a tablas, el autor por razones de espacio no presenta el texto griego original. Estos fragmentos reflejan lo que parece ser un rasgo característico de los métodos de Critodemo: la elaboración de complejas tablas, en este caso sobre la determinación de la duración de la vida.

La obra se completa con tres Apéndices: I “Timeline of ancient astrology (pp. 221-2), II “Basic astrological doctrines” (pp. 223-36) y III “Tables in Valens IX and his emulation of Critodemus” (pp. 237-40), que resumen algunos aspectos desarrollados en la obra.

³ Cf. A. Bernabé, “La fórmula órfica “cerrad las puertas, profanos”. Del profano religioso al profano en la materia”, *Ilu, revista de ciencias de las religiones* 1, 1996, 13-37.

En suma, la obra de T. viene a colmar importantes lagunas en nuestra información: en primer lugar, sobre un autor, Critodemo, que ocupó un lugar importante en la historia de la astrología greco-romana, pero que había pasado casi inadvertido, ofreciendo por primera vez una completa colección de los fragmentos conservados de su obra, acompañados de bien documentados comentarios; en segundo lugar, sobre los primeros tiempos de la astrología grecorromana, que se ven notablemente iluminados. Aunque en algunos casos la atribución concreta de los fragmentos a Critodemo esté lejos de ser evidente y en ocasiones T. trate de sacar un partido excesivo de datos precarios, el hecho es que, incluso aunque no aceptemos que los datos de atribución más dudosa procedan de Critodemo, su estudio sigue siendo de gran utilidad para entender mejor el citado período. Este propósito de dotar al lector de un marco de referencia más amplio, en un terreno por el que no es fácil transitar, es sin duda preferible al más limitado, consistente en recoger las *ipsissima verba* del autor.

T. muestra en todo momento su competencia no solo en los arcanos de la astrología y su compleja terminología, sino en la tradición literaria del orfismo tardío, por lo que sus comentarios son fiables y bien documentados y configuran un instrumento de trabajo extraordinariamente útil para el estudio de estos campos.

ALBERTO BERNABÉ

Prof. Emérito

Universidad Complutense

albernab@ucm.es

CLAUDIA SCHINDLER, *Lucretius*, Brill Research Perspectives in Classical Poetry, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2023, viii+128 pp., €74.20, ISBN 978-90-04-53903-7.

Il volume di Claudia Schindler si presenta già dall'abstract (p. 1) come un'agile introduzione a Lucrezio e al *De rerum natura*, con l'obiettivo di delinearne le caratteristiche principali e il rapporto con i modelli letterari, sia sul versante della poesia didascalica da Esiodo a quella ellenistica, sia su quello dei modelli epici come Omero in ambito greco ed Ennio in quello latino. L'altro elemento sottolineato dall'autrice è l'adattamento della filosofia epicurea alle specificità della società e della cultura romana della sua epoca, con una particolare attenzione all'*otium* come caratteristica del pensiero epicureo, che viene proposto ai Romani come modello di vita.

Il lavoro di Schindler risponde così a questa impostazione generale, chiarita e specificata nell'*Introduzione*, cui segue il lungo capitolo 2 (*Lucretius' Poem*), che costituisce il nucleo centrale e offre un panorama complessivo della figura del poeta latino, della formazione del suo poema e della sua posizione nella cultura romana.

L'introduzione riassume nel primo paragrafo (1.1 *A Discomforting Poet*) la vicenda della conoscenza e dell'influsso dell'opera lucreziana, dai primi apprezzamenti che essa ebbe da parte dei letterati romani, alle controversie sulla sua posizione 'materialistica', alla sua conoscenza nel Medioevo e nell'epoca rinascimentale e oltre, sino alle tendenze interpretative della critica moderna, al suo ruolo nella cultura, anche scientifica, del secolo scorso; vengono accennate anche le complicate problematiche poste dallo stato in cui ci è giunto il testo, che generano grandi difficoltà agli editori moderni, anche per la questione dell'ordine dei versi e delle possibili interpolazioni, che sono state ipotizzate in moltissimi luoghi del poema. Il punto di riferimento sono gli studi complessivi di Marcus Deufert, che sfociano nella sua edizione teubneriana, cui l'autrice dedica brevi riferimenti. Il secondo paragrafo (1.2 *The Poet and His Time*) inquadra il poeta nel contesto della diffusione dell'epicureismo a Roma, specie in personaggi dell'aristocrazia romana, e affronta brevemente le questioni della biografia lucreziana, per la quale le scarse fonti disponibili ci offrono pochi, e talvolta dubbi, appigli; la questione dei possibili legami con la Campania sono il punto più toccato, con riferimento ai vari indizi già raccolti nella cospicua bibliografia esistente.

Dopo questa rapida sintesi, il secondo capitolo si propone di entrare nel merito della genesi del poema lucreziano e delle sue caratteristiche, a partire dal suo contenuto e dalla sua struttura, che sono l'oggetto del primo paragrafo (2.1 *Contents and Structure*). La struttura dell'opera viene discussa per prima, con la suddivisione dei libri, l'utilizzo delle parti proemiali e finali, con le loro interrelazioni; questa parte si avvale di una ormai consolidata bibliografia e consente all'autrice di fornire un quadro esauriente pur nella sua sinteticità. I vari sottoparagrafi in cui è articolata questa sezione hanno un carattere sostanzialmente dossografico, che segue gli sviluppi del dibattito scientifico sulle questioni più complesse della struttura del *De rerum natura*, come i proemi (§ 2.1.2.1) e le chiuse (§ 2.1.2.2), dove va rilevata la discussione sulla *vexata quaestio* del finale *ex abrupto* del libro VI e dell'intera opera, sulla quale Schindler preferisce non prendere una posizione, secondo il principio di fondo del suo lavoro che enuncia e descrive le questioni, senza proporre o scegliere ipotesi già avanzate. Successivamente (§ 2.1.2.3) l'autrice si sofferma sulla metodologia didattica usata da Lucrezio nel presentare la dottrina epicurea, finalizzata non tanto (o non soltanto) a far conoscere i principi della fisica, ma a fornire una guida morale per gli uomini del suo tempo specie in relazione alla religione e alla paura delle divinità. In questo senso viene anche ben valutata la dimensione retorica che emerge da vari luoghi del *De rerum natura*, che viene collegata all'approccio didattico di Lucrezio.

L'intero secondo paragrafo (2.2 *Patrii sermonis egestas? The Metrics, Language, and Style of DRN*) affronta uno dei temi più interessanti dell'opera lucreziana, il linguaggio e la tecnica poetica, esaminate con sintetica attenzione alle singole questioni e sempre con una metodologia sostanzialmente dossografica.

Ci si poteva forse aspettare qualcosa di più in relazione al colorito arcaico della lingua e della prosodia e metrica lucreziana, che portava già i grammatici antichi a collocarlo più fra i *veteres* che fra i classici, e che è stato anche oggetto di riflessioni moderne, pur nella consapevolezza che comunque la versificazione lucreziana svolge anche un ruolo di ponte fra i versi dei poeti epici arcaici come Ennio e la modalità più moderna che troviamo in Virgilio. Ma in ogni caso anche questa parte è utile come primo approccio e non si può dire che vi siano omissioni che ne limitano o ne compromettono l'utilizzazione.

Attenzione più specifica a temi letterari viene invece rivolta nel terzo paragrafo dedicato ai modelli poetici (§ 2.3 *Not a Lone Genius: DRN and the Literary Tradition*), che raccoglie e sistematizza i molti studi sull'argomento in relazione al rapporto con i vari generi letterari della tradizione greco-romana (§ 2.3.1), offrendo un'attenzione specifica all'epica (§ 2.3.3), a partire da Omero per la poesia greca e da Ennio per quella latina.

Il quarto paragrafo (§ 2.4 *Between Dogmatism and Romanitas: Lucretius and Epicurus*) affronta molto sinteticamente il problema del rapporto con Epicuro, che pone la questione, oggetto di un ampio dibattito fra gli studiosi, che cerca di individuare quali fossero le fonti epicuree cui Lucrezio attingeva, e in particolare di definire in quale misura fossero utilizzate direttamente le opere del maestro e quanto invece derivasse da epitomi o da opere di seguaci dell'epicureismo, come Filodemo, che era in contatto con intellettuali romani vista la presenza di frammenti delle sue opere nella cosiddetta 'Villa dei Papiri' di Ercolano (uno degli indizi usati proprio per ipotizzare i rapporti di Lucrezio con la Campania). Così come rimane controverso stabilire quanto Lucrezio si avvallesse anche di fonti legate ad altre scuole filosofiche, come i Presocratici, le cui teorie sono oggetto di discussione nel I libro, Platone, lo Stoicismo e lo Scetticismo. L'ultima questione affrontata in questa sezione è quella di quanto Lucrezio sia fedele a Epicuro e di quale peso abbia in lui la tradizione e la cultura romana (a partire dall'ampio dibattito sul ruolo dell'inno a Venere che apre il poema). Schindler fornisce numerosi esempi del colorito romano che emerge in molti punti del *De rerum natura*, senza però sottovalutare quanto l'ideologia lucreziana sia dirompente rispetto ad alcuni cardini del *mos maiorum* e del sistema di valori romano, come la religione o le pratiche divinatorie. Il discorso si sarebbe qui potuto allargare a una dimensione molto più ampia, cioè la romanizzazione dei modelli letterari e culturali greci che caratterizza l'intera letteratura romana di epoca arcaica, da Livio Andronico alla commedia plautina e terenziana, fino a Lucrezio, che potrebbe essere considerato da questo punto di vista l'ultimo degli arcaici, contemporaneo però della poesia neoterica e di Catullo che elimineranno il filtro romano per seguire in maniera più strutturata i canoni e i modelli della poesia ellenistica. Ma questo discorso esula dagli obiettivi di Schindler, che rimangono saldamente ancorati a fornire solo un approccio complessivo alla figura di Lucrezio.

Il quinto ed ultimo paragrafo (§ 2.5 *Bitter Absinthe, Sweet Honey: Poetry and Doctrine in DRN*) affronta infine il rapporto fra il poeta e il suo pubblico, riprendendo il tema della funzione didattica del *De rerum natura*, impostata fin dall'inizio, con riferimento a studi recenti, sul duplice ruolo che il poeta si assegna: discepolo di Epicuro e al tempo stesso maestro di un allievo non specificato che non corrisponde esattamente al Memmio dedicatario dell'opera (si può d'altronde osservare che la ben nota topica delle prefazioni di opere latine dedicate a un personaggio di rango più elevato evita sempre di considerarlo di livello culturale inferiore rispetto all'autore, ma lo valuta come un interlocutore con il quale si possono affrontare argomenti elevati). Schindler quindi passa in rassegna i vari studi che hanno esaminato le modalità e il tono con cui Lucrezio si rivolge a questo indefinito allievo, suddividendo la sua esposizione in due sottoparagrafi, il primo (§ 2.5.1) dedicato al rapporto fra la 'Didactic person', cioè Lucrezio, e il suo allievo, mentre il secondo (§ 2.5.2) ha per oggetto la relazione della 'Didactic person' con il suo maestro (Epicuro). L'ultima questione discussa (§ 2.5.3) è infine relativa al motivo per il quale Lucrezio ha scelto la poesia per esporre una materia dura e complessa come la filosofica epicurea, oggetto anch'esso di un ampio dibattito negli studi moderni, che parte dall'atteggiamento critico di Epicuro verso la poesia, del quale abbiamo testimonianza da Diogene Laerzio e da un frammento dello stesso Epicuro. Su questo presupposto la bibliografia moderna ha oscillato fra il considerare il poema lucreziano come eterodosso rispetto alle posizioni del maestro e una valutazione più flessibile sull'argomento in studi più recenti. La questione rimane però aperta, come mostrano anche le diverse interpretazioni della famosa similitudine lucreziana delle amare medicine poste in tazze con gli orli cosparsi di miele per consentirne l'assunzione, che tanto successo ha poi avuto nella letteratura moderna. Per fare un passo avanti in questo dibattito, Schindler sottolinea il ruolo dell'*otium* nella creazione letteraria di Lucrezio, che discende a sua volta dall'aver accolto i precetti del maestro e aver raggiunto grazie ad essi la condizione di vita che permette l'*otium*, in virtù del quale ci si può dedicare sia alla filosofia sia alla poesia. Questa osservazione finale sembra essere un contributo più originale dell'autrice, anche se qualche dubbio resta sul fatto che questa sia una spiegazione sufficiente per dirimere la questione dell'uso della poesia da parte di Lucrezio a fronte dell'atteggiamento più negativo di Epicuro.

Il volume è chiuso da una bibliografia selettiva ma comunque esauriente sulla quale si fonda l'intera organizzazione di questo lavoro, e da un indice di nomi e cose notevoli. Se si vuole poi esprimere un giudizio complessivo sul volume di Claudia Schindler, è stato già messo in luce il carattere dossografico del suo lavoro e la sua tendenza a non prendere posizione nel dibattito sulle varie questioni prese in considerazione, atteggiamento ben comprensibile in un volume di natura informativa, nel quale non c'è spazio per entrare nel merito di problemi molto complicati e ricchi di una enorme bibliografia. Allo stesso modo non dobbiamo cercare nel libro di Schindler spunti originali, che richiederebbero discussione

analitiche improponibili in un lavoro complessivo come questo. In qualche caso, come la tradizione del testo di Lucrezio e le conseguenti problematiche ecdotiche, o come la lingua e la versificazione del *De rerum natura*, ci si poteva aspettare qualcosa in più, ma l'impostazione di questo lavoro sembra più legata all'aspetto letterario e ideologico che ad analisi filologiche e linguistiche. Il lavoro di Schindler è comunque un'utile introduzione a Lucrezio, che può esse adoperata sia da chi si avvicina per la prima volta all'opera, sia come punto di partenza per chi intende affrontare specifiche questioni.

PAOLO DE PAOLIS
Università di Verona
paolo.depaolis@univr.it

TIMOTHY PETER WISEMAN, *Catullan Questions Revisited*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022, x+176 pp., £75.00, ISBN: 978-1-009-23574-7.

In questo volume Timothy Peter Wiseman riprende il titolo del suo *Catullan Questions*, Leicester 1969, che affrontava i problemi dell'attribuzione dell'ordinamento dei poemi a Catullo stesso e della cronologia tradizionale. Il volume, che riecheggiava a sua volta il titolo *Quaestiones Catullianae* di Ludwig Schwabe (Giessen 1862), fu accolto con alterni giudizi dalla critica; l'autore riconsidera queste tematiche alla luce della pubblicazione di almeno altri due lavori successivi alla prima edizione: John K. Schafer, *Catullus Through his Books. Dramas of Composition*, Cambridge 2020, e Ian Du Quesnay, *Catulli Carmina*, in Ian Du Quesnay, Tony Woodman, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Catullus*, Cambridge 2021, 167-218. Lo scopo è di rivedere alcune questioni catulliane alle quali, attraverso una riflessione sulla base di dati testuali, storici e archeologici, fornisce un nuovo senso storico.

Il volume comprende anche alcuni contributi già pubblicati da Wiseman, qui ripresi o ampliati, come puntualmente indicato nella *Prefazione* (p. x), e si divide in due parti. La prima (pp. 1-83) presenta quattro capitoli, ognuno dei quali si occupa di un problema specifico al quale, in stretto dialogo soprattutto con le recenti pubblicazioni sopra menzionate, l'autore fornisce risposte nuove e interessanti; la seconda (pp. 85-158), costituita da tre capitoli, comprende studi autonomi ai quali Wiseman riserva un'ampia analisi non solo sul piano letterario ma anche su quello storico e sociale: in particolare, alle due complesse questioni dell'etnografia della regione da cui proveniva Catullo e della natura del carne 64 segue una carrellata sulla figura di Clodia-Lesbia e la sua interpretazione nel romanzo storico. Il volume si conclude con una ricca e aggiornata bibliografia (pp. 159-69), un *Index* (pp. 170-3) e un *Index locorum* (pp. 174-6).

Who was Lesbia? (pp. 3-12) Con questa domanda Wiseman riprende un tema già affrontato in *Catullan Questions* per smentire la conclusione cui arrivava Ludwig Schwabe, che identificava la Lesbia catulliana con Clodia, moglie di Quinto Metello Celere, sulla base del noto passo apuleiano (*apol.* 10), e proponeva, di conseguenza, tutta la ricostruzione della vicenda amorosa che pure in questo volume viene rivista. Nel 1969 Wiseman si era limitato a mettere in dubbio l'identificazione dal momento che questa Clodia aveva altre due sorelle e capire chi di loro fosse Lesbia non era possibile. Adesso, invece, lo studioso ripercorre gli studi che si sono susseguiti nel tempo e i dati ricavabili dai carmi catulliani e da altre fonti relative a questi personaggi. Considerando che spesso il poeta si riferisce all'amata come *puella* e non come donna di mezza età, giunge a ipotizzare che questa sia identificabile con la moglie di Gneo Pompeo il Giovane, figlio maggiore di Pompeo Magno: Claudia Pulchra, figlia di Appio Claudio Pulchro e sorella della moglie di Marco Bruto. In questo modo Catullo avrebbe avuto una relazione con una giovane di 16-18 anni, da poco sposata, e di circa sei o sette anni più piccola di lui.

Nel secondo contributo *How Many Books?* (pp. 13-47) Wiseman riprende un interrogativo già posto nel 1969. La premessa da cui parte lo studioso è che la raccolta giunta fino a noi risalga a un codice pergameneo scritto intorno al 200 d.C., ma il suo obiettivo resta quello di definire da quanti e quali rotoli derivava questo manoscritto. Wiseman ridiscute le posizioni assunte nel tempo da diversi studiosi sull'articolazione del *liber* e le testimonianze deducibili da citazioni di autori antichi per giungere alle seguenti conclusioni: il primo blocco era costituito dai carmi 2-14 (ipotesi di Kroll), ai quali l'autore aveva poi anteposto il carme 1 per la dedica a Cornelio Nepote; per questa ragione, presso autori antichi come Marziale (1.7; 4.14.10-14), questa sequenza è conosciuta come *Passer Catulli*. Il secondo gruppo riunisce i componimenti 14b-53, a questo colui che avrebbe ideato il *codex* avrebbe aggiunto la sequenza 54-60: tale secondo blocco aveva forse il nome di *Hendecasyllabes*, sebbene questa ipotesi di titolo risulti allo stesso Wiseman meno persuasiva della precedente. La cronologia dei componimenti è da collocarsi tra il 56 e il 54 a.C., anno della pubblicazione; la morte del fratello, infatti, aveva determinato un cambio nella poetica di Catullo che lo aveva portato verso un altro tipo di poesia che prevedeva la rappresentazione: poeti e grammatici (Iuv. 8.185-8; Mart. *epigr.* 9; Prisc. 6.7, 6.73 = *gramm.* II 199-200 K, II 257-8 K; Non. 195 L) testimonierebbero l'esistenza di testi teatrali composti da Catullo, in particolare mimi. A ciascuno dei *Carmina docta* (61-68b) Wiseman riserva una descrizione e un'analisi specifica ritenendo che fossero stati scritti per circolare autonomamente e che, solo in un secondo momento, fossero stati inseriti, nella formazione del codice, tra due blocchi di poesie brevi. La sequenza 69-116, infatti, era costituita da carmi brevi, gli *Epigrammi*.

Where Was the Audience? (pp. 48-61) La terza domanda, come sottolinea Wiseman, si occupa di storia sociale più che di critica letteraria, ma qui l'autore vuole concentrarsi soprattutto sui destinatari multipli di alcuni carmi catulliani

che egli ritiene essere stati trascurati dalla critica. Attraverso l'analisi di singoli componimenti da una parte riesce a dimostrare come alcuni di essi dovevano essere pensati per la recita durante il *convivium*, dall'altra riesce a identificare e a ricostruire i luoghi in cui tali letture dovettero avvenire, dalla villa di Sirmione (carme 4) a una locanda di Roma (carme 37).

What Were the Long Poems? (pp. 62-83) Con la quarta e ultima domanda della prima parte Wiseman si occupa di quei carmi che per la loro lunghezza non possono essere immaginati automaticamente nei contesti performativi delineati nel capitolo precedente. La maggiore difficoltà nella ricostruzione di tali contesti consiste, secondo Wiseman, soprattutto nel fatto che, a ragione, i poeti non esplicitavano ciò che era visibile al loro pubblico, pertanto sta alla critica essere in grado di cogliere gli elementi performativi. Tra i carmi analizzati il 62, ad esempio, con la sua forma drammatica presuppone un contesto performativo, una rappresentazione, ma le combinazioni di personaggi che si possono ipotizzare sono infinite. Per il carme 67 Wiseman esclude che possa esserci un legame con il 66, sempre ripercorrendo e commentando tutta la bibliografia precedente a riguardo. Nel caso del 63, variamente interpretato, Wiseman ipotizza che fosse non per un banchetto ma per un evento legato al sacro, non solo un rito ma anche e soprattutto i giochi che avevano pur sempre un legame con l'aspetto religioso; questa seconda ipotesi lo convince maggiormente tanto da arrivare a proporre che il carme fosse stato composto per i *ludi* del settembre del 55 a.C., che Pompeo organizzò per l'inaugurazione del teatro in pietra. Infine per 68b, considerato come il più difficile per tale tipo di ricostruzione, viene avanzata l'ipotesi di una lettera con lettura pubblica.

La seconda parte del volume contiene tre studi indipendenti: *How Gallic Were the Transpadanes?* (pp. 87-102), *Why Is Ariadne Naked?* (pp. 103-41), *Clodia: Some Imaginary Lives* (pp. 142-58).

Nel primo Wiseman si occupa della regione di cui era originario Catullo, evidenziando le contraddizioni che si creano quando si adoperano i concetti di Gallia Cisalpina, Transpadani, Italici e così via, alla luce di fonti antiche. In particolare è Strabone che utilizza una terminologia piuttosto oscillante. In conclusione l'autore non giunge a fornire una risposta neanche sull'origine del nome di Catullo, lasciando aperta la questione se fosse un nome celtico o di una famiglia di veterani insediati nella regione.

Nel capitolo successivo l'attenzione si concentra sul personaggio di Arianna che nel carme 64 appare nuda: Wiseman motiva tale rappresentazione servendosi sia di fonti letterarie che archeologiche. Il componimento costituisce un problema già solo per la definizione del genere letterario, in quanto "epillio" è un'etichetta moderna: pertanto, dopo una serie di considerazioni Wiseman preferisce parlare di poesia mitologica. La nudità non è richiesta dalla storia ma potrebbe riferirsi, invece, ad un'attrice che sul palco appariva tale. In effetti, l'intrattenimento per mezzo di attrici nude era un'usanza antica (già dei *Ludi Florales*), che Ovidio (ad esempio) riprendeva dal teatro, per cui nelle sue opere sono frequenti le

protagoniste che si spogliano; inoltre, anche in occasione dei *Lupercalia* i corpi nudi dei podisti erano previsti e paralleli di figure femminili così rappresentate sulla scena possono essere ritrovati in scene mitologiche con protagoniste Atalanta e Venere dai tempi antichi fino almeno a Tertulliano; pertanto, Wiseman conclude che è lecito pensare che anche il carne 64 venisse rappresentato sulla scena, accompagnato da danze che vengono presupposte da elementi del testo stesso.

Nell'ultimo capitolo, come anticipato, l'autore si concentra su Clodia come personaggio del romanzo storico. Si tratta della ripresa di uno studio che Wiseman pubblicò già nel 1975 e che pertanto qui è corredato di un *Post scriptum*. L'autore si dice insoddisfatto dei ritratti che della donna vengono forniti da romanzieri e scrittori (Jack Lindsay, William George Hardy, Pierson Dixon, Robert De Maria e Kenneth Benton; Marcel Schwob, Thornton Wilder, Alfred Duggan e Rex Warner) ma non si meraviglia tanto perché i loro lavori si basano ancora su quella ricostruzione e identificazione di Schwabe (Giessen 1862), che pure presenta tante aporie. Se, tuttavia, nel 1975 Wiseman auspicava un lavoro migliore, ad oggi la sua speranza non è stata ancora soddisfatta ma conclude riconoscendo le priorità della narrativa e il fatto che i romanzieri lavorano con il materiale fornito dagli storici pertanto si augura che questi ultimi possano avere presto un parere diverso così da dare ai primi almeno l'opportunità di utilizzare un diverso punto di vista.

In questa sede si è tentato di fornire una breve e sommaria sintesi di un lavoro particolarmente ricco e denso, dove all'ampia bibliografia tenuta in considerazione si affianca una notevole quantità di fonti antiche, letterarie o archeologiche, a supporto delle ipotesi avanzate. La lettura che Wiseman fornisce di tali testimonianze è spesso originale, a volte quasi marginale e tangente, per cogliere in un dettaglio la possibilità di avanzare una nuova e, in certi casi, più o meno audace ipotesi di ricostruzione storica.

La sua convinzione della necessità di considerare insieme storia sociale e storia letteraria, in una modalità olistica, al fine di dare senso univoco a tanti indizi che spesso si presentano sparsi ed enigmatici, trova la sua concretizzazione proprio in questo volume. Tale approccio presuppone una conoscenza ampia, solida e profonda tanto della letteratura antica, soprattutto latina, quanto della critica che si è esercitata su di essa. Che le sue ipotesi possano risultare talvolta non del tutto convincenti, come lui stesso ammette, non sorprende nella misura in cui lo stesso approccio delle *Questions*, che si configurano quasi come un filo rosso nella bibliografia all'attivo di Wiseman, risultano essere la migliore strategia narrativa per continuare a porre problemi e a dialogare con gli studiosi di ieri, di oggi e anche con quelli di domani. Tale approccio risulta particolarmente proficuo proprio in quanto alimenta un confronto della critica su questioni complesse che, forse, non verranno mai risolte. D'altra parte già la pubblicazione di Wiseman del 1969 (*Catullan Questions*) suscitò interesse e dibattito, basti pensare che il volume ebbe più di dieci recensioni e che lo stesso autore, a distanza di oltre mezzo secolo, è tornato su di esse.

Alla luce della ricchezza di stimoli e suggestioni che il volume propone, dell'interesse delle questioni affrontate e dall'ampiezza di fonti e dati utilizzati, certamente quest'opera continuerà ad alimentare il dialogo tra critica storica e critica letteraria su Catullo.

FILOMENA BERNARDO

Università degli Studi di Napoli "Federico II"

Universidad de Huelva

filomenabernardo739@gmail.com

CHRISTOPHER B. POLT, *Catullus and Roman Comedy: Theatricality and Personal Drama in the Late Republic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021, xii+215, pp., GBP 70,99, ISBN 978-11-08-83981-5.¹

We live today in a world saturated by mass entertainment, from cinema through popular music to Netflix series. Many of us take it for granted that this public performative art not only occupies our time, but it also influences our minds: how we speak, how we think, how we feel are influenced by what we have seen enacted. It would be reasonable to look for the same dynamics in ancient Roman society. We know, after all, that there were theatrical performances in ancient Rome at several public festivals every year; an educated Roman of the late Republic will have seen a considerable number of plays. And yet we know fairly little about the influence of Roman theatre on later Classical authors. In part this is surely due to the challenges of comparing texts of different genres, and especially to the gaps in our evidence regarding theatrical performances in this period. And yet there is evidence enough in the texts themselves. Specific instances of the influence of Roman comedy on Catullus have been shown by a number of previous studies, notably in a monograph by Alex Agnesini.² Now Christopher Polt has published a comprehensive study by the influence of Roman comedy on the poems of Catullus. Polt maintains that this influence has been profound and structural: "Roman comedy, I argue, offers Catullus a common cultural vocabulary, drawn from the public stage and shared with his audience, with which to explore and convey private ideas about love, friendship, and social rivalry" (p. 7); "I ... argue that Catullus expressly draws inspiration for his poetics, in part, from Roman comedy" (p. 9). There might be debate about the exact degree of this influence, about specific examples of it, or the mechanisms through which it occurred. But

¹ This review was within the research group LITTERA (reference: 2021 SGR 00074) with the help of a Ramón y Cajal grant (RYC2018-024411-I) awarded by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities, with the support of the European Social Fund.

² A. Agnesini, *Plauto in Catullo*, Bologna 2004.

the cumulative evidence is convincing: Roman comedy influenced extensively the poems of Catullus, and by extension probably also the lost writings of the other poets in his circle of “neoterics”.

The Introduction (pp. 1-44) asks why Catullus found “Roman comedy an appealing target of allusion and reflection” (p. 8). Polt identifies three underlying reasons. Catchwords of Catullus’ poetry emphasizing wit and smallness such as *lepidus* and *nugae* are already well attested in the plays of Plautus and Terence; Catullus takes them over, and he adopts the attitude of a “comic parasite” (p. 23). Furthermore, the domestic and urban perspectives of Roman comedy, with its cast of “little people” who resemble the mass of spectators (p. 24), are very close of those of Catullus. Polt states that “Catullus’ world is just as small and intimate as that of the *palliatae*” (p. 25).³ Third, the peculiar mix of Greek substrate and Roman elements in Roman comedy, which Polt calls “Greco-Roman Hybridity and Translation” (p. 36). This argument is the least convincing, as Greek elements also mixed with Roman ones in many other genres of Roman literature, and also in spoken Latin. The underlying challenge is to separate the specific influence of Roman comedy on Catullus from elements from other sources that happen to be shared by both.

“Through the Comic Looking Glass”: Chapter 1 (pp. 45-69) studies the broader dynamics between theatre, lived experience and self-representation in late Republican Rome. Polt takes up a recent suggestion by William Batstone “that metatheater is an artifact of ancient culture that preexists its theatrical counterpart and presents a means by which Romans approach and interact with their “real” world” (p. 54).⁴ Another key concept is “theatricality”, that of human beings feeling that they must act in life as if they were performing in front of observers (p. 55), which Polt argues was a common aspect of Roman sociocultural reality in this era. And if there was a social necessity to perform, “the theater ... offered a ready supply of roles through which Romans such as Cicero and Catullus could become themselves” (p. 69).

Chapter 2, “The Best Medicine: Comic Cures for Love in the First Century BCE” (pp. 70-125) explores how Cicero, Lucretius and Catullus take up the motif of the comic *adulescens* from Terence’s *Eunuchus*. Unlike Cicero and Lucretius, Catullus tries “to think not *with* the comic *adulescens* but *as* him” (p. 73). Polt argues convincingly that the comic figure of the *adulescens*, the young man in lover, underlies Catullus’ self-presentation as a lover in poems such as 5 and 7. More specifically, he detects specific allusions to Terence’s *Eunuchus* in several passages by Catullus. Most striking is the resemblance of Catullus 109.3f. *di*

³ This is indeed one side of Catullus’ world, but elsewhere his vision extends to Italy and the Mediterranean colonies of the Roman Republic, and even beyond them: see poems 11.1-12, 29, 36.12-15, 39, 46, and others.

⁴ Cf. W. Batstone, “Plautine Farce and Plautine Freedom”, in W. Batstone, G. Tissol, eds., *Defining Genre and Gender in Latin Literature: Essays Presented to William S. Anderson on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, New York 2005, 13-46, at 28.

magni, facite ut uere promittere possit / atque id sincere dicat et ex animo to *Eun.* 175-7 *utinam istuc uerbum ex animo ac uere diceret: / ... si istuc crederem / sincere dici, quiduis possem perpeti*. The resemblance is obvious; it is hard to deny that Catullus draws on Terence here. And yet it is not clear to me that strictly speaking we are dealing with an allusion, as opposed to the reuse of a turn of phrase in an act of literary “recycling”, as it is not clear how catching this reference could yield a deeper understanding of Catullus’ text.

Chapter 3 tackles “Heroic Badness and Catullus’ Plautine Plots” (pp. 126-47) through one turn of phrase that connects poems 21, 24 and 49, and it interprets these three passages as instances in which Catullus assumes the clever malevolence of the *seruus callidus*, the cunning slave of comedy. At 21.2f. the phrase appears as *quot aut fuerunt / aut sunt aut aliis erunt in annis*; it recurs with slight variations at 24.2f. and 49.2f. In all three cases, the context is an address to a person. Polt (p. 129) connects this phrase to Plautus, *Persa* 777 *qui sunt, qui erunt quique futuri sunt posthac* and *Bacchides* 1087 *qui fuerunt quique futuri sunt posthac*. The resemblance is obvious, and it is plausible that in these three passages Catullus is imitating comic irony and fake grandiloquence. It seems more doubtful that in these cases the poet is playing with the persona of the Plautine *seruus callidus*, which does not work well at all for poem 24, an address to a beloved whom the poet tries to shield from a rival.

The focus shifts to female characters in Chapter 4, “Naughty Girls: Comic Figures and Gendered Control in Catullus” (pp. 148-73). Polt compares Catullus’ search for Camerius in poem 55 convincingly with Amphitruo’s account of his search for Naucrates (Pl. *Amph.* 1009-19). This is another example of how Catullus’ understatement, irony and repeated statements of failure follow, and may well have been inspired by, comic models. While searching for Camerius in poem 55, Catullus runs into a group of prostitutes in the Portico of Pompey, one of whom uncovers herself and claims that Camerius is hiding in her bosom (55.11f.; Polt p. 155 believes that she is also the speaker in line 13, but it is much easier to assign that line to the poet-narrator). The poet addresses the prostitutes as *pessimae puellae* (55.10), a term that he also uses jokingly for his beloved Lesbia (36.9 *pessima ... puella*). Polt argues that these Catullan passages reflect the “Heroic Badness” of lower-class women in comedy. But here clear verbal parallels appear to be lacking, and the resemblance is at most one of attitude. However, it seems easier to explain these two phrases as instances of an ironic use of language that pervades the shorter poems of Catullus — and also Roman comedy, especially that of Plautus.

An Epilogue (“The Show Goes On: From Roman Comedy to Latin Love Elegy”, pp. 174-88) considers how Catullus set a precedent for the appropriation of comic themes and language in Latin love elegy (a subject studied by Polt’s mentor Sharon James, who has been a profound influence on this book). It does so through the example of poem 110; Polt argues convincingly that the characterization of Aufillena as a greedy but faithless concubine reflects comedy’s representation of mercenary love, and it serves in turn as a model for the greedy girlfriends of Latin love elegy.

In sum, this is a suggestive and insightful book. My only major issue with its argumentation is one of scale. How profound is the influence of Roman comedy on the poetry of Catullus? Here I am a little less sanguine than the author of this book. On the level of style and vocabulary, Catullus' debt to Roman comedy is considerable. There are resemblances in motifs, and in patterns of behaviour, self-presentation and characterization. There is also a limited number of clear textual parallels. On the other hand, allusions that can be clearly identified as such (cf. p. 35) do not appear to be numerous at all.

DÁNIEL KISS
Universitat de Barcelona
kiss@ub.edu

CHRISTOPHER B. KREBS, *Caesar: Bellum Gallicum Book VII*, Cambridge Greek and Latin classics, Cambridge-New York: Cambridge University Press, 2023, xvi+386pp., 30,33€, ISBN 978-1-009-17714-6.

It is in some ways very difficult to write a review of Christopher Krebs' new commentary on Julius Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum Book VII*, because so much about the volume is self-evident. While there is some variation across individual texts, most classicists know what to expect from a Cambridge Green and Yellow commentary. And certainly no one who works on Latin historiography needs a reviewer to tell them that Krebs is one of the most thoughtful readers of Caesar of our time. My aim here, rather, will be to outline Krebs' general approach and to illustrate the range and depth of Krebs' work with a case study.

As scholarly interest in the "literary" Caesar has increased rapidly over the last two decades, there has been an increasingly urgent need for new commentaries on Caesars' writings that address the issues which concern contemporary scholars. The magisterial commentaries produced by the likes of T. Rice Holmes and other luminaries in the 19th and early 20th century cannot be surpassed in their detailed treatment of topography, strategy, weaponry, and battles and their meticulous interrogation of the historical facts of Caesar's account. But this is not how we read Caesar anymore, at least not exclusively. The publication of Kathryn Welch and Anton Powell's edited volume *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter* in 1998 opened a door to scholarship that took Caesar seriously as a writer, a literary artist on the level of Thucydides (hence the volume's title, a play on Virginia Hunter's classic). Krebs himself has had much to do with the renaissance of Caesar the author, both through his own scholarship and with his oversight of 2018's *Cambridge Companion to the Writings of Julius Caesar* (along with Luca Grillo). While some capital-h Historians may still bristle at the notion of poetic allusions in Caesar's commentaries or scoff at the idea that their rhetorical sophistication

goes beyond political propaganda, regarding Caesar as a literary artist is no longer a fringe position among classicists (and certainly not among those who identify as students of historiography). Now that the literary approach to Caesar has become mainstream, there is need for commentaries that support scholarship in this area. Krebs makes explicit in the introduction that his approach is literary and historiographical; his goal, he says, is to “appreciate C. as a writer and the seventh book of his *BG*...within its ‘horizon of expectations’ and especially in its historiographical aspects is the foremost goal of this commentary (3).” This distinguishes this volume from any commentary that is currently available for Book VII.¹

The volume contains the customary features: in addition to the text and commentary, it features an extensive Introduction and a collection of well-produced maps and figures. Krebs’ Introduction covers the expected topics, focusing in most detail on material most specifically pertinent to Book VII. For example, Krebs opts not to include a full biographical overview of Caesar’s life and career (reinforcing that the commentary’s intended audience is not a beginner one), limiting himself to a brief discussion of Caesar’s career before Gaul that sets up the circumstances of his appointment (pp. 6-10). Krebs briefly introduces the concepts of Gaul and the Gauls (10-12) before outlining the events of Book VII in both narrative and timeline form (12-18). Krebs signals early on that, in his discussion of the Roman campaigns, he will not make the once-common mistake of falling under Caesar’s spell and viewing his victories as the triumphant and beneficial expansion of civilization. Krebs reminds us in the Introduction that Caesar waged “a brutal, imperialistic war (5),” and the rest of the Introduction and the commentary do not lose sight of the suffering inflicted for reasons of self-interest. Caesar the author is rightly admired, but Caesar the general is never lionized.

As we might expect from Krebs’ stated aims, the section on *BG* as text and literature comprises the largest section of the Introduction (pp. 23-57). Krebs gives a balanced account of the questions surrounding the *BG*’s composition. He acknowledges the arguments for both serial and unitary composition before settling on something of a middle ground; he suggests that Caesar began writing the commentaries on the traditional annual basis but came to conceive of them as a unified whole and later (in 51 BCE or later) lightly revised and distributed them as a single text (p. 28). The related and vexed question of the *BG*’s genre is handled with subtlety. Krebs acknowledges the difficulty posed by our lack of

¹ The Aris and Phillips Classical Texts series has recently published translations and commentaries of *BG* V-VI and I-II (full disclosure: this reviewer is their author) that have also sought to highlight the literary qualities of Caesar’s work. Fortunately, there is room for all of these books; the Aris and Phillips volumes have an undergraduate audience very squarely in mind, while Krebs notes in his introduction that this readership is not his primary focus (39). Indeed, while some Green and Yellows could be used in the advanced undergraduate classroom, this is clearly a commentary for professional scholars and graduate students.

surviving examples of *commentarii*, but points to several stylistic features of the *BG* that align with other forms of official and bureaucratic documents (29). At the same time, the *BG* (particularly Book VII) is characterized by historiographical features like direct speech and digressions on geography and ethnography. The final verdict: “His *commentarii* are a magistrate’s report of historical ambition; and as such *sui generis* (31).”

The discussion of Caesar’s style (which builds on Krebs’ chapter in the 2018 *Companion*) is clear, concise, and indispensable. Krebs identifies those features of Caesar’s prose with which students of Latin have long been familiar: his regularization of orthography, morphology, and syntax; his economy of expression and preference for common vocabulary rather than the novel; and his almost obsessive use of the ablative absolute. But Krebs also discusses some of the underappreciated elements of Caesar’s style. For example, despite claiming to “avoid the strange or uncommon word like you would a cliff (*tamquam scopulum, sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum*, Gell. *NA* 1.10.4),” Caesar does make occasional strategic use of technical, archaic, non-Latin, and rare vocabulary. As Krebs notes, this specialized vocabulary serves at times to heighten Caesar’s rhetoric and at other times to create a sense of precision (34); as is discussed below, Caesar makes especial use of agricultural terms in his ekphrasis on the fortifications at Alesia. The section of the introduction focused on Caesar’s narrative (39-44) is also a high point, and reflects contemporary interest in narratological approaches to historiography. The illustrations, maps, and figures are exceptionally useful and beautifully produced. In addition to general, topographical and battle maps, there are figures illustrating the circumvallations at Alesia, which are very beneficial for readers (like this reviewer) who struggle to visualize Caesar’s descriptions. The text of Book VII is based on Hering’s Teubner, currently the best available text of the *BG*. Krebs has offered 36 alternative readings, noted on pp. 61-2; there are also minor changes to Hering’s paragraph breaks and interpunctuation, and some spellings have been regularized (60).

To illustrate the general approach of Krebs’ commentary, I offer his treatment of Caesar’s ekphrasis of the fortifications at Alesia (7.72-4) as a case study. When Caesar learned that Vercingetorix was withdrawing within Alesia while he sent for reinforcements from the rest of Gaul, he constructed his now-famous double wall at Alesia, a countervallation to pen in the stronghold and an outer circumvallation to protect Caesar’s men against attacks from the outside. Caesar devotes two chapters to an extended description of the rationale behind and construction and function of these fortifications. Krebs’ discussion of Ch. 72-4 is organized around three main ideas, which together highlight Caesar’s accomplishments as both *auctor* and *imperator*. First, Caesar’s description of the project is meant to highlight his *scientia militaris* and his ability to bring order to bear on any situation. Second, the ekphrasis is narratively useful insofar as it slows the story down and creates drama. Third, this passage highlights Caesar’s literary experience and ambitions through its abundance of references to both literary and technical writing.

Krebs' commentary on the Alesia ekphrasis takes into account recent excavations and points out where Caesar's narrative aligns or diverges from the archaeological evidence. Many details are accurate: Caesar describes the advance ditch as having vertical sides (*derectis lateribus*, 72.1), which is "more or less" confirmed by excavations; it appears to be the case that the inner trench was designed to be filled with water, as Caesar claimed (*aqua. . . compleuit*, 72.3); and Caesar's reckoning of the perimeter of the outer fortification (*quattuordecim milia passuum*, 74.1) is accurate. Where Krebs' discussion differs from earlier commentaries is in his framing of the discrepancies between Caesar's account and the material record. Rather than bluntly treating the differences as Caesarian self-aggrandizement, Krebs highlights how Caesar's account aligns with standard military and agricultural practices; Caesar knew how it *should* be done, even if the irregularity of the landscape and practicalities of warfare prevented him from precisely making theory into reality. For example, Caesar says the siege works were set back four hundred paces (*pedes quadringentos*, 72.2) from the first trench; the actual distance was further, but Krebs points out that Caesar has used a "standard agricultural measure." In other places, the differences between Caesar's description and the archaeological evidence can be attributed to Caesar's emphasis on order and regularity. Thus, for example, Caesar tells us that the two fortifications were "matching, of the same kind (*pares eiusdem generis munitiones*, 74.1)" when in reality "the archaeological record is more complicated."

Consistent with his overall emphasis on the literary qualities of Caesar's work, Krebs also uses the commentary on Alesia to show how Caesar uses language to create narrative effects. As Krebs notes, the passage as a whole has a "retardatory" effect, heightening the sense of dramatic tension by halting the narrative just before the climactic face-off at Alesia; as Vercingetorix waits for his reinforcements, we wait for the next thing to "happen," too. However, within the ekphrasis, there is no stagnation, but rather a rush of activity, and Caesar evokes the cacophony and commotion of construction through mimetic language. As Krebs demonstrates, swift, orderly prose reflects the swift, orderly work of Caesar's men; thus, at 73.1, a "tricolon of polysyndetic infinitives suggests breathless action, its effect enhanced by the enclosing word order of *erat* and its unusually delayed complement *necesse*." Krebs points out sound-effects, as well (e.g., *praeacutis cacuminibus* at 73.2, which in turn may be inspired by the "smashing alliteration and assonance in Enn. *Ann.* 187-91").

The highlights of Krebs' commentary, for me, are his notes demonstrating Caesar's engagement with a wide variety of texts and literature. Throughout the commentary Krebs highlights echoes of, allusion to, and verbal repetitions with other sources, some expected and others perhaps less so. Krebs does a particularly fine job drawing out the depth and complexity of Caesar's engagement with Polybius, which to this point has not been widely discussed in the literature; this commentary will be the starting point for all further research on intertextuality and allusion in Caesar's works. In the Alesia ekphrasis, Krebs calls attention to

echoes of technical and agricultural writing. As we have seen, Caesar's description of the siege works sometimes aligns with the archaeological evidence, and in other cases has been distorted. As was discussed above, often where Caesar has rounded or regularized his figures he has done so in a manner consistent with standardized agricultural measurements, suggesting that he had some familiarity with the treatises of Cato and others. That Caesar knew these writings directly is further suggested by his use of technical vocabulary unknown or highly unusual in historiography but common in agricultural treatises. Caesar's description of rows of pits dug in a quincunx pattern (73.5-8) seems to be drawn from this tradition; the arrangement itself comes from agricultural practice, as described by Cato (*Agr.* 45, regarding olive planting) and later Vergil and Columella (*Georgics* 2.277-8 and *Rust.* 3.13, on planting vineyards). The depth of the pits (*tres in altitudinem pedes*, 72.1) is standard in the horticultural writings. Contrary to Caesar's general practice of avoiding unusual words, he employs specialized vocabulary in the ekphrasis: his uses of *scrobis* (72.1) *praeurere* (73.6), *disserere* (73.9) are all borrowed from the agricultural lexicon, while his use of *labra* (72.1) parallels that in Vitruvius (9 *praef.* 11). This reflection of non-historical, non-military technical works in Caesar's writing gives us a glimpse of the vastness of his intellectual curiosity.

In his Introduction, Krebs remarks that his decision to highlight the literary qualities of Caesar's work "will come at a price (4)." To "admit" that the *BG* is, in some degree, a work of literary imagination is to grapple with the realization that our long-cherished ideas about the "facts" of Caesar's campaigns and the events and characters we came to view in a certain way might exist as we know them only within the confines of the *BG* itself. I am not sure that this is such a great loss. If what we gain in exchange for relinquishing a version of Vercingetorix that was no more than a phantom to begin with is a fuller appreciation of Caesar as a gifted and challenging literary artist, this is a price I think we should be willing to pay.

JENNIFER GERRISH
College of Charleston
gerrishj@cofc.edu

STEFANO MASO, *Cicero's Philosophy*, Trends in Classics 3, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2022, pp. xiii+178, \$28.99, ISBN 978-3-11-065839-2.

This slim volume is part of the series “Key Perspectives on Classical Research”, whose aim is to explore the themes that have shaped previous scholarship on an author, genre, or topic in Classical Studies. Cicero’s philosophical works are certainly ripe for this treatment, given how much their scholarly fortunes have changed in the past half century or so. In recent years, there has been a dramatic reassessment of the nineteenth and early twentieth century view that viewed Cicero the philosopher as a mindless copyist of Hellenistic Greek philosophy, a second-rate author whose *philosophica* were only valuable as a source to be mined for their original Greek ideas. Contemporary scholarship has tended to take a more charitable approach to Cicero’s philosophy, laying stress on Cicero’s skill in synthesizing so many different Greek works and in making them palatable for a Roman audience.

Much like Cicero’s philosophical works themselves, this book is also primarily a synthesis, collecting and summarizing scholarship on this topic that dates from the past half century or so. Maso focuses exclusively on studies that have contributed to a more positive view of Cicero the philosopher, an attitude that he shares.

The book consists of five chapters and an epilogue that cover a range of topics related to Cicero’s philosophy. The first two chapters provide a biographical overview of Cicero’s interest in philosophy: his philosophical training is the topic of chapter one, while chapter two considers his return to philosophy after Caesar’s accession to the dictatorship in the 40s. The remaining three chapters take up various topics that have been the focus of modern scholarship on Cicero’s philosophy. Chapter three provides an overview of contemporary research, proceeding through the philosophical works text by text. It is followed in chapter four by an overview of different scholarly approaches towards assessing the originality of Cicero’s philosophical works. The final chapter discusses several technical Greek terms that Cicero translated into Latin.

Maso’s aim with this volume is admirable, and the advanced undergraduate and early-stage graduate student who wishes to grasp the basics of Cicero’s philosophy will find useful information within it. Unfortunately, several aspects of the volume hamper its usefulness. While the first two chapters largely cohere with one another, the remaining three do not, and the book ultimately does not offer a comprehensive account of modern scholarship on Cicero’s philosophical works. Furthermore, as a non-native English speaker, Maso was not well served by his press, which did not provide much assistance in the way of copy-editing. This is certainly not Maso’s fault, but it has the effect of making the book more challenging to read. Nonetheless, the book does offer a decent overview of the *status quaestionis* when it comes to Cicero’s philosophy, and I certainly would have been grateful to have such a book to peruse when I was in graduate school

and first began the complicated task of making sense of Cicero's vast philosophical corpus.

Chapter One, "Cicero's Philosophical Apprenticeship," offers a biographical account that begins with Cicero's earliest studies in philosophy and ends with the Platonizing dialogues he wrote in the 50s BCE (among these three dialogues, it is Cicero's ideal of combining philosophical education with training as an orator as it is depicted in *De Oratore* that receives the most attention). Maso primarily bases this biography on Cicero's own autobiographical *obiter dicta* (especially as found in his letters and the autobiography embedded in the *Brutus*), although he also draws on Plutarch's biography and the scholarly biographies that have been produced on Cicero from the mid-twentieth century on. The chapter concludes by describing Cicero's increased awareness in the 50s of the importance of morally acceptable and productive *otium*, which would provide a foundation for the ambitious project of philosophical translation and synthesis that he undertook in the following decade.

Chapter Two, "Cicero's Philosophical Employment", describes that project. This useful chapter opens with a brief biographical account of Cicero's motivations in the 40s for returning to philosophy. This is followed by a chronology of his philosophical works, including those that predate this period. The remainder of this lengthy chapter is then devoted to summaries of the many works that Cicero produced in the 40s. Brief descriptions of significant recent scholarship are provided for some of these works. However, this practice is uneven; no bibliography is provided for *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, *De Natura Deorum*, *De Senectute*, *De Divinatione*, *De Fato*, *De Amicitia*, *Topica*, and *De Officiis*. If Maso had consistently applied the principle of summarizing each work and supplying relevant bibliography, this chapter would be required reading for anyone approaching the philosophical works for the first time. While it is useful enough as it stands, the reader is left to search out on their own recent scholarly approaches to several of the most important components of Cicero's philosophical project.

Chapter Three, "Contemporary Research on Cicero as a Philosopher", provides an overview of the modern scholarship on Cicero's philosophy that Maso considers fundamental for a beginner in the topic. He confines himself to scholarship that accepts that Cicero was a proper philosopher, at least in the meaning that he argues the word acquired in the first century BCE: not a theorist but rather "a man heavily engaged in the decisive issues of his own age, who has developed the need to find, in the theoretical and critical-philosophical knowledge, the necessary tools so as to overcome the difficulties connected with the events of political contingency" (49). He begins the chapter with an annotated bibliography that covers six categories: (1) research that gives the broader perspective of the Roman cultural context in which Cicero wrote; (2) research on the Academic school; (3) the seminal 1995 volume *Cicero the Philosopher*, edited by J.G.F. Powell (J.G.F. Powell, ed., *Cicero the Philosopher*, Oxford 1995); (4) two comprehensive volumes, Brinkmann (K.

Bringmann, *Untersuchungen zum späten Cicero*, Göttingen 1971) and Görler (W. Görler, *Untersuchungen zur Ciceros Philosophie*, Heidelberg 1974); (5) a variety of studies dedicated to specific aspects of Cicero's philosophy; and (6) Gawlick and Görler's account of Cicero in the fourth volume of *Die Philosophie der Antike* (G. Gawlick, W. Görler, "Cicero", in M. Erler, H. Flashar, eds., *Die Philosophie der Antike IV: Die hellenistische Philosophie*, Basel 1994, 1054-68). The rest of the chapter focuses on three central themes in Cicero's philosophy: Cicero's views on epistemology as an Academic, the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy, and his ethical thought. In each of these sections, Maso focuses in depth on how recent scholarship has changed scholarly opinion on these topics. Though it is necessarily selective, the bibliography does cover most of the major work on Cicero's philosophy that has been done in the past half century and will certainly help orient the philosophical novice.

Chapter Four, "Problems in Cicero's Philosophy," provides an overview of approaches on the question most consistently raised regarding Cicero's philosophical works: namely, how original they are and whether they can be taken as reliable sources for the views of the Hellenistic philosophers whose treatises they draw on. The scholarship covered in this book differs most radically from earlier studies on precisely this point. The golden age of *Quellenforschung* treated Cicero's philosophical works as little more than fragments of Hellenistic philosophers that the talented scholar could reassemble into the original Greek treatise. More recent scholarship has emphasized not just the considerable effort Cicero put into adapting Hellenistic philosophy for a Roman audience, but also the sense of entitlement with which he, as a Roman, plundered the intellectual property of Greek philosophers. Maso illustrates this approach by surveying contemporary work on *De Officiis*, *De Amicitia*, *De Natura Deorum*, *De Divinatione*, and *De Fato*. He then turns to consider how accurately Cicero portrayed the views of the skeptical Academy, Stoa, Garden, and eclectic "Old Academy" of Antiochus in his philosophical works. The chapter ends with a brief excursus on the extent to which *De Re Publica* and *De Legibus* should be numbered among Cicero's philosophical works.

The final chapter, Chapter Five, entitled "Cicero's Philosophical Vocabulary", discusses Cicero's translation of eight technical Greek terms: ἀδιάφορα (translated with *indifferentia*), βούλησις (*voluntas*), εἰμαρμένη (*fatum*), καθῆκον (*officium*), κατάληψις/καταληπτική φαντασία (*comprehensio/visum comprehendibile*), οἰκείωσις (*conciliatio*), πιθανόν (*probabile*), and πρόληψις (translated variously with *anticipatio*, *praenotio*, and *praesensio*). Maso argues that Cicero's translations of these terms, the majority of which are related to concepts central to Stoicism, were particularly careful. Notably, all of them also developed a rich afterlife in subsequent Roman philosophy as well as in the European philosophical tradition.

The book concludes with a brief epilogue in which Maso argues that the final chapter, with its focus on Cicero's philosophical vocabulary, reinforces the major themes of the volume: namely, that Cicero was a prudent and accurate translator

of Greek philosophy, but that his aim shifted “from that of a simple mediator of Greek tradition and culture to...a philosopher intending to pursue an educational, moral and civic project” (149).

This is an uneven book: its aims are admirable, but its execution often leaves something to be desired. Scholars who specialize in Cicero’s philosophy will not find much new insight in it, nor indeed was that its purpose. For the beginner, however, it could provide a useful starting point. And ultimately, it is a refreshing sign of how much scholarly approaches to Cicero’s philosophy have changed that Maso has been able to devote an entire book to a survey of scholarship that takes Cicero’s role as a philosopher seriously.

CAROLINE BISHOP
Texas Tech University
Caroline.Bishop@ttu.edu

PHILIPP BRÜLLMANN, JÖRN MÜLLER, *Cicero: De officiis*, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2023, ix+248 pp., ISBN 978-3-11-076019-4.

In der von Otfried Höffe herausgegebenen Reihe „Klassiker auslegen“ ist als 78. Band ein Sammelband zu Ciceros Lehrbrief *De officiis* erschienen. Der Sammelband umfasst insgesamt 13 Einzelbeiträge unterschiedlicher ausgewiesener Cicero-Experten in deutscher und englischer Sprache. Die Beiträge sind systematisch angeordnet: Den Beginn macht eine Einleitung der Herausgeber Brüllmann und Müller; anschließend folgt ein Beitrag von Marco Bleistein zu Ciceros Proömien; im Weiteren orientiert sich die Reihenfolge der Einzelbeiträge an der Abfolge der drei Bücher von *De officiis*. Zwar behandeln die einzelnen Kapitel je nach Forschungsschwerpunkt der Autoren durchaus unterschiedliche Themen, allerdings ist die inhaltliche Einheit des Sammelbandes weitgehend gewahrt, so dass der Band durchaus als eine Art Handbuch zu Ciceros Schrift genutzt werden kann.

Zudem weisen alle Beiträge eine Art roten Faden auf, indem sie drei wichtige Forschungsaspekte betonen: a) Sie heben im Unterschied zur früheren Forschung Ciceros Eigenständigkeit hervor; b) sie ordnen Ciceros Schrift trotz allen stoischen Zügen in einen prinzipiellen skeptisch-platonischen Rahmen ein; c) sie verweisen auf die Verbindung von Rhetorik, Philosophie und politischem Nutzen als Kernintention des Lehrbriefs. Gleichwohl unterscheiden sich die Beiträge durchaus in der Frage, inwieweit Ciceros Philosophie eher auf einer griechisch-stoischen Tradition fußt oder eine eigene Adaption der griechischen Philosophie in einen spezifisch römischen Kontext vornimmt (*contextualism*). Insofern bildet der Sammelband durchaus unterschiedliche Sichtweisen der aktuellen Cicero-Forschung ab.

In ihrer Einleitung (S. 1-18) gehen Brüllmann/Müller auf den traktatartigen Briefcharakter der an Ciceros Sohn Marcus gerichteten Schrift ein, die einen dogmatischen Zugriff zum Thema vermuten lassen könnte. Zurecht zeigen sie allerdings schon hier die für die Skepsis typischen Elemente im Text auf, die das Lesepublikum zu einem eigenen Urteil einlädt. Sie sehen in der Schrift eine Art „Karriereratgeber“ für angehende Politiker, die sich einer ähnlichen Lebenssituation wie der primäre Adressat befinden. Ciceros Schrift stellt die erste erhaltene systematische Ethik aus der Antike dar und erfuhr eine breite Rezeption in der Neuzeit: So wurde sie von Gutenberg nach der Bibel als zweites Buch gedruckt und kann geradezu als „Gelenkstelle in der Geschichte der Ethik“ gelten. Sie geht problemorientiert vor und gibt situativ orientierte Ratschläge an einen Adressatenkreis von (angehenden) Rednern, Anwälten und Politikern, was die Themen- und Beispielauswahl im Werk erklärt.

Marco Bleistein widmet sich im zweiten Beitrag (S. 19-32) einer bekannten Forschungskontroverse: Stehen die Proömien von Ciceros philosophischen Werken in einem organischen Zusammenhang mit dem folgenden eigentlichen Werk oder sind sie lediglich ein eher zufallsbedingt ausgewähltes Produkt aus dem in Brief Cic. Att. 16.6.4 erwähnten Proömien-Vorrat *volumen prohoemiorum*, ohne dass ein direkter Bezug zum restlichen Werk zwingend sein muss? Bleistein entscheidet sich mit guten Argumenten für die erste Variante und kann für die drei Bücher *De officiis* den inhaltlichen Zusammenhang zwischen Proömien und den konkreten Ausführungen aufzeigen. Ein weiterer wichtiger Aspekt ist Bleisteins Nachweis, dass Ciceros Spätwerk keinesweges (wie früher oft behauptet) kontemplative Produkte eines erzwungenen *otium* darstellen; vielmehr macht gerade *De officiis* eher den Eindruck einer politisch aktiven Orientierung am Zeitgeschehen, verbunden mit dem Aufruf, sich für den Erhalt der freiheitlichen *res publica* einzusetzen.

Georgia Tsouni behandelt in einem übergreifenden Beitrag (S. 33-50) die skeptischen Grundlagen von *De officiis*: Den skeptischen Zugriff unterstützen hier bereits die Wahl der Gattung Brief, die die Verwendung der 1. Person („ich“) impliziert und somit die Ausführungen von vornherein als eine persönliche Meinung des Autors bzw. Brief-Ich erscheinen lassen. Zugleich hebt die Briefform den Charakter der traktatähnlichen Schrift als bloße Ermahnung zur Lebenspraxis hervor, die von Lesepublikum reflektiert werden muss. In seiner Schrift verwendet Cicero zudem häufig Ausdrücke der Wahrscheinlichkeit (*probabile*), die explizit auf den Skeptizismus verweisen. Speziell in Buch 3 wägt Cicero immer wieder die unterschiedlichen Sichtweisen von Stoa und Peripatos ab und kann bei den vielen aufgeführten Beispielen eine Art Kasuistik („case studies“) vornehmen, wie sie aus dem Kontext der skeptischen Akademie bekannt ist. Diese Fallstudien zeigen auch, dass Cicero oft weniger von stoischen Lehren ausgeht, als vielmehr die Praxis des römischen Rechts im Sinne des Gemeinwohls (*communis utilitas*) anwendet.

Im vierten Beitrag geht Julia Wildberger (S. 51-69) den stoischen Grundlagen der Schrift nach. Sie zeigt, dass Cicero weniger auf die rigorose Stoa Chrysipps zurückgreift, sondern im Ganzen eher der mittleren Stoa (Panaitios, Poseidonios) zuneigt, aber natürlich in Vielem eigene Schwerpunkte setzt – z.B. durch den ständigen Rückgriff auf den Probabilismus der Skeptiker. Ein wichtiger, von der gängigen Stoa abweichender Aspekt betrifft die Definition der Natur des Menschen und des ethisch Guten (*honestum*) bei Cicero: Sie kommt anders als z.B. bei Chrysipp ohne Gott aus und basiert rein auf der Grundlage der menschlichen Vernunft. Zugleich siedelt Cicero ähnlich wie Panaitios die Pflichtenlehre im sozialen Kontext der Nobilität an, was der sozial inklusiveren Auffassung der älteren Stoa widerspricht. Auf der anderen Seite bezieht sich das *commune officium* – wie auch andere Beiträge des Sammelbandes hervorheben – prinzipiell auf alle „normalen“, d.h. meist defizitären Menschen und nicht nur auf den Idealtyp des Weisen. Die Schrift will also kein unerreichbares Ideal konstruieren, wie es aus vielen antiken philosophischen Schriften bekannt ist, sondern sie gibt Handlungsmaximen für den ganz „normalen“ Alltag des Lesepublikums. Eine vergleichbare Interpretation legt Christoph Horn im fünften Beitrag (S. 71-87) vor, den er programmatisch „Nicht-ideale Ethik für nicht-weise Menschen“ titulierte. Im Weiteren richtet er sich gegen den „Kontextualismus“, d.h. der Anbindung von Ciceros Ausführungen an römischen Vorstellungen zuungunsten der stoischen Fundierung. Zwar gibt auch Horn durchaus eine Adaption an den römischen Kulturkontext zu, allerdings bleibt für ihn die stoische und oft auch platonische Grundlage (*Politeia*) immer präsent. Dies zeigt er etwa an den Beispielen der Gerechtigkeit, des Vertrauens und der Wohltätigkeit. Gleichwohl sieht Horn in dem ausgeprägten Pragmatismus eine Abweichung Ciceros von platonischen Vorstellungen.

Jörn Müller analysiert in seinem Kapitel (S. 89-106) Ciceros aristokratisch geprägte Konzeption der Tugend und *magnitudo animi*. Er konstatiert zum einen eine fehlende Definition der Tugend bei Cicero, betont zugleich deren durchgängig performativen Charakter und die praktische Lebensorientierung für den aktiven Politiker. Die Tugend ist somit öffentlich und auf die *res publica* sowie das Gemeinwohl ausgerichtet. Am Beispiel des Regulus-Exemplums (Cic. *off.* 3.114f.) erörtert Müller die Besonderheit von Ciceros Begriff von *virtus* und *magnitudo animi*: Sie beziehen sich keineswegs nur auf strahlende militärische Sieger oder erfolgreiche Politiker, sondern können durchaus Merkmale von Unterlegenen, aber moralischen Siegern sein.

David Machek bindet im siebten Beitrag (S. 107-22) Ciceros vier-*personae*-Theorie an den Rollenbegriff der Stoa an. Wie Cicero in Buch 1 schreibt, nimmt der Mensch vier unterschiedliche Rollen ein: 1. als Angehöriger der Spezies Mensch, 2. als individuelle Person, 3. im Rahmen seiner sozialen Herkunft, 4. durch seinen Beruf. Während Platon und Aristoteles auf die „Funktion“ (*ergon*) des Menschen abheben, betont die Stoa im Sinne der Theatermetaphorik eher die „Rolle“ des Einzelnen. Dies passt gut zur Schicksalslehre: Zwar gibt das Fatum

dem Einzelnen seine Rolle vor, allerdings kann er sie besser oder schlechter ausfüllen bzw. „spielen“. Nicht die zugewiesene Rolle bzw. die äußeren Lebensumstände machen den Menschen (un)glücklich, sondern der Umgang damit. Wie die Stoa nimmt auch Cicero eine jeweils individuell ausgeprägte Natur (*physis*) des Einzelnen an: Danach sollte sich im Idealfall dann die Ausgestaltung der vierten Rolle, d.h. die Wahl eines Berufes richten.

Mit dem achten Beitrag von Dorothea Frede (S. 123-41) wird das in Buch 2 angesprochene Problem des *utile* erstmals behandelt. Am Beginn weist Frede auf die Schwierigkeit einer treffenden Übersetzung von *kathēkon/officium* hin: Statt der gängigen, aber unpassenden Übersetzung „Pflicht“ schlägt sie inhaltlich passendere Ausdrücke vor wie „Angezeigtes; Gebotenes“ im Sinne von „Empfehlenswertem“. Diese wichtigen Ausführungen hätte man eigentlich eher am Beginn des Sammelbandes in dem einführenden Kapitel erwartet. Im Weiteren geht Frede auf die Bestimmung des Nützlichen (*utile*) ein, das sich bei Cicero v.a. im Eigennutz zur Durchsetzung bestimmter Ziele manifestiert. Ziele des Handelns sind Ehre und Ruhm, die gleichwohl Wohltaten für die Gemeinschaft einschließen. Ciceros kasuistische Ausführungen machen für Frede den Einsatz der Nobilität für das Gemeinwohl attraktiv, weil es ihnen eben auch Nutzen im Sinne von Ehre und Ruhm einbringt. Eine ähnliche Stoßrichtung verfolgt der Beitrag von Stefan Röttig (S. 143-59), allerdings mit einer Verbindung zur Einzeltugend der Gerechtigkeit. Anders als z.B. bei Seneca spielt laut Röttig bei Cicero der Aspekt der Glückseligkeit (*beatitudo*) als Produkt von tugendhaftem Handeln und Wohltätigkeit (*beneficentia*) nur eine untergeordnete Rolle: Stattdessen steht das reputationsförderliche Wirken für die Gemeinschaft im Vordergrund.

Die Behandlung von Buch 3 beginnt mit dem Kapitel von Tue Emil Öhler Søvso (S. 161-78), das das Verhältnis von Nutzen und Moral in den Blick nimmt. Öhler Søvso führt aus, dass *utile* nicht einfach mit „nützlich“ wiedergegeben werden kann, sondern eine Übersetzung von gr. *symphéron* darstellt, also eher einen „instrumentellen Wert der Brauchbarkeit“ ausdrückt. Cicero versucht den Konflikt zwischen Moral und Nutzen aufzulösen und bewegt sich dabei durchaus in teilweise stoischer Tradition, greift allerdings zusätzlich auf Grundsätze römischer Rechtspraxis zurück. Rebecca Langlands analysiert in ihrem Beitrag (S. 179-95) die Funktion der *exempla* in Buch 3: Zum einen zeigen sie (u.a. am Beispiel von Caesars Ermordung), dass das wahre *honestum* oft nicht auf den ersten Blick erkennbar ist, weil z.B. ein (gerechter) Tyrannenmord scheinbar gegen das Mord-Verbot verstößt, aber für die Gemeinschaft nützlich ist. Zum anderen entsprechen die vielen *exempla* allesamt nicht dem idealen Weisen und weisen auch keine *virtus perfecta* auf. Damit sind sie aber gerade gute Vorbilder für gewöhnliche Menschen in realen Handlungskontexten.

Im zwölften Beitrag geht Jed W. Atkins (S. 197-213) den Grundsätzen der politischen Theorie in Ciceros *De officiis* nach. Dieses übergreifende Kapitel zeigt, wie Cicero scheinbar gegensätzliche Aspekte in seinem Werk zu verbinden sucht; zugleich grenzt es Ciceros Staatsauffassung von anderen philosophischen

Richtungen ab: Insbesondere Ciceros „*naturalism*“ mit der Annahme einer natürlichen Veranlagung des Menschen zu Gemeinschaft und Staatsbildung weicht von anderen politischen Theorien ab, die (z.B. Platon) die Staatsbildung eher aus der Defizienz oder Schutzbedürftigkeit des Einzelnen heraus begründen. Ähnlich wie im Dialog *De republica* entwirft Cicero auch in seinem Lehrbrief eine realistische, d.h. nicht-utopische Staatsauffassung, die viele praktische Regeln für Magistraten und politisches Handeln bietet, zugleich aber v.a. beim Freiheitsbegriff von der aristokratischen Oberschicht aus gedacht ist.

Der letzte Beitrag von Philipp Brüllmann (S. 215-32) beschäftigt sich mit der Rezeption von Ciceros *De officiis* von der Spätantike bis in die Neuzeit am Beispiel von Ambrosius und Immanuel Kant. Hierbei werden einerseits die Relevanz und der Vorbildcharakter von Ciceros Schrift klar, andererseits gibt es wichtige Unterschiede: Sowohl Ambrosius als auch Kant wenden sich von den eher auf den gewöhnlichen, defizitären Menschen abzielenden „mittleren Pflichten“ (*media officia*) ab und entwerfen stattdessen wieder ähnlich wie die ältere Stoa rigorosere Idealvorstellungen. Bei Ambrosius sind diese im Wesentlichen biblisch auf dem Vorbild Jesu gegründet, bei Kant steht das Handeln aus Pflicht im Vordergrund.

Im Anhang enthält der Sammelband eine Sammlung von aktueller Spezialliteratur zum Thema sowie einen Sach- und einen Personen-Index.

Im Ganzen handelt es sich um einen sehr nützlichen und aufgrund der Expertise der Beitragenden um einen fachlich fundierten, inhaltlich facettenreichen Band, der in alle aktuellen Forschungsfragen und –kontroversen zu Ciceros *De officiis* einführt.

PETER KUHLMANN

Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

Peter.Kuhlmann@phil.uni-goettingen.de

SERGIO CASALI, *Virgilio: guida all'Eneide*, Bussole 678, Roma: Carocci editore, 2023, 143 pp., € 13.00, ISBN 978-88-290-2067-6.

Der Autor erklärt die *Aeneis* zu Beginn mit Recht für „un’opera di enorme complessità“ und möchte in der Hoffnung, dem Leser „almeno un’idea di tale complessità“ zu geben, auf S. 11-120 im Format 20 x 13 (121-31: Appendice metrica, 133-44: Bibliografia) „solo alcuni aspetti“ ansprechen (S. 9). Es ist aber eigentlich allein der eine Aspekt der Intertextualität, den C., weltweit für seinen stupenden Spürsinn in diesem Bereich bekannt, in seinen sieben Kapiteln (in Anspielung auf Rom als Sieben-Hügel-Stadt wie *Aen.* 1.7?) immer wieder in den Blick nimmt. Hier bietet er keineswegs nur längst Vertrautes, sondern präsentiert viele neue faszinierende Erkenntnisse, die das Büchlein auf jeden Fall zu einer sehr lesenswerten Vergil-Monographie machen. Leider werden mit Kap.

1 ganze 19 Seiten für zwölf trockene Inhaltsparaphrasen vertan, die man heute eher in Wikipedia sucht und in der italienischen Variante als wirklich umfassende Übersicht findet. Kap. 2 schlägt den Bogen von *Ecl.* 6 mit der *recusatio* und *Ecl.* 4 (deren Prophezeiung C. S. 39 auch als “profezia dell’*Eneide*” interpretiert; doch warum erwähnt er nicht *Aen.* 6.791f. *hic vir hic est* ... als mögliche ‘Lösung’ des *puer*-Rätsels?) über *Georg.* 3.1-48 mit der Ankündigung des Epos (dessen Konzept er zu selbstverständlich mit dem der *Aeneis* gleichsetzt) zu *Aen.* 7.37-44a, wo die einstige *recusatio* mit *maius opus moveo* ‘zurückgenommen’ wird: “Dal rifiuto (*ecl.* 6) alla promessa (*georg.* III), alla realizzazione (*Aen.* VII)” (S. 38) – gewiss, aber da C. in *Aen.* 7-12 insgesamt eine römische *Ilias* sieht, vernachlässigt er, dass die römische *Odyssee* insofern bis Buch 8 reicht, als der Held darin ‘heimkehrt’, und die früher vom *poeta* verweigerten *proelia* so richtig erst in den wahrhaft ‘iliadischen’ Büchern 9-12 toben.

Sehr ausführlich widmet C. sich in Kap. 3 dem Proöm, wo ihn erneut am meisten “il programma intertestuale” interessiert, z. B. dass *cano* nach *Arma* (C. verweist nicht auf den Anklang an Ἄνδρα und Ἀρχόμενος) für die *Ilias* und *virum(que)* für die *Odyssee* an das Sprecher-Ich der Posthomerica erinnert und dass die *causae* (1.8) für den Zorn der Juno doppelter Natur sind: “storiche e mitologiche” (S. 53). Kap. 4 und 5, der längste Abschnitt des Buchs (S. 57-92), belegt unter der Überschrift “Virgilio e la tradizione epica” auf Knauers und Nelis’ Spuren minuziös, welche Handlungseinheiten aller zwölf Bücher Vergil nach Handlungseinheiten der beiden homerischen Epen und der *Argonautika* des Apollonios “modelliert” hat –, das leicht quellenpositivistisch angehauchte *modellare* erscheint dabei als der am häufigsten verwendete Begriff – und danach behandelt C. Fälle von Intertextualität mit Werken anderer Gattungen, diesmal exemplarisch (93-106: “Polifonia dei generi”): 1. lenkt C. unsern Blick vom “dibattito tra Didone ed Enea” in 4.305-87 durch das “Fenster” der Ariadne-Rede in Catull 64 auf Medea-Passagen bei Apollonios und Euripidides; hier war ich z. B. verwundert, dass C. zu *Aen.* 4.316 *per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos* ~ Cat. 64.141 *sed conubia laeta, sed optatos hymenaeos* nicht auf den Anklang an die Sequenz Glykoneus – Pherekrateus jeweils in V. 3f. der Strophen von Catulls Hochzeitsgedicht 61 aufmerksam macht. 2. verdeutlicht C. die Spannung zwischen epikureisch-“naturwissenschaftlichem” und mythischem Götterbild sehr anschaulich durch das Aufzeigen von Anspielungen auf Stellen bei Lukrez, die im Zusammenhang mit Junos *ira* offensichtlich ins kulturelle Gedächtnis rufen sollen, dass laut dem Lehrdichter die *divom natura* fern in den Intermundien *non tangitur ira* (2.644-51).

Was das Verhältnis des *Aeneis*-Dichters zu Augustus betrifft, entscheidet sich C. in dem abschließenden Kap. 7 für Ambivalenz zwischen “pessimism” und “optimism” und exemplifiziert das u. a. durch den Verweis auf den Widerspruch zwischen Ascanius Iulus als erstem König von Alba laut Jupiter in 1.266ff. und Silvius Postumus, Anchises in 6.762ff. zufolge erster Herrscher in der Nachbarstadt, der als Sohn der Nicht-Trojanerin Lavinia kein Urahn der Julierdynastie sein

kann. Dies und alles, was C. vorher darlegt, liest mit großem Gewinn, wer die *Aeneis* und die wichtigste Forschungsliteratur überblickt, aber benötigt ein solcher Rezipient einen “guida”? Damit ist doch wohl eine Werkeinführung gemeint, und eine solche richtet sich in erster Linie an Studierende und gebildete Laien. Bedenkt man nun jedoch, welch minimale Vorkenntnisse heutige Gymnasiasten (auch in Italien, wie dortige Kollegen erzählen) an die Universität mitbringen, darf man fragen, ob das Zielpublikum eines “Fremdenführers” wie C. das alles zu verstehen vermag, was das Büchlein enthält. Will ich, wenn ich ein so berühmtes Werk der Weltliteratur näher kennenzulernen suche, wenn ich nachzuvollziehen in der Lage sein möchte, warum man Vergil den “Vater des Abendlands” genannt hat, tatsächlich primär wissen, welche hinter dem Text versteckten anderen Werke evoziert werden? Zweifellos vermitteln die in Kap. 6 behandelten Beispiele von Intertextualität eine tiefe Einsicht in die Polyphonie der *Aeneis*-Verse, die man natürlich nicht ignorieren kann. Aber auf den 36 Seiten über Vergil und die epische Tradition wird nicht *arte allusiva*, sondern ein ermüdender Katalog von Prätexten geboten, der bei Laien den (falschen) Eindruck erwecken dürfte, der Dichter habe die *Aeneis* als Plagiator aus Versatzstücken der zwei (bzw. drei) griechischen Epen zusammengestückt, wie ja schon die zeitgenössischen *obtrectatores Vergilii* behaupteten.

Ich jedenfalls hätte von einem “guida” zu diesem Epos Informationen über die Sprachkunst erwartet, die zum Vorbild für alle späteren lateinisch schreibenden Poeten von Ovid an wurde, über die Erzähltechnik des ‘lyrischen’ Epikers, der seine *persona* mit Einfühlung in die von Leid betroffenen Figuren reden lässt; ich hätte mir exemplarische Interpretationen von zwei oder drei besonders repräsentativen Passagen gewünscht, in denen auch die Verskunst gewürdigt würde, die C. separat in seiner viel zu theoretischen Appendice metrica erörtert, obwohl ihm doch klar sein müsste, dass heutige Studierende in ihrer ‘Metrophobie’ dieses Kapitel schwerlich würdigen. Wer die *Aeneis* einfach lesen und genießen möchte, der sollte z. B. bei Betrachtung des “dibattito tra Dido ed Enea” behutsam an der Hand des “guida” von Vers zu Vers geleitet, nicht mit Informationen über Anspielungen auf Texte, die er sich erst selbst erschließen müsste, überfordert werden. Aber nicht viel mehr als Letzteres leistet das Büchlein, während es zu den gerade von mir angesprochenen Aspekten schweigt. Der Autor hat zweifellos einen wertvollen Beitrag zur Vergil-Forschung geleistet, der Titel “guida all’Eneide” entspricht jedoch nicht dem, was ich mir unter dieser Textsorte vorstelle.

NIKLAS HOLZBERG
München/Erfurt
nc.holzberg@gmail.com

R. MALTBY, *Book Three of the Corpus Tibullianum, Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*, Pierides. Studies in Greek and Latin literature X, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2021, X-701 pp., ISBN 1-5275-6823-7, 978-1-5275-6823-5.

La edición ofrece el primer texto completo con traducción y comentario en inglés del tercer libro del *Corpus Tibullianum*, que M. sospecha que fue escrito por un solo autor (pp. 80-111). El texto se ha basado en una nueva colación de unos treinta manuscritos (pp. 1-2). Por cierto, cuando se dice que A+ corresponde a la mayoría de los códices se incurre en una generalización que poco aclara sobre los códices concretos que transmiten una lectura dada. Al final del tomo se añade un Appendix de algunos “Important Intertexts for the understanding of Tibullus 3” (pp. 563-71), una amplia bibliografía (pp. 572-98), un “General Index” (pp. 599-608), un “Index of Latin and Greek Words” (pp. 609-17) y un rico “Index locorum” (pp. 618-701).

El aparato crítico es mucho más incompleto que el de Navarro Antolín (Leiden 1996) en lo que respecta a III 1-6 y a él seguiremos al consultar dudas textuales.

El comentario es muy completo y detallado. Solo me permito hacer algunas observaciones.

3.1.23 Heyne (1817, 272) interpreta los términos “marido” (*vir*) y “hermano” (*frater*) como el marido que Lígdamo quiso ser en otro tiempo y como el amante que es en el presente; cf. Petr. 9.9; H. Tränkle, *Appendix Tibulliana*, Berlin 1990, Berlin-New York, 80-1; F. Navarro, *Lygdamus. Corpus Tibullianum III 1-6 Lygdami elegiarum liber*, Edition and Commentary, Leiden 1996, 21-4.

3.1.28 Sobre “el agua infernal” como alusión al río Leteo o río del Olvido, cf. Catul. 65.5-6; Verg. *Aen.* 6.714-15.

3.2.1-2 Aparece el motivo del “primer inventor”, aquí el primero que robó una amada; cf. 1.4.59, 1.10.1-2.

3.2.9-30 Los versos constituyen una *descriptio funeris* o fantasía funeraria; cf. Prop. 2.13.17-36; Tib. 1.3.5-9; Tränkle, *Appendix Tibulliana*, 1990, 83-4.

3.2.17-18 El ritual del *ossilegium* o recogida de los huesos después de la incineración remonta a Homero, *Il.* 23.252-3, 24.793-4.

3.3.3-10 Los versos presentan la estructura de una *priamel* o *preambulum*; cf. 3.2.1-8; Tib. 1.1.51-2, 1.2.75-6, 1.8.33-4, 1.9.71-2; Prop. 1.14.15-22.

3.4.21 Perífrasis astronómica para designar el amanecer.

3.4.23-42 La descripción de Apolo se parece a la tópica *descriptio puellae vel pueri delicati* de los poetas; cf. R. Moreno Soldevila, *Diccionario de motivos amorios*, Huelva 2011, 134-41.

3.4.31-4 La escena de la novia aguardando a su futuro esposo en la ceremonia de la boda recuerda a Catulo (61.191-5), a Virgilio (*Aen.* 12.65-9) y a Ovidio (*am.* 2.5.34-42).

3.4.61-2 Sobre la misoginia, cf. también Eur., fr. 500 K. “Excepto a mi madre, odio a todo el sexo femenino”; Sen. *Phaedr.* 578-9 “El único consuelo que tengo de la pérdida de mi madre / es que ya se me permite odiar a todas las mujeres”.

3.4.86-94 Sobre la insensibilidad de la amada, cf. Tränkle, *Appendix Tibulliana*, 1990, 133-4; F. Navarro, *Lygdamus*, 1996, 391-5.

3.5.1-4 El poeta describe mediante una *ecfrasis topou* o *descriptio loci* la costa de Bayas en Nápoles, famosa en la Antigüedad como sitio de recreo.

3.5.6 Se expresa el motivo funerario de la *inmatura mors*; cf. R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Urbana 1942, 184-98.

3.5.14 La blasfemia contra los dioses era una de las mayores ofensas que podía cometer un hombre; cf. Hom. *Il.* 24.607-8; Tib. 1.2.81-2, 1.3.52, 2.6.17-18; Prop. 2.28.9-14.

3.6.1-4 Los versos se presentan en forma de un himno clético en miniatura.

3.6.3 El vino puede actuar tanto como remedio de amor (*remedium amoris*) como de excitación del mismo (*irritamentum libidinis*); cf. Tib. 1.2.1, Prop. 3.17.3-4; F. Socas, “Vino”, en Moreno Soldevila, *Diccionario de motivos amorios*, 2011, 449-53.

3.6.32 El verso alude al dicho popular de que “después de la tempestad viene la calma”.

3.6.43 Cf. F. Socas, “Magisterio de amor”, en Moreno Soldevila, *Diccionario de motivos amorios*, 2011, 257-9.

3.6.61 Los suspiros son un síntoma de amor (*signum amoris*); cf. Moreno Soldevila, *Diccionario de motivos amorios*, 2011, 411.

3.7.19-23 La digresión trata sobre la formación del cosmos a través de los cuatro elementos (tierra, agua, aire y fuego), según la doctrina estoica.

3.7.41 Se usaba la imagen de la balanza como símbolo de la justicia y la equidad: *libra aequitas, virgo iustitia* (Servio a Verg. *georg.* 1.33).

3.7.49 Cf. F.D. Bright, “The role of Odysseus in the *Panegyricus Messalae*”, *QUCC* 46, 1984, 143-54.

3.7.101-5 Se alude a dos clases de formación en el campo de batalla: formación compacta con un solo frente (vv. 101-2) y formación dividida en dos alas sin centro (vv. 103-5).

3.7.152 La división del mundo en cinco partes (dos zonas frías, dos templadas y una tórrida) está descrita en Ovidio, *met.* 1.45-51.

3.8.4 El ensimismamiento es un síntoma convencional de enamoramiento; cf. Prop. 4.4.21-2; Ov. *Her.* 16.253-4.

3.9.1-10 La escena de caza más completa en la literatura latina se encuentra en Sen. *Phaed.* 1-84.

3.9.2 El jabalí era proverbialmente el animal más feroz en la caza; cf. Jenof., *Cinegético* 10.1; Prop. 2.13.53-4; Ov. *met.* 10.705-6.

3.9.11-14 El o la amante desean acompañar a su amado en sus aficiones (*obsequium amoris*); cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 208, Prop. 1.10.10-12; Tib. 1.4.49-50; Ov. *Her.* 4.37-8; *met.* 10.533.

3.9.15-18 Los amantes desean gozar de los placeres de Venus (*gaudia Veneris*) en plena naturaleza como culminación de su dedicación al enamorado aficionado a la caza; cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 208-11; Ov. *Her.* 4.41-4; *met.* 10.554-9; R. Moreno Soldevilla, “Placer”, en *Diccionario de términos amatorios*, 2011, 323-6.

3.10.1-2 Sobre el motivo de la sotería o curación de una grave enfermedad, cf. Prop. 2.9.25-8, 2.28; Tib. 1.5.9-18; Ov. *am.* 2.13; *ars* 2.319-36.

3.10.15 El enamorado, gracias a la protección de Venus y Amor, se erige en una persona sagrada e inviolable; cf. Posidipo, *AP* 5.213.3-4; Filodemo, *AP* 5.25; Prop. 3.16.11-14.

3.11.13 El término *servire* encubre el motivo del *servitium amoris* o esclavitud de amor; cf. 1.2.99-100, 2.3.29-30; J.A. Estévez, “Esclavitud de amor”, en Moreno Soldevilla, *Diccionario de motivos amatorios*, 2011, 164-9.

3.11.15-16 Los enamorados están unidos metafóricamente por las cadenas del amor (*vincula amoris*); cf. M. Librán, “Cadenas de amor”, en Moreno Soldevilla 2011, 81-2.

3.11.17 El amor en secreto (*furtivus amor*) gusta a los amantes; cf. Moreno Soldevilla 2011, 54-5.

3.12.2 La amada culta (*docta puella*) era capaz de leer latín y griego, cantar, bailar y componer versos; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 25, retrato de Sempronio.

3.12.18 Sobre la enfermedad de amor, cf. Á.J. Traver, “Mal de amores”, en Moreno Soldevilla 2011, 259-62.

3.13.9 Con el término *peccasse* se alude al acto sexual; cf. Tib. 1.6.16, 71; 1.9.23; 4.14.1.

3.17.6 En la juntura *lento pectore* se alude a la indiferencia y desprecio de Cerinto, es decir, al motivo del desdén en el amor; cf. Hor. *carm.* 4.13.6; Ov. *Her.* 3.138, 15.169-70, 210; M. Librán, “Desdén”, en Moreno Soldevilla, *Diccionario de motivos amatorios*, 2011, 141-3.

3.18.1 Sobre el piropo (comparación lisonjera fogosa) *mea lux*; cf. 4.3.15; M. López, “Piropos”, en Moreno Soldevilla, *Diccionario de motivos amatorios*, 2011, 321-3.

3.19.3 Cf. también Petrarca, *Son.* 172 “A cu’ io dissì: Tu sola mihi piaci”.

A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER
Universidad de Huelva
rdverger@uhu.es

EDOARDO GALFRÉ, *Storia di un esule: l'evoluzione della poesia dell'esilio di Ovidio dai Tristia alle Epistulae ex Ponto*, Palingenesia, 135, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2023, 242 pp., 60,00€, ISBN 978-3-515-13371-5.

Nella sua *Storia della letteratura latina*¹, Ettore Paratore, trattando della produzione di Ovidio, non ha risparmiato giudizi estremamente duri nei confronti di quello che, ai suoi occhi, appariva un mediocre verseggiatore dallo stile abbondante e impersonale. Se già opere più note e apprezzate come le *Metamorfosi* non godevano di un'eccessiva stima da parte dello studioso, è sicuramente la produzione successiva alla terribile esperienza dell'esilio il bersaglio delle considerazioni più severe e spietate. A seguito della condanna da parte di Augusto nell'8 d.C., la poesia maliziosa e disincantata di Ovidio ha lasciato il posto a componimenti dai toni comprensibilmente più malinconici e dimessi, definiti da Paratore «una continua, stucchevole, ininterrotta querimonia, contaminata dalle adulazioni più smaccate per i propri persecutori» (p. 499). Dell'inferiorità della sua nuova Musa si dice cosciente lo stesso poeta, che continuamente si appella all'indulgenza del lettore perché sappia perdonarne la pochezza stilistica e la ripetitività tematica (cfr. ad es. Ov. *trist.* 1.1.35-56). Negli ultimi decenni la critica ha, però, notevolmente riveduto tale giudizio, liberando *Tristia* ed *Epistulae ex Ponto* dall'accusa di essere un prodotto scadente, segno dell'inevitabile decadenza che colpì il poeta, e superando la riduttiva visione della poesia esilica come uno sfogo istintivo dalla scarsa rilevanza letteraria.

Il lavoro di Edoardo Galfré (d'ora in avanti, G.), frutto di una revisione della Tesi di Perfezionamento da lui discussa nel febbraio 2019 presso la Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, si inserisce all'interno di questa tradizione di studi che si potrebbe definire «riabilitativa» della poesia esilica ovidiana². Di essa l'autore intende offrire un'interpretazione complessiva e sistematica attraverso una «lettura diacronica, il cui obiettivo è lo studio del modo in cui la poesia dell'esule a Tomi evolve nel corso del tempo e della misura in cui la dimensione del tempo viene tematizzata e svolge dunque un ruolo in queste opere» (p. 7). Tale approccio consente a G. di analizzare alcune peculiarità della scrittura ovidiana già dagli antichi considerate come *vitia*, vale a dire la *iteratio* variata di un medesimo concetto e la riluttanza a *desinere*, interpretandole piuttosto come elementi di «resistenza poetica» (p. 20).

¹ E. Paratore, *Storia della letteratura latina*, Firenze 1951.

² Si ricordano, a titolo esclusivamente esemplificativo, i seguenti lavori, tutti menzionati dallo stesso G. in bibliografia: B.R. Nagle, *The Poetics of Exile. Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid*, Bruxelles 1980, che per prima ha notato una continuità di percorso nella carriera poetica di Ovidio; J.-M. Claassen, *Displaced persons. The literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius*, London 1999, le cui riflessioni psico-antropologiche sono in parte anticipate in J.-M. Claassen, *Poeta, exsul, vates: A Stylistic and Literary Analysis of Ovid's Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto*, Diss. Stellenbosch 1986; G.D. Williams, *Banished voices: readings in Ovid's exile poetry*, Cambridge 1994.

Come chiarito nell'*Introduzione* (*Per uno studio diacronico della poesia dell'esilio di Ovidio*, pp. 13–31), l'analisi proposta si basa sull'osservazione del rapporto tra due importanti fattori: da una parte, il tempo 'storico' dell'esilio, che nel suo essere provvisorio presupporrebbe un movimento lineare tendente a una conclusione, dall'altra la crescita continua della poesia dal Ponto, prodotta proprio dal mancato raggiungimento di tale fine. Da qui «la contrapposizione tra la 'volontà di chiusura' nutrita dal poeta in esilio, la cui speranza si mostra ogni volta idealmente proiettata verso la fine dell'esperienza tomitana e della poesia che la accompagna, e [...] il 'rischio dell'eternità', il rischio cioè, percepito dall'esule, che il ripetuto gesto conclusivo riproposto in ogni singola raccolta rappresenti una fine inesorabilmente disattesa, dissolta nell'eterna ripetizione di quel medesimo gesto» (p. 26).

Il volume è composto da tre capitoli, due dedicati ai *Tristia* (*Tristia* 1 e 2 sono oggetto d'analisi nel primo capitolo, alle pp. 32-74, mentre a *Tristia* 3, 4 e 5 è riservato il secondo capitolo, alle pp. 75-145) e uno alle novità introdotte dalle *Epistulae ex Ponto* (pp. 146-211). Completano il volume un breve *Epilogo* (pp. 212-215), nel quale si sottolinea la relazione tra poesia elegiaca (con particolare riferimento a Properzio) e poesia dell'esilio, entrambe legate «a un'esperienza biografica segnata dall'incompiutezza del desiderio e dall'inesauribilità del lamento» (p. 214), una nutrita *Bibliografia* in due sezioni (*Principali edizioni e commenti di Tristia, Ibis ed Epistulae ex Ponto*, in ordine cronologico, a p. 216; *Altre opere citate*, in ordine alfabetico per autore, alle pp. 217-229), un *Indice dei passi citati* (pp. 230-239), e un *Indice dei nomi e delle cose notevoli* (pp. 240-242).

Il primo capitolo, intitolato *Tristia 1-2 e il carattere incompiuto dell'esilio di Ovidio*, si apre con una riflessione sulla struttura unitaria di *trist.* 1, il libro composto e inviato durante il turbolento viaggio verso Tomi. Di esso G. evidenzia da una parte tutti gli elementi che lo rendono di fatto un libro in sé concluso (come il rapporto che lega l'elegia proemiale e quella conclusiva), dall'altra gli indizi di non-finitezza che lasciano presagire l'intento di proseguire con l'opera di scrittura. Ovidio, del resto, congeda il primo libro quando il viaggio verso il Ponto è ancora in corso e ciò «induce il lettore a domandarsi se il poeta non invierà altre notizie una volta giunto a destinazione» (p. 38), come effettivamente farà componendo il secondo libro. A suffragare tale interpretazione, che coglie nella struttura apparentemente chiusa del primo libro segnali di sconfinamento e continuazione al di fuori di esso, interviene la suggestiva lettura del secondo emistichio di *trist.* 1.1.21 *quaerenti plura legendum*. Sulla scorta di Casali, G. considera *plura* ambivalentemente legato sia a *quaerenti* che a *legendum*, in una doppia dipendenza che se per Casali costituisce l'invito a cogliere allusioni e riferimenti disseminati sotto la superficie del testo (come a dire “legga di più e più in profondità chi vuole saperne di più”), per G. diventa segno della volontà di Ovidio di proseguire altrove il racconto del proprio esilio e delle sue cause, in «un *liber alter* dei *Tristia*, che conterrà proprio quei temi, i *crimina*, e quella (auto)difesa del poeta che sono ora decisamente esclusi dalla cornice 'limitata' del

primo *parvus liber*» (p. 41). Da questa lettura deriva l'idea che la composizione del secondo libro sia già un progetto presente nella mente del poeta al momento del congedo del primo e che *Tristia* 1 e 2 costituiscano, per questa ragione, un blocco unico, che non a caso G. analizza all'interno di un unico capitolo. Questa tensione tra chiusura e apertura, compiutezza e incompiutezza, conclusione e prosecuzione, conduce poi G. a riflettere sul rapporto tra questa dinamica e il fenomeno della metamorfosi, tanto caro a Ovidio. In quanto stato intermedio tra la vita e la morte e contemporaneamente stato di conservazione della vita in altra forma, la metamorfosi diviene efficace immagine della condizione dell'esule (come dal poeta esplicitamente affermato in *trist.* 1.1.115-22) e insieme modello narrativo del suo racconto, fornendo all'Ovidio di Tomi un lessico e una retorica peculiari. G. individua in *trist.* 1.3, la nota elegia del racconto dell'ultima notte trascorsa a Roma, un esempio lampante di questa associazione. In essa, infatti, emerge in maniera particolarmente chiara la «waving identity» (la definizione è di Natoli), che l'esule condivide con i personaggi delle *Metamorfosi*. Nel suo resoconto dell'addio alla città, Ovidio da un lato costruisce il racconto di una fine, quella del tempo vissuto a Roma, dall'altro afferma la sua sopravvivenza in quanto personaggio, «favorendo piuttosto un'idea di conservazione e prosecuzione» (p. 52). In quest'ottica sarebbe stato interessante sviluppare con maggiore ampiezza un parallelo che G. menziona nella nota 50 di p. 48, vale a dire l'associazione tra la partenza di Ovidio e quella di Enea, la cui *rhexis* nel secondo libro dell'*Eneide* costituisce un riferimento obbligato per la costruzione dell'elegia. L'addio a Troia, infatti, propone la medesima dinamica di rottura e continuità, come G. stesso osserva nella nota n. 41 di p. 45, dal momento che sancisce la fine di un tempo (quello di Enea a Troia) e insieme l'inizio di una nuova storia (quella che porterà alla fondazione di Roma), da Ovidio stesso ripercorsa negli ultimi tre libri delle *Metamorfosi*.

All'interno di questa prospettiva, G. prosegue la sua riflessione concentrandosi sul carattere 'intermedio', tipico della dinamica metamorfica, che caratterizza la condizione del poeta esule e che fa sì che la prosecuzione che accompagna il mutamento si configuri come provvisoria. Chiusura e continuità, quindi, ma anche temporaneità. Per meglio chiarire questo ulteriore passaggio, G. si concentra sull'analisi dello spazio abitato da Ovidio in *trist.* 1, durante il viaggio in mare verso Tomi, uno spazio di fatto transitorio, mutabile, 'intermedio' appunto. Tale analisi contempla un confronto tra il viaggio di Ovidio e quello del suo referente epico Ulisse, tra i quali G. individua similarità e soprattutto divergenze, in quel classico meccanismo di paragone che pone sempre l'esule in una posizione di maggiore sventura rispetto al suo *alter ego* mitico.

Conclusa tale riflessione, G. si dedica a *Tristia* 2, l'unico libro dal Ponto a essere costituito da una sola elegia, quella direttamente indirizzata ad Augusto. Alla luce degli aspetti finora trattati (opposizione limite-continuità da una parte, provvisorietà dall'altra), il secondo libro evidenzia il controverso rapporto esistente tra «autorità politica e autorialità poetica» (p. 64). Alla base del racconto

che il poeta offre della propria condanna, c'è infatti l'esaltazione della *clementia* (o meglio sarebbe dire dell'*ira clemens*) di Augusto, che se da una parte sancisce l'inizio della vicenda biografica e poetica dell'esule, dall'altra giustifica la continuazione di una poesia che nella transitorietà della condizione che racconta individua la possibilità di una fine, salvo poi protrarsi con l'aggiunta di nuovi libri. Ancora una volta chiusura, continuazione, provvisorietà, all'interno di una tensione costante verso un limite che non viene mai raggiunto e che per questo rende necessaria e inevitabile la prosecuzione. L'idea del contrasto tra fine e necessità di proseguimento e, quindi, di collocazione dell'opera nello spazio intermedio tra queste due tensioni, è un principio sul quale G. torna a più riprese, in una tendenza alla reiterazione che se da una parte può apparire come sovrabbondante in virtù della sua ripetitività, dall'altra si associa in maniera efficace alla movenza della poesia dell'esilio che si prefissa di analizzare.

Il secondo capitolo, dal titolo *Tristia 3-5 e la poetica dell'addizione*, si concentra, poi, sugli ultimi tre libri della raccolta, inviati a Roma con cadenza annuale negli anni tra il 10 e il 12 d.C. Questo blocco di testi viene esaminato alla luce di quella dinamica fra limite e continuazione già analizzata a proposito del primo libro, grazie alla quale si può osservare come la progressiva estensione del tempo della condanna abbia provocato l'estensione stessa dell'opera in cui quel tempo viene raccontato, producendo anche, però, - ed è questa la novità - una trasformazione «della continuazione in ripetizione», la quale «rischia di compromettere l'esistenza stessa di un *telos*, e di generare al contrario una poesia infinita» (p. 76). Questo assunto viene supportato dall'analisi delle elegie proemiali e conclusive di ciascuno dei tre libri e del rapporto che le lega, evidenziando come Ovidio avverta sempre, all'inizio di ogni libro, il bisogno di giustificare l'avvenuta composizione di una nuova silloge e, alla fine, di rassicurare il lettore circa il fatto che quello presente è l'ultimo *liber* che intende produrre, nonostante tale proponimento resti sempre disatteso. Segue, poi, l'analisi di una selezione di elegie che presentano una riflessione più ampia sul tempo, sia esso intermedio, ciclico, o eterno. Si tratta, nello specifico, di *trist.* 3.2, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13, 4.6, 4.8, 5.10.

Nel terzo capitolo, intitolato *Epistolarità, comunicazione, chiusura dai Tristia alle Epistulae ex Ponto*, l'attenzione si concentra sulla seconda raccolta di elegie composte da Ovidio durante il suo esilio, analizzata attraverso i medesimi parametri interpretativi utilizzati per la prima: contrapposizione tra limite e continuazione, dimensione del tempo, antitesi tra linearità e ciclicità e, quindi, tra provvisorietà ed eternità. Precede tale esame una considerazione più generale circa la natura delle due opere. Allontanandosi da una lettura unitaria che considera entrambe degli epistolari, G., infatti, abbraccia come metodo per l'osservazione dei meccanismi evolutivi interni alla produzione ovidiana dell'esilio, quello di «riconoscere la presenza o meno di 'epistole' nei *Tristia*, senza tuttavia attribuire alle elegie di quest'opera la preventiva qualifica di lettere» (p. 149). Seguendo tale approccio, è possibile osservare il progressivo emergere di due elementi che diventano

poi peculiari nelle *ex Ponto*, vale a dire l'impiego dell'epistola come forma letteraria (nei *Tristia* non sistematico) e l'esplicitazione dei nomi dei destinatari, che nei *Tristia* Ovidio aveva solo desiderato nominare. Tale constatazione rende le *Epistulae ex Ponto* un'opera solo relativamente nuova, dal momento che essa non fa altro che fondere ed esplicitare «due 'urgenze' del poeta in esilio (nominare gli amici; a questo fine, utilizzare l'*epistula*) che nei *Tristia* paiono tenute sostanzialmente distinte» (p. 155). In questa lettura, G. si sofferma sul significato del termine *littera* attestato in *trist.* 1.11.1, sostenendo l'impossibilità di riconoscerne il valore di 'epistola'. Tale perentoria esclusione rischia, però, di depauperare la ricchezza semantica del sostantivo, che lo stesso G. non manca di rilevare nella nota 32 a p. 159. La polisemia di *littera* viene, infatti, accantonata in questo passo a favore di una scelta semantica univoca, volta a sottolineare la novità epistolare delle *ex Ponto* a fronte della più variegata natura delle elegie dei *Tristia*. Tale operazione, se da una parte fornisce suggestive chiavi interpretative, come per *trist.* 1.11.1 e 3.1.54, dall'altro dimentica un elemento caratteristico della poesia ovidiana, vale a dire l'ambivalenza, che opera proprio nella somma e nella stratificazione dei significati. Nell'ottica del progressivo emergere della forma epistolare tra *Tristia* ed *ex Ponto*, confermato dall'aumento delle elegie che si autodefiniscono come epistole, non sembra forse così necessario ipotizzare una netta separazione tra i due significati del termine. Assai più convincenti appaiono, invece, le riflessioni proposte a conclusione del capitolo sul quarto libro dell'opera, che Ovidio avrebbe aggiunto ai tre precedenti sulla scorta di Properzio e Orazio. A distanza di almeno tre anni, egli avrebbe deciso di colmare il vuoto prodotto da un inusuale allentamento del ritmo di pubblicazione, attraverso un nuovo *liber* contenente elegie che coprono l'ampio lasso di tempo «che va dalla seconda metà del 13 [...] alla seconda metà del 16» (p. 198). Tale novità rompe la ciclicità del tempo individuabile nei *Tristia* e nei primi tre libri delle *ex Ponto*, e produce una 'rarefazione' della scrittura che sfocia, come recita il titolo dell'ultimo paragrafo, in una «fine in dissolvenza», precorritrice dell'arte cinematografica, cui G. dedica una veloce menzione a p. 200.

Nel suo complesso, il lavoro costituisce un importante tassello nella tradizione degli studi sulla poesia ovidiana dell'esilio. Attraverso uno stile elegante e una scrittura estremamente chiara, a fronte di qualche modesta ridondanza, G. propone riflessioni originali e spesso suggestive, suffragate da puntuali argomentazioni e valorizzate da una lodevole precisione nella cura editoriale. Si tratta certamente di un lavoro ben strutturato e ben confezionato, destinato a essere uno strumento indispensabile per chiunque si occupi della poesia di Ovidio, e non solo di quella composta durante gli anni a Tomi.

LUIGI DI RAIMO
luigi_dr@hotmail.it

ELTJE K. BÖTTCHER, *Ovids Weltgedicht der Metamorphosen. Zur Intertextualität als Multiplikationsfaktor*, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2023, ix+334 pp., 129,95€, ISBN 978-3-11-078415-2.

Ovids *Metamorphosen* laden mit ihren mehr als 250 Erzählungen seit jeher dazu ein, nach übergeordneten Ordnungsschemata zu forschen, sei es auf chronologischer oder inhaltlicher Ebene, sei es unter Berücksichtigung narrativer Strategien. Böttchers Dissertationsschrift greift diese Ansätze auf und verfolgt dabei das Ziel, die in dem Universalepos angelegte Kohärenz zu verdeutlichen und damit den einzelnen Metamorphosensagen eine sinnvoll und logisch durchdachte Anordnung zugrunde zu legen, die, wie schon Quintilian bemerkte,¹ nicht immer leicht zu erkennen ist. Dass die *Metamorphosen* vor dem Hintergrund der Erzähltheorie bzw. übergeordneten Schlagbegriffen wie Raum und Zeit immer noch zu neuen Untersuchungen anregen, zeigt die kürzlich veröffentlichte Arbeit von Sarah Bach,² die den Raum als wichtigen Kontaktpunkt zwischen dem imaginären Raum des Werks und der Realität interpretiert und dabei die zunehmende kulturelle Bedeutung Roms in den Blick nimmt, oder die Dissertationsschrift von Philipp Geitner,³ der die Funktion der Anachronismen in den *Metamorphosen* unter Berücksichtigung der Erzähltheorie untersucht.

Böttchers Dissertation gliedert sich in drei Teile: In den einleitenden Kapiteln 1 und 2 rekapituliert die Autorin die wichtigsten Beiträge zum Thema „die *Metamorphosen* als Weltgedicht“ und zur Intertextualitätsforschung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Verhältnisses zwischen Ovid und Vergil. Im nächsten Teil (Kapitel 3-6) verfolgt sie das Ziel, eine widerspruchsfreie Kohärenz in Bezug auf Chronologie, Raum und Figureninventar nachzuweisen und entwickelt den Ansatz von Chrysanthe Tsitsiou-Chelidoni⁴ weiter, welche die erzählerischen Querverbindungen untersucht und den Begriff der Kohärenz als maßgebend bewertet hat. Im Vergleich zu Tsitsiou-Chelidoni bietet Böttcher eine Vielzahl weiterer Beispiele, um ihre Annahme von einer kohärenten Werkwelt zu erhärten.

Kapitel 5 widmet sich zunächst der Zeitkohärenz, die trotz der Vielzahl an chronologischen Brüchen, Analepsen und Prolepsen angesichts des grundsätzlich fortlaufenden Zeitrahmes *ab origine mundi ad mea tempora* gewahrt sei: Wenn in der noch recht am Anfang des Werks stehenden Erzählung von Apollo und Daphne vom Lorbeer die Rede ist, der das Haar des Gottes ziert – und, wie der Leser aus seiner Gegenwart selbst weiß, auch die Tore des Palastes des Augustus –, habe das

¹ Quint. *inst.* 4.1.77.

² S. Bach, *Espace et structure dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide*, Bordeaux 2020.

³ P. Geitner, *Anachronismus und Aktualisierung in Ovids »Metamorphosen«*. Eine Ästhetik uneigentlicher Zeitlichkeit, Berlin-Boston 2021.

⁴ C. Tsitsiou-Chelidoni, „Erzählerische Querverbindungen in Ovids Metamorphosen“, in W. Schubert, ed., *Ovid. Werk und Wirkung. Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht zum 65. Geburtstag*, Frankfurt am Main 1999, 269-303.

für den Rezeptionsvorgang des Lesers zur Folge, dass er „bereits zu Beginn des Werks darauf eingestimmt [wird], die Mythen als frühen Teil ebenderselben Welt zu verstehen, in der er sich selbst bewegt“ (p. 45). Auf die problematische Frage, ob die Tiere oder Pflanzen, in die die Figuren im Laufe des Werks verwandelt werden, die anfängliche Schöpfung erst zur Vollendung bringen, wie also die Frage „nach der Originalität von Metamorphosen“ (p. 48) zu verstehen ist, könne jedoch nicht immer eine Antwort gegeben werden. Letzte Entscheidungsinstanz sei der Leser, der für sich klären müsse, ob eine Ursprungsverwandlungssage vorliege. Kohärent konzipiert seien auch die zahlreichen Räume, in denen sich die Handlungen abspielen.⁵ In diesem Zusammenhang wird der kosmische Grenzgänger Phaethon in den Blick genommen und einige exemplarische Reisebewegungen der Figuren, die als Verbindungselemente fungierten. Figurenkohärenz werde beispielsweise durch Patronymika (diachrone Kohärenz) oder durch Begegnungen (synchrone Kohärenz) erzeugt; bezüglich des aus chronologischen Gründen unmöglichen Zusammentreffens zwischen Pythagoras und Numa bietet die Autorin eine mögliche Lösung an, dass Ovid auf kursierende Gerüchte über eine Bekanntschaft anspiele, die seit dem Fund einer Kiste mit der Inschrift „Numa Pompilius“ im Jahr 181 v. Chr. im Umgang waren.⁶ Vielleicht, so Böttcher, wolle Ovid „am Werkende besonders plakativ zur Schau stellen, dass Dichtung dies eben darf“ (p. 70). Unter dem Stichwort „biographische Kohärenz“ behandelt Böttcher kurz das Leben des Hercules, in dem eine Ungereimtheit tatsächlich nicht zu erklären sei. Obwohl von dessen Tod in Buch 9 die Rede sei, werde er überraschenderweise in Buch 11 als Zerstörer der Mauern Trojas präsentiert. Diese Ungereimtheit führt Böttcher auf einen Fehler auf Seiten Ovids zurück. Doch könnte es nicht sein, dass sich Ovid hier eine poetische Freiheit zunutze macht, die in der Hercules-Biographie selbst verankert ist? Im Herakles-Mythenkreis ist unter anderem überliefert, Herakles habe Zeus bei der Vernichtung der Giganten beigestanden, obwohl er doch zu diesem Zeitpunkt überhaupt noch nicht geboren war. Bei Ovid hingegen agiert Hercules, obwohl er bereits gestorben ist.

Eine wichtige Rolle zur Beurteilung von Kohärenz spielt das Figurenwissen und die Zuverlässigkeit der zahlreichen Binnenerzähler. In Kapitel 5 untersucht die Autorin die Aspekte, die in der kohärenten Werkwelt Vielfalt erzeugen, etwa durch die Facettenvielfalt von Figurentypen oder Variationen in der Erzählhaltung, -perspektive oder Fokalisierung, wobei die einzelnen Aspekte unter dem Begriff

⁵ C. P. Segal, *Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses. A study in the transformations of a literary symbol*, Wiesbaden 1969 hat die werkstrukturierende Bedeutung der Landschaftselemente (Grotte, Quelle) in den *Metamorphosen* herausgearbeitet, deren ähnliche Beschreibung das Bild eines mehr oder weniger homogenen Raumes evozierten. Während Segal die kohärenzerzeugenden Funktionen hervorhebt, betont Kirstein die narrativen Varianzen in der Darstellungsebene, siehe R. Kirstein, „Der sehende Drache. Raumnarratologische Überlegungen zu Ovids *Metamorphosen*“, in C. Kugelmeier, ed., *Translatio humanitatis. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Peter Riemer*, St. Ingbert 2015, 209-38.

⁶ Für eine nähere Analyse dieses Anachronismus siehe z.B. Geitner, *Anachronismus*, 194-212.

„Multiplikationsfaktor“ subsumiert werden. Am Beispiel des Handlungsortes „Höhle“ und des Figurentyps „Nymphe“ gibt sie einen Eindruck davon, wie variationsreich Ovid seine Werkwelt gestalte. Auffällig ist hierbei, dass der Typ Nymphe, die ihre Jungfräulichkeit verteidigt, vorrangig in der ersten Pentade (Daphne, Syrinx, Callisto) zur Darstellung gebracht wird; in der dritten Pentade befinden sich die Nymphen hingegen in einem monogamen Eheverhältnis. Die Frage, ob sich darin womöglich die zeitliche Annäherung an die Augusteische Herrschaft widerspiegelt, geht die Autorin jedoch nicht nach.

Nach einem kurzen Zwischenfazit interpretiert Böttcher in den folgenden Kapiteln 7-15 in ausgewählten Episoden die intertextuellen Bezüge als eine Strategie, die Grenzen der dargestellten Wirklichkeit zu erweitern. In Kapitel 8 untersucht sie die Insel „Sizilien“, den Handlungsort des Raubes der Proserpina, dessen Darstellung zusammen mit der *Fasti*-Episode und Ciceros Sizilienbeschreibung in den *Verres*-Reden ein „Referenzdreieck“ bilde. Durch die Anspielungen auf Kallimachos' Demeterhymnos werde der Leser zu einer vergleichenden Lektüre und zum Füllen der Leerstellen eingeladen. In Kapitel 9 zeigt die Autorin, wie Ovid in der Episode von Salmacis und Hermaphroditus „ein mehrfaches Wechselspiel von Geschlechtervertauschungen“ (p. 131) erzeuge, indem er den reisenden Hermaphroditus mit der Odysseus-Rolle parallelisiere. Diese werde dann aber von Salmacis übernommen, wenn sie den Jungen in den Worten anspreche, die Odysseus an Nausikaa richtete. Parodistische Effekte seien so greifbar, während die idealisierenden Rollenbilder des tapferen, heldenmutigen Mannes auf der einen Seite und der sitzamen Frau auf der anderen Seite hinterfragt würden.⁷ Kapitel 10 widmet Böttcher dem Verhältnis zwischen Ovid und Vergil in der Orpheus- und Eurydice-Episode. Sie weist auf die exakten Übereinstimmungen im Handlungsaufbau hin (Tod der Eurydice durch einen Schlangenbiss, Orpheus' Gang in die Unterwelt und seine Ansprache bei den Unterweltsgöttern, Rückgabe der Eurydice, Orpheus' Aufstieg und sein verhängnisvolles Umdrehen; schließlich Eurydices Reaktion auf das „Fehlverhalten“). Abweichungen dienten dazu, die Liebe des Orpheus, die Böttcher als eine „fürsorgliche“ (p. 153) beschreibt, aufzuwerten. Die in den *Georgica* zentralen Themen „Schuld“ und „Sühne“ spielten in den *Metamorphosen* keine Rolle. Ovid fülle zudem Leerstellen aus, indem er Orpheus' Gesang unmittelbar wiedergibt, um so dem Thema „Liebe“ möglichst viel Raum zu verschaffen. Mit ihrer Deutung setzt sich die Autorin überzeugend von den Ansätzen ab, die die *Metamorphosen*-Version als eine reine Parodie der *Georgica*-Vorlage betrachten. Das Verhältnis zu Vergil wird anschließend anhand der Figur der Fama weiter erarbeitet (Kapitel 11), die bei Ovid auffällig neutral und in einer reinen Botenfunktion beschrieben werde und damit mit dem handlungstreibenden „Monster“ von Vergil kontrastiere.

⁷ Siehe auch R. Kirstein, „Half Heroes? Ambiguity in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*“, in M. Vöhler, T. Fuhrer und S. Frangoulidis, eds., *Strategies of Ambiguity in Ancient Literature*, Berlin 2021, 157-74. Kirstein interpretiert die Erzählung von Salmacis und Hermaphroditus als Ambiguitätsnarrativ, das wiederum eng mit dem Heldennarrativ verknüpft sei.

Die Autorin stellt in ihrer Untersuchung eine überzeugende Parallelisierung zu Homers Musen fest, die der epische Erzähler in *Ilias* 2 vor dem Schiffskatalog anruft, um Auskünfte über die Truppenstärke zu erhalten. Mit diesem Bezug werde zugleich ein wichtiges Schlüsselthema des 12. Buches bezüglich der (Un-) Zuverlässigkeit historischer Überlieferung (p. 193) antizipiert, wofür bereits die Nestor-Rede im vorigen Abschnitt sensibilisiere. Es folgt in Kapitel 12 eine neue Betrachtung des Rededuells zwischen Odysseus und Ajax, deren Zuverlässigkeit zu prüfen der Leser aufgrund der Anspielungen auf die Vorlagentexte (*Ilias*, Sophokles' *Philoktet*) ermuntert wird. Die Beachtung der Fokalisierung spiele dabei eine wichtige Rolle, da der Leser neue Informationen aus Sicht der Figur erhalte, deren Plausibilität eben durch die Figurenperspektive überprüft werden könne.⁸ Die Berichte der beiden Odysseus-Gefährten über ihre Erlebnisse nach den Abenteuern auf der Cyclopeninsel, die Ovid dem von Vergil in die Literatur eingeführten Achaemenides und seiner eigenen Kreation Macareus in den Mund legt, gäben die Sicht auf die Ereignisse wieder, die Odysseus am Phäakenhof geschildert habe. Odysseus bleibe dabei stets Zentrum der Erzählung, so dass auf ihn neue Perspektiven gewonnen werden könnten. In Kapitel 14 beschäftigt sich Böttcher mit der Figur der von Seefahrern gefürchteten Scylla, die in den *Metamorphosen* als unschuldiges Mädchen innerhalb eines idyllischen Rahmens dargestellt wird. Der Leser bekomme im weiteren Handlungsverlauf (Scylla weist Glaucus ab, der daraufhin Circe um Hilfe bittet; da diese aber selbst Glaucus verfällt und sich für seine unerwiderte Liebe rächen will, verwandelt sie Scylla in ein Monster) eine Erklärung für Scyllas Handeln in der *Odyssee*: Ihre Aggression gegen Odysseus sei nämlich „als Reaktion auf Circes vorausgegangene Aggression ihr gegenüber“ (p. 286) zu deuten. Der Bericht des Erzählers von einer zweiten Vorbeifahrt an einer jetzt versteinerten Scylla diene dazu, die reale Lebenswelt des Lesers zu integrieren und somit das „Dreieck zwischen Homertext, Vergiltext und der eigenen Lebenswelt zu schließen“ (p. 286). In der letzten Untersuchung geht es um Polyphem (Kapitel 15), dessen beide Gesichter – auf der einen Seite der *amator*, der um die Nymphe Galatea wirbt, auf der anderen Seite das menschenfressende Monster – Ovid in einer kohärenten Figur zusammenfüge, wobei er Elemente aus Homer, Theokrit und Vergil miteinander kombiniere. Der Telemus-Episode komme dabei eine Schlüsselfunktion zu – indem Galatea den Seher erwähne, integriere sie die Passage der *Odyssee*, in der Polyphem rückblickend von dem Seher und seiner Warnung vor Odysseus berichtet habe. Dass Telemus in der *Odyssee* unbeschadet fortgesegelt sei, werde nun in den *Metamorphosen* durch Polyphems Verliebtheit plausibel gemacht. Mit Galateas (vermutlich erfundenem) Geliebten Acis fülle Ovid insofern eine Leerstelle aus Theokrits *Idyll* 11, als die Eifersucht des Cyclopen aufgrund der Liebesgeschichte von Galatea und Acis erklärbar werde.

⁸ Geitner, *Anachronismus*, 57 weist darauf hin, dass hier ein Fall vorliegt, in dem Figurenwissen und Leserwissen auf dieselbe Stufe gestellt werden.

Nach einer Schlussbetrachtung (Kapitel 16), in der die Autorin einen zentralen Aspekt der *Metamorphosen* nennt, nämlich den „Vorgang des Überliefers, Erzählens, Umdeutens, Vergessens, Auslassens und Verschweigens“ (p. 316), infolgedessen Zweifel und Widersprüche an und in den Erzählungen erklärbar werden, folgen ein Literaturverzeichnis und ein kurzer Index, in dem die wichtigsten Namen und Begriffe aufgeführt sind; ein Stellenindex fehlt leider, der gerade bei der Vielzahl von Textstellen aus verschiedenen Werken sinnvoll gewesen wäre.

Böttcher liefert mit ihrer präzisen philologischen Arbeit überzeugende Argumente, welche die *Metamorphosen* als eine größtenteils einheitlich konzipierte Werkwelt erscheinen lassen. Mit ihren Verweisen auf zahlreiche Episoden kann sie ihre Thesen begründen und die intratextuellen Vernetzungen innerhalb der *Metamorphosen* fokussieren. Im Vordergrund stehen dabei die Inhalte der Figurenreden und die Frage, inwiefern sie unter Einbezug der Vorgängertexte plausibel und nachvollziehbar sind. Änderungen bedeuten dabei keinen Bruch zum Vorgängertext, sondern sind oft dem anderen Blick bzw. der anderen Perspektive (Stichwort Fokalisierung) der Figur geschuldet. Intertextuelle Verweise, vor allem auf Vergil und Homer, werden überzeugend interpretiert, wobei die entsprechenden Textstellen der Vorlagentexte durch die Paraphrase der wichtigsten Punkte auch der nicht mit den Texten vertrauten Leserschaft verständlich gemacht werden. Böttchers Analysen und intertextuellen Interpretationen stellen ein wertvolles Tool bei der Untersuchung der *Metamorphosen* dar. Dabei werden die Aspekte „Ein- und Vielheit“ auch in den intertextuellen Untersuchungen berücksichtigt, was wiederum innerhalb der gesamten Dissertation Kohärenz erzeugt. Doch bei aller Systematik und Kohärenz zum Trotz bleiben Inkonsistenzen und Ambiguitäten, die darauf abzielen, den Leser dafür zu sensibilisieren, dass nicht auf jeden Sachverhalt eine eindeutige Erklärung abgeliefert werden kann. Zudem ist anzunehmen, dass Ambiguitäten einen wichtigen Teil des poetischen Programms der *Metamorphosen* darstellen, die den Leser bisweilen dazu ermutigen, etablierte Denkmuster zu hinterfragen. Die Autorin verschweigt diese Inkonsistenzen zwar nicht, lässt sie aber mehr oder weniger im Raum stehen. Interessant wäre zudem gewesen, das Epos des Apollonios, dessen wichtige Funktion Damien Nelis⁹ für Vergils *Aeneis* herausgestellt hat – unter anderem mit detaillierter Interpretation der Bedeutung von Sizilien bei Apollonios und Vergil oder der Medea für die Charakteristik der Dido – mehr zu berücksichtigen. Auch die Figuren Circe und Scylla böten einen Vergleich mit Ovids Darstellung an. In dieser Hinsicht bietet die Dissertation Anregungen, um das überaus komplexe Verhältnis zwischen Ovid und seinen Vorgängern weiter zu erschließen.

YASMIN SCHMIDT

Universität Frankfurt

Y.Schmidt@em.uni-frankfurt.de

⁹ D. Nelis, *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*, Cambridge 2001.

IRIS BRECKE, *Ovid's Terence. Tradition and Allusion in the Love Elegies and Beyond*, Trends in Classics 156, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2024, xxiii+158pp., €99.95, ISBN 978-3-11-130703-9.

This interesting new monograph investigates the reception of Terence in Ovid's elegiac works, specifically the *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria*, and *Tristia* 2. Going beyond the 'comedy model,' Brecke (B.) argues for a close intertextual relationship between Ovid's poems and Terence's comedies, especially the *Eunuchus*, which, as much previous scholarship has argued, may be seen as a "particularly rich source for later writers in general when it comes to the Roman development of a type of subjective love, and as the comic play that perhaps most prominently points forward to the elegiac genre"(XVI).¹ The play famously includes a violent rape scene, an *exclusus amator*, and examples of the erotic topoi of love as madness and warfare. B. argues that "Ovid deploys Terence so as to address current societal issues, conservative morals and the status of art and the artist" (77), but the focus throughout the work is more narrowly on specific allusions. Because of this focus, there is also little discussion of Tibullus and Propertius as intermediaries in Ovid's reception of Terence. Summaries at the end of each chapter strive to connect the arguments of the individual readings to an "allusive network," some parts of which are more convincing than others. While I missed discussion of the indebtedness of elegy to such comic figures as the *lena* and *meretrix* of comedy, this monograph is a welcome addition to a growing body of recent scholarship that aims to explore a wider range of generic models for Ovid's poetry.

Chapter One investigates an "intricate allusive play" in *Tristia* 2, where for the only time Ovid mentions Terence by name, citing him as an example of the comic genre (359 *conviva Terentius esset*). This is seen as influenced by Horace's praise of Terence's art in *Epistle* 2.1.59, an important model for Ovid's poem. It is argued that both Horace and Ovid cite Terence as a comparison for themselves: aesthetically sophisticated, but unappreciated and misunderstood by their contemporary audiences (and, for Ovid, by Augustus). B. argues that the use of Terence in the defense of his poetic art is a point of contact between *Tristia* 2 and *Rem.* 357-436. B.'s suggestion that the recurring image/association in the exile poetry of Augustus as Jupiter (a massive topic) should be read in the light of the scene in the *Eunuchus* in which Chaerea claims to imitate Jupiter in his rape of Pamphila (584-91) is less convincing.

Chapter Two explores the crucial issues of marriage, rape, and status in the comedies of Terence and in the episode of the Sabine women in the first book of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*.

¹ Brecke acknowledges earlier ground-breaking scholarship, which argued that we should see in Terence, particularly the *Eunuchus*, a crucial forerunner of subjective love poetry, by David Konstan, "Love in Terence's *Eunuch*", *AJP* 107, 1986, 369-93 and Sharon James, "*Fallite fallentes*: Rape and Intertextuality in Terence's *Eunuchus* and Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*", *Eugesta* 6, 2016, 86-111; see also John Barsby, "Ovid's *Amores* and Roman Comedy", *PLLS* 9, 1996, 135-57.

B. argues that tensions in Ovid's poetry regarding reciprocal elegiac love and the traditional values of marriage, recently reinforced by Augustus' legislation, are highlighted by allusions to Terence's employment of the stock comedic plot of rape-marriage between two citizens (*Andria*, *Hecyra*, *Eunuchus*, *Adelphoe*). B. observes the paradox in Ovid's use of the Sabine rape narrative to illustrate how the theater is good female hunting ground since the women in question are virgins (1.116), whose rape leads to marriage (as in the comic plot), which is not a goal of the poem or part of the elegiac erotic 'plot.' B. suggests that Ovid's implicit criticism of the "forced and violent nature of traditional Roman marriage" (25) is underlined by references to the unconventionally brutal rapes of Terence's *Hecyra* and *Eunuchus*.

Chapter Three takes on the large topic of the metaphor of love as a disease, focusing on the *Remedia Amoris*. While admitting that the image is widespread in ancient literature, B. suggests that parts of the Ovidian programme in the *Remedia* are inspired by notions of lovesickness and erotodidaxis found in Terence's *Eunuchus* and *Andria*. For example, B. adduces the slave Parmeno's likeness to the *praeceptor* as "love doctor" (*Eun.* 923-40) as a possible source of inspiration for the image in Ovid. Again, some of these topoi are just too widespread (e.g. the dangers of *otium*, fake tears) to be convincingly pinpointed as Terentian in origin.

The topic of Chapter 4 is *servitium amoris*, mainly as it is represented in the *Ars Amatoria* and *Heroides* 20, in which a slave-like role is encouraged in order to gain access to the *puella*. B. argues that similarities in vocabulary suggest that Terence played a role in the development of Ovidian elegiac *servitium*. The connection between the wise slave of Comedy and the elegiac lover/*praeceptor* has been well established. B. presents Acontius in *Her.* 20 as an example of the combination of lover and trickster. Central to the argument is the opening scene of the *Eunuchus*, where "one can find clear prefigurations of what will become central notions of the image of *servitium amoris* in general, and as this is developed by Ovid in particular" (110). In this scene the young man Phaedria is the *exclusus amator*, shut out due to a *dives amator* (Thraso), figures which both become important in Roman love elegy. Moreover, Chaerea, in pretending to be the Eunuch, acts out the typical slave role in order to gain access to Pamphila.

Chapter Five addresses the theme of *militia amoris* in Ovid (*Amores* 1.9, 3.8) and argues that Terence "played a significant part in the development of this image" (112). In this the *Eunuchus* and *Hecyra* are the most important models again, with the former providing an example of a soldier-lover in the character of Thraso. The opening scene of the *Eunuchus* contains sustained military metaphors in the dialogue between Phaedria and Parmeno, equating the instability of warfare with that of love in a way that is suggestive for *Am.* 1.9. The *Hecyra* offers a scene between two *meretrices* (58-75) in which the elder Syra depicts the relationship with men in military terms, which B. argues prefigures Ovid depiction of the "battle of the sexes" in the *Ars Amatoria* (there is however, no discussion here of the possible influence of the female *lena* as a model for the *praeceptor amoris* in

Ovid). B. adds here also a discussion of amatory violence, which is traced back to Terence. B. argues that “all of the three Terentian *paraclausithyra* [in the *Adelphoe* and *Eunuchus*], can be interpreted as *militia*” (133). A final chapter helpfully summarizes the main arguments.

K. SARA MYERS
University of Virginia
ksm8m@virginia.edu

J.C. McKEOWN, R.J. LITTLEWOOD, *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes. Volume IV.i A Commentary on book three, Elegies 1 to 8*, Prenton: Francis Cairns Publications, 2023, xxviii-305 pp., ISBN 978-0-995461-23-9.

El volumen consta de Prefacio (pp. VII-VIII), de “References and Abbreviations” (pp. IX-XXVIII) y del comentario a cada elegía. En la bibliografía, añádase R. Maltby, *Book Three of the Corpus Tibullianum*, Cambridge 2021; A. Ramírez de Verger, *Publius Ovidius Naso. Carmina amatoria*, Monachii et Lipsiae, editio altera, 2006.

El comentario de *Amores* de J.C. McKeown se extendía hasta el libro II (1987, 1989, 1998). Es una grata noticia que se culmine la obra con el comentario del libro III, aunque por ahora solo llegue hasta la elegía 8.

El estudio de cada elegía se compone de bibliografía, resumen, introducción literaria y comentario verso a verso. El volumen está editado de forma impecable salvo el desliz de la p. 14 “see the introduction, p. *”.

Paso a comentar algunos pasajes:

3.1.22 En lugar de *facta* Heinsius (1658, 264 in notis) propuso *furta* (‘amores furtivos’) apoyándose en *trist.* 2.432 (*detexit variis qui sua furta modis*), donde algunos manuscritos ofrecen las dos lecturas, *furta* / *facta*. Sobre *furta*, cf. *epist.* 18.64 (*flecte, precor; vultus ad mea furta tuos!*), *met.* 2.696 (*tutus eas; lapis iste prius tua furta loquetur*), *Catul.* 12.7 (*fratri, qui tua furta vel talento mutari velit*), *Catal.* 13.10 (*seu furta dicantur tua*), *Prop.* 2.2.4 (*Iuppiter, ignosco pristina furta tibi*), 4.8.34 (*et Venere ignota furta novare mea*), *Tib.* 1.2.36 (*obvia: celari vult sua furta Venus*), 1.5.69 (*at tu, qui potior nunc es, mea furta caveto*). Los autores no citan dicha propuesta.

3.1.41 El término amatorio *cura* ‘dolorem simul atque amorem significat’ (Pichon, s. v., 1966, 120), no ‘subject matter’.

3.1.46 Habría que especificar que el enamorado solía dejar antes de marcharse unos versos de reproche o de amor escritos en unas tablillas que dejaba colgadas a la puerta de su altillo amada.

3.2 Cf. también S. Merkle, “Amores 3.2 und Ars amatoria 1.135-162 – Ein Selbstplagiat?”, *ZAnt* 33, 1982, 135-45.

3.2.8 Me sigue sorprendiendo que no sean completas las citas de filólogos anteriores al s. XIX. En la p. 66 a 2.8, por ejemplo, hay que decir Burman (1727, I, p. 470ⁿ), no simplemente Burman.

3.2.10 El comentario es muy incompleto. Némethy (*Amores. Budapestini, Academiae Litterarum Hungaricae, 1907*) leyó *reserato* en lugar de *sacro de* apoyándose en el v. 77 (*reserato carcere*) y *ars* 3.595 (*reserato carcere*); añádase también *trist.* 5.9.29 (*reserati carceris*); Liberman (G. Liberman, “Un nouvel Ovidius amatorius”, *Rph* 79, 2005, 153) *laxo de*.

3.2.29-30 Se alude indirectamente a la postura erótica (σχήματα συνουσίας) de *tollere pedes* para el coito; cf. 2.4.22; *ars* 3.775; Marcial 10.81.4, 11.71.8; A. Ramírez de Verger, “*Figurae Veneris* (Ov. *ars* 3.769-88)”, en *Ovid, Werk und Wirkung*, 240.

3.2.32 En la p. 77 léase 10.536, no 10.356.

3.2.34 Para el proverbio *in flammam flammis, in mare fundis aquas*, léase A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig 1890, 170-1.

3.2.35 *posse*, no *posse*.

3.2.39-40 Cf. *Antología griega*, 12.180 y comentario de M. González Rincón, *Estratón de Sardes: Epigramas*, Sevilla 1996, 171-2.

3.2.60 Tópico amatorio de la *puella divina* o amada como una diosa; cf. J. Martos, “Amada divina”, en R. Moreno, *Diccionario de motivos amorios*, Huelva 2011, 32.

3.3 Cf. también en la bibliografía que encabeza el comentario a A. Skiadas, “*Periuria amantum. Zur Geschichte und Interpretation eines Motivs des augustischen Liebesdichtung*”, en *Monumentum Chiloniense. Festschrift für E. Burck*, Amsterdam 1975, 400-18.

3.3.11 Sobre el juramento de Venus, cítese también a Catulo, 70. Némethy defendió *aeterni* con el apoyo de Hor. *carm.* 2.8.9-12.

3.3.26 No se comenta que *nimirum* fue una propuesta de Némethy con el apoyo de Her. 16.23-4 *illa dedit faciles auras ventosque secundos: / in mare nimirum ius habet orta mari*.

3.4 Cf. R.O.A.M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Horace*, Oxford 1980, 277-80; E. Greene, “Sexual Politics in Ovid’s *Amores* 3.4, 3.8, and 3.12”, *CPh* 89, 1994, 344-50.

3.4.4 Sobre “hacer” igual a “hacer el amor”, léase también a E. Montero, *El latín erótico*, Sevilla 1991, 230-1, 252.

3.4.8 Para *exclusis*, cf. 1.6.31 (*quid facies hosti, qui sic excludis amantem?*), 1.8.78 (*audiat exclusi verba receptus amans*); *ars* 3.69 (*tempus erit, quo tu, quae nunc exclusis amantes*), 3.588 (*‘non potes!’ exclusum te quoque tanget amor*); *rem.* 36 (*dicat et exclusus flebile cantet amans*).

3.4.20 Me desespera que no se cite con exactitud a los filólogos anteriores al s. XIX. Leo en la p. 137 sobre *saepe*: “*nempe* to *saepe*, conjectured by Heinsius and approved by Bentley”, pero ¿dónde?, porque parece que es una propuesta de Bentley (en *Edmundi Hedickii Studia Benteleiana, V. Ovidius Benteleianus*, Freienwaldae 1905, 22), no de Heinsius.

3.5 Se duda, como hizo Kenney (*Agon* 3, 1969, 1-14), de la autenticidad de la elegía, pero léase a Munari, *Amores*, Firenze 1950, XXIII-XXIV.

3.5.6 Para *umida*, cf. también *met.* 5.390 *frigora dant rami, varios humus umida flores*.

3.5.11 sobre la alternancia *tum/tunc*, cf. R.J. Tarrant (*P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses*, Oxford, 2004, 499), G. Luck (“Naugerius’ Notes on Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*”, *ExClass* 9, 2005, 212), Th. Gaertner (“*Tum und tunc* in der augustischen Dichtersprache”, *RhM* 150, 2007, 211-24) y A. Ramírez de Verger (*Book VI of Ovid’s Metamorphoses. A Textual Commentary*, Berlin-Boston 2021, 69, coment. a 6.3).

3.5.19 *ferendi* fue defendido por Bentley con el apoyo de 3.6.70 *currendi vires eripiente metu*; cf. también *met.* 12.568 *deficiunt motumque negant viresque volandi*, 13.80 *at postquam eripui, cui standi vulnera vires / non dederant*; A. Ramírez de Verger, *Ovidius. Carmina Amatoria*. Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana. München-Leipzig 2003, 107.

3.6.19 Burman (1727, I, 489-90) propuso leer *rapacibus* en lugar de *capacibus*, cf. *met.* 8.551 *nec te committe rapacibus undis*.

3.6.46 El epíteto *Argei* fue defendido por Heinsius (1658, 276) con el apoyo de Hor. *carm.* 2.6.5.

3.6.59-60 Sobre el ‘corazón de hierro o de piedra’, cf. Ovidio, *met.* 9.614 *nec rigidas silices solidumve in pectore ferrum / vincetur*; Bömer 1977, 457.

3.6.68 Para *tepidos* ... *sinus* en lugar de *tepido* ... *imbre*, cf. *Her.* 3.114 *se tenet in tepido mollis amica sinu!*; *ars* 2.360 *hospitis est tepido nocte recepta sinu*, 3.212 *cum fluit in tepidos pondere lapsa sinus?*; 3.622 *quas tegat in tepido fascia lata sinu*; *rem.* 354 *et fluere in tepidos oesypa lapsa sinus*; *fast.* 4.522 *decidit in tepidos lucida gutta sinus*.

3.6.71 No se cita la variante *saeva* en lugar de *sera*, aceptada por Naugerius, cf. *met.* 9.317-18 *ridentem prensamque ipsis dea saeva capillis / traxit*.

3.6.87-8 Sobre los *gaudia Veneris* o placer sexual, cf. R. Moreno, “Placer”, en *Diccionario de motivos amorios*, 323-6.

3.6.106 El cierre de un poema con una maldición suele aparecer en el epigrama; cf. *A. P.* 5.52 (Dioscórides), 9.277 (Antífanos).

3.7.9 Para *cupidae* ... *linguae* en lugar de *cupida* ... *lingua*, no citado, cf. *Her.* 4.79, 15.55, *Mart.* 7.88.9.

3.7.11-12 Las *blanditiae* son las caricias en el amor en general, no solo ‘sexy bedroom talk’; cf. A. Ramírez de Verger-Miryam Librán, “*Irritamenta Veneris* en Marcial”, en J.J. Iso, ed., *Hominem pagina nostra sapit, Marcial 1900 años después*, Zaragoza 2004, 209-26; R. Moreno Soldevila, “Cariño”, en R. Moreno

Soldevila, *Diccionario de motivos amorios en la literatura latina (siglos III a. C. - II d. C.)*, Huelva 2011, 83-85.

3.7.55-6 Sigo la puntuación, con sentido irónico, de Némethy: *sed, puto, non blanda est! Non optima perdidit in me / oscula! Non omni sollicitavit ope!*

3.7.67 Solo la *pudicitia philologorum* impide leer *rigent* en lugar de *vigent*, cf. Hor. *epod.* 8.17; Mart. 6.73.8, 10.91.1, 11.16.5; Heinsius, 1658, 282 in notis.

3.8.5 Para *pulchrae* en lugar de *pulchre*, cf. *Her.* 16.85, *ars* 3.259.

3.8.22 No se comenta nada de la propuesta *fassi* de Kenney (1994, 93).

3.8.24 Prefiero poner signo de admiración, no de interrogación, detrás de *fores*.

3.8.25 A Frontón es mejor citarlo por la edición de M.P.J. van den Hout (Lugduni Batavorum 1964), no por la anticuada de S.A. Naber (Lipsiae 1867).

3.8.41 El término *terras* es preferible a *terram* por la ‘assonance’ de *terras scindebat*.

A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER
Universidad de Huelva
rdverger@uhu.es

VICTORIA RIMELL, *A Commentary on Ovid, Remedia amoris*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2024, 448 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-289421-2.

El libro es resumido por la propia autora así (pp. 2-3): “In this introduction, I first discuss how we might situate the *Remedia* within Ovid’s elegiac Works and within the corpus as a whole and explore what changes when we view Ovidian poetry from this vantage point (**section 1**). The first section functions as an introductory essay in itself, discussing many of the poem’s major themes (such as exile, memory and amnesia, time magic, guilt, security), outlining the role played by its key mythic *exempla* and giving a critical summary of recent trends in scholarship on the poem. I then outline (in **section 2**) the *Remedia*’s engagement with didactic and erotodidactic traditions, and with other ‘technical’ subject matter, from rhetoric to medicine. In **sections 3 and 4**, I summarize the content, structure and structuring principles of the poem, before turning to questions, surrounding its ‘double’ audience (both male and female, and both ‘sick’ and ‘healthy’, **section 5**). In **sections 6 and 7**, I discuss the title and date. **Section 8** identifies key points and trends in the literary reception of the *Remedia* from the first century to the present. Finally, I turn to the manuscript tradition (**section 9**)”.

En la p. 70 se expresan las diez divergencias textuales entre la edición de Kenney (1995) y la de Rimell. Sigue, pues, el texto y aparato crítico por la edición de Kenney sin ponerle ninguna pega para mejorar el texto, como sería el caso de las siguientes lecturas (en segundo lugar las de Kenney/Rimell):

8 et si, quid faciam nunc quoque, quaeris: amo *sic dist.* Heinsius, cf. *Her.* 5.130 / et si, quid faciam, nunc quoque, quaeris, amo.

17-18 *ab arto ... e trabe / amator ... a trabe.*

34 *capto ... viro / cauto ... viro.*

129 *impleverit* / falta la variante *expleverit* de Burman, cf. *trist.* 4.3.36, Verg. *Aen.* 2.586.

164 *transtulerat* / falta la propuesta de Naugerius: *quo tulerat*.

173 *semina* / falta la variante *munera* de O5, cf. *med.* 3-4, *Pont.* 3.8.11.

210 *sub parvis* / falta la propuesta de Damsté: *sub saevis*.

215 *et* / no se cita la corrección de Heinsius (1658, 269): *ut*, cf. *fast.* 2.388.

237, 239 *lar* / *Lar*, según Heinsius (1658, 269).

327-330 léase *turgida, nigra, macies, petulans, rustica*.

337-338 léase *omne papillae / pectus habent tumidae: fascia nulla tegat (omne papillae / pectus habent, vitium fascia nulla tegat)*.

365, 369 *Livor* (Heinsius 1658, 273) mejor que *livor*.

383 *ferat* (P6, Heinsius 1658, 273) mejor que *feret*.

385, 386 *Arte* mejor que *arte*.

396 *Epos* (Muretus) mejor que *epos*.

446 *saevaue* Merkel (1852, 241) *prob.* Goold 1965, 102-3; Henderson 1980, 163 cf. v. 53, *ars* 3.567 / *laesaue*.

465 *ac ne / et ne*.

487 *Artes / artes*.

488 *eat* Heinsius (1658, 276), cf. vv. 70, 532, *fast.* 4.18, *trist.* 5.5.18 / *erit*.

492 *glacie / dominae*.

704 *tuque favens* de P4 fue conjeturado por Goold (1965, 105), cf. *ars* 1.268, Verg. *georg.* 1.18, Ov. *am.* 2.13.21, *met.* 3.613, *trist.* 5.5.5 / aparato crítico incompleto.

756 *cui faveas actor quid iuvet arte docet* / *+quid caveas actor qua iuvet arte docet+*.

759 *Amori* Heinsius (1658, 286) / *amori*.

Paso a exponer algunas observaciones textuales.

12 Heinsius (1658, 431) leyó *praetextum* en lugar de *praeteritum*, cf. *Pont.* 1.3.30 *quod tua fecerunt scripta, retexit opus*.

18 Heinsius (1658, 432; cf. *met.* 5.127 *e poste*) leyó *e trabe* en lugar de *a trabe*.

26 No se cita, al menos, el atractivo y poético *letifero* del código *Matritensis*, de la *editio Romana* de 1471 y de Heinsius (1658, 432) con *fast.* 1.123 *sanguine letifero totus miscebitur orbis*.

33 El término *capto*, defendido por Burman (1727, 717; cf. v. 108, *Her.* 15.63), es preferible a *cauto*.

73 Heinsius (1658, 433-4) propuso leer *oppressa* en lugar de *suppressa*.

75 En lugar de *incipiens* se lee en algunos manuscritos y en la *editio Bononiensis* de 1471 la juntura *o vates*, cf. *fast.* 6.21 *namque ait 'o vates, Romani conditor anni; 534 'nunc', ait 'o vates, venientia fata resigna*.

88 El término *acta* en lugar de *aucta* fue leído previamente por Naugerius (1583, 293)

108 En algunos manuscritos recientes en lugar de *in capto* se lee *incauto*, acogido por Heinsius (1658, 435) con el apoyo de *ars* 3.745 *exit et incauto paulatim pectore lapsus*.

129 Por *impleverit* Burman (1727, 723) leyó *expleverit*, que gozó la aprobación de Némethy (1921, 33ⁿ) con el apoyo de *trist.* 4.3.38 *expletur lacrimis egeriturque dolor* y Verg. *Aen.* 2.586 *laudabor poenas, animumque explesse iuvabit*.

141 No se comentan las variantes *limo* y *rivo* en lugar de *vino*.

152 Heinsius (1658, 437) propuso leer *candida* en lugar de *splendida*.

161 En algunos manuscritos se lee *quaeritur* (Goold 1965, 97) en lugar de *quaeritis*.

164 Naugerius (1583, 296) propuso ingeniosamente leer *quo tulerat* en lugar de *transtulerat*, pero cf. *fast.* 2.279 *transtulit Evander silvestria numina secum*.

173 El término *semina* presenta la variante *munera* en el código O5, cf. *medic.* 3-4 *cultus humum sterilem Cerealia pendere iussit / munera*; *Pont.* 3.8.11 *femina pro lana Cerealia munera frangit*.

181 No se citan las variantes *moderatur* y *meditatur* en lugar de *modulatur*.

230 No comenta la variante *lavabis* en lugar de *levabis*; cf. *Her.* 2.90 *fessaque Bistoniam membra lavabis aqua*.

233 En el manuscrito Es3 se lee *strictissima* en lugar de *tristissima*. Heinsius apoyó la variante con *am.* 3.1.50 *liminis adstricti sollicitare fidem*.

268 Es preferible la lectura *in* (*longus in invito pectore sedit Amor*) en lugar de *et*, cf. el v. 108 *et vetus in capto pectore sedit amor*; *am.* 1.1.26 *uror et in vacuo pectore regnat Amor*; 1.4.36 *mite nec in rigido pectore pone caput*; *ars* 3.242 *plorat in invisas sanguinolenta comas*; *trist.* 1.5.6 *cum foret in misero pectore mortis amor*, 3.6.25 *idque ita, si nullum scelus est in pectore nostro*, 5.4.24 *omnibus, in toto pectore semper habet*.

284 Heinsius (1658, 448) consideró que este verso era espurio o que algo faltaba en el texto.

323 Heinsius (1658, 450) propuso leer *ut* en lugar de *et*.

333 No se comentan las variantes *exige quod* de Burman (1727, 736) y *exigito* de Heinsius (1658, 451) con el apoyo de *ars* 1.225 *hos facito Armenios, haec est Danaë Persis*.

344 Naugerius (1583, 301) leyó *crimina* en lugar de *omnia*.

357 Henderson (1979, 12) leyó *veneris*, no *Veneris*, como en los versos 407, 800, 802 y 805.

365, 369 Heinsius (1658, 464) leyó *Livor*, no *livor*.

384 Es preferible leer *ferat* a *feret*.

385, 386 Es mejor leer con Burman (1727, 740) *Arte*, no *arte*, pues se refiere al *Ars amatoria*.

403 Habría que poner coma detrás de *velim*.

408 El subjuntivo *putes* de la editio Aldina de 1515 es preferible al indicativo *putas*.

446 Merkel (1852, 241), no Némethy, fue el primero en proponer *saevaue*; cf. v. 53 *utile propositum est saevas extinguere flammās, ars 3.567 nec franget postes nec saevis ignibus uret*, entre otros.

465 La conjunción *ac* de la *editio Romana* a. 1471 es preferible a *et*, como defendió Bentley (1713, 51 a *Hor. carm. 1.18.7 ac ne quis modici transiliat munera Liberi*). Rimell no comenta nada.

488 El subjuntivo *eat* es preferible al futuro *erit*, como propuso Heinsius (1658, 463) con el apoyo de los versos 70 *rectaque cum sociis me duce navis eat*, 532 *quaque vocant fluctus, hac tibi remus eat, fast. 4.18 dum licet et spirant flamina, navis eat y trist. 5.5.18 quod superest, tutum per mare navis eat*.

492 El término *glacie* es el ablativo comparativo que depende de *frigidior*, como en *Her. 1.22 frigidius glacie pectus amantis erat y 10.32 frigidior glacie semianimis fui*.

501 El pluscuamperfecto *simularat* parece preferible al imperfecto *simulabat*.

512 Henderson leyó con razón *Arte*, no *arte*, cf. v. 487 *quaeris ubi invenias? Artes tu perlege nostras*.

565 Heinsius (1658, 468) propuso *dormit* en lugar de *vivit* con el apoyo de *Her. 17.179 et vir abest nobis et tu sine coniuge dormis, 19.57 forsitan invitus mecum tamen, improbe, dormis, ars 1.601 et 'bene' dic 'dominae! bene, cum quo dormiat illa!'*, *rem. 481 nam, si rex ego sim, nec mecum dormiat ulla*.

598 Merece citarse la propuesta de Heinsius (1658, 470), *querentis*; cf. v. 644 *deque tua domina multa querenda refers, ars 2.306 et, quod desierit, verba querentis habe, fast. 3.507 dixerat; audibat iamdudum verba querentis*.

606 Heinsius (1658, 280) interpretó *silva* como vocativo.

618 Burman (1727, 756) propuso *labenti* en lugar de *currenti* con el apoyo de *am. 2.16.9 perque resurgentes rivis labentibus herbas*.

623 Heinsius (1742, 94) leyó *iam plana* en lugar de *male firma*; cf. *Stat. silv. 5.1.30 nunc etiam ad planctus refugit iam plana cicatrix*.

700 No habría estado de más citar las enmiendas Heinsianas (1658, 475) a *raptas*: *rapidas* o *rabidas*.

728 Se debe leer *lasciva gaudia*, no *lasciva guadia*.

747 No se comenta nada sobre *Hecalen* de Merula y la *editio Aldina* a. 1502.

759 Es preferible leer *Amori*, no *amori*, como propuso Heinsius (1658, 286).

778 El término *toro* es preferible a *viro*, como defendió Heinsius (1658, 478) con el apoyo de *Her. 19.100 dicar Abydeno Thressa puella toro*. Castiglione (1904) cree que *viro* es una glosa.

785-95 Geisler (1969, 71-2) con la aprobación de Lucke (1982, 349) consideró espurios estos versos, pero cf. Pinotti (1988, 329-30).

A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER
Universidad de Huelva
rdverger@uhu.es

RANDOLF LUKAS, *Josephus Latinus, Antiquitates Judaicae Buch 6 und 7. Einleitung, Edition und Kommentar zur Übersetzungstechnik*, BAC 112, Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2022, clxvi+129 pp., ISBN 978-3-86821-969-2.

In the late 6th century CE, Cassiodorus commissioned a group of learned monks in his monastery Vivarium to produce a Latin translation of two works of the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus which had hitherto been unavailable to readers without knowledge of Greek: the twenty books of the *Jewish Antiquities* (*AJ*) and the two books of *Contra Apionem* (*Ap.*). Roughly one thousand years later, Guillaume Budé (1468–1540), appalled by this translation’s unclassical Latin and the many obvious mistakes in it, stated that “it would have been better it had never been published”.¹ However, for the most part of those centuries that lay between the production of this Latin version and Budé’s scathing remark, very few people would have agreed with the famous French humanist’s view that this text should have never seen the light of day. On the contrary: as the impressive number of over 170 surviving manuscripts demonstrates, this Latin translation of Josephus produced in Cassiodorus’ Southern Italian monastery was highly welcomed by generations of readers throughout the Latin Middle Ages.

The importance of the Jewish historian for late antique and medieval Christianity can, in fact, hardly be exaggerated. Josephus’ retelling of the history of the Jewish people in *AJ* was an essential tool to clarify historical, geographical, and etymological obscurities in the Bible; the *Testimonium Flavianum*, a (probably largely spurious) mention of Jesus Christ in *AJ* 18.63–64, served as a supposed extrabiblical confirmation of Christ’s existence; and Josephus’ narration of the destruction of Jerusalem in the *Bellum Judaicum* (*BJ*) was considered a proof for God’s punishment of his once chosen people. For these and many other reasons, the works of Josephus became one of the most essential text for medieval Christian intellectuals and no respectable monastery library could do without them.

In modern scholarship, the topic of the huge popularity of Josephus in the Latin Middle Ages is now beginning to receive the attention it deserves: several individual studies as well as larger research projects analyse the ways in which the Jewish historian was read, annotated, translated, used and misused by Church Fathers, Carolingian theologians, Sorbonne scholastics, and many other groups as well as individuals in medieval Europe.² However, a major impediment for the study of the reception of Josephus in this period is the fact that the late antique Latin translations – the textual form in which almost all readers in Western and Central

¹ Guillaume Budé, *De asse et eius partibus*, Paris 1514 (USTC 183526), f. 105r.: [*Josephi libri*], quos latine ita versos legimus ut praestabilius fuerit nunquam fuisse editos. Budé here specifically refers to the part of the Vivarium translation that contains *Ap.*, but it can also be taken as a general statement about its quality in the eyes of a humanist.

² For an overview of the latest research on the reception of Josephus in the Latin Middle Ages, see Karen Kletter, Paul Hilliard (eds), *A Companion to Josephus in the Medieval West*, Brill’s Companions to the Christian Tradition 106, Leiden 2024 (forthcoming).

Europe between 600 and 1500 CE would have approached this author – still await a complete modern edition. For the largest part of the so-called *Josephus Latinus*, scholars still have to resort to an edition issued in 1524 by the illustrious Basel printer Johann Froben (USTC 657576) when referencing these highly influential translations (the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, for example, still quotes from this Renaissance print!).

Given the enormous number of manuscripts and the sheer size of Josephus' oeuvre, the lack of a critical edition of the *Josephus Latinus* is not surprising. Thankfully, at least certain portions of this corpus have by now been edited according to modern philological standards. Regarding the translation produced in Cassiodorus' Vivarium, two partial editions exist so far: in 1898, Karl Boysen published the Latin text of the two books of *Ap.* In 1958, Franz Blatt undertook an edition of books 1–5 of *AJ.* As for the Latin version of Josephus' *BJ* – a text that had been translated roughly one century earlier than *AJ* and *Ap.* – we since recently possess a critical edition of book 1, published by Bernd Bader in 2019. The latest effort in this field now comes from Randolph Lukas (L.) who, by editing books 6–7 of *AJ*, brings us yet another small but significant step closer to having a reliable text for the whole of the *Josephus Latinus*.

L.'s edition, based on a PhD thesis submitted at the University of Bochum in 2021, is divided into two main parts, an extensive introduction and the critical text itself. The former section opens with a brief outline of the origins of the translation of *AJ* und *Ap.* in Cassiodorus' Vivarium, before succinctly discussing the principal reasons for its rich reception throughout the Middle Ages. This is then followed by an overview of the research conducted on the Latin Josephus from the late 19th century to the 21st century revival of studies on the transmission and reception of the works of this author.

Chapter II of the introduction explains L.'s editorial methodology, in particular his criteria for selecting the manuscripts he collated. Given the severe criticism Blatt had incurred for his choice of codices, L. was well advised to completely reassess the transmission. Thanks to his close exchange with David B. Levenson and Thomas R. Martin, who have done seminal groundwork on the Latin text of both *BJ* and *AJ*, L. did not have to start entirely from scratch, but could rely on some expert guidance as to the selection of his textual witnesses. Nevertheless, L.'s *recensio* differs enough from that of his two colleagues that he decided to introduce his own classification of manuscripts ('Lukas Klassen') rather than just adopting the groups devised by Levenson and Martin. Out of the 159 codices transmitting the text of of *AJ* 6–7, L. ultimately chose sixteen manuscripts which, in his opinion, are best suited to get as close as possible to the *Urtext* and, furthermore, to cover the transmission in all its breadth. In chapter III, the selected textual witnesses are then codicologically described in great detail. This section, together with the list of all known manuscripts containing the *AJ* at the very end of L.'s edition (pp. 118–128), is a highly useful update to Blatt's fundamental but incomplete and occasionally also inaccurate description of the *AJ* codices still extant. Chapter IV contains a brief

discussion of the most important early prints up to Froben's 1524 edition (here, as well as in the list of early prints at the end of L.'s edition, the USTC numbers – by now the standard for referencing early modern prints – would have been useful).

Chapter V then offers the most substantial section of L.'s introduction: with admirable clarity, L. leads the reader through his reconstruction of the dependencies between the manuscripts of the Latin version of *AJ*. It is particularly helpful that, after the discussion of each manuscript group, L. offers a provisional stemma, therefore visualising step by step his thought process that leads to the final and convincing stemma on p. CI. L. shows that the whole transmission of books 1–10 (or potentially even 1–12) can be traced back to a single, already defective, and now lost archetype (Ω) from which a tripartite stemma then depends. The first branch is represented by only one manuscript, but a rather spectacular one: the papyrus Cimelio 1 (manuscript *A* in L.'s stemma), which is today kept in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan, was written in the late 6th or early 7th century and can, therefore, only be a couple of decades younger than the original translation of *AJ* and *Ap.* produced at Vivarium. Although now only a fragment, it luckily contains most of the text of *AJ* 6–7 and is, therefore, of great value to L.'s reconstruction of the text. The two other main branches of the transmission are the group of Italian manuscripts (α) and a transalpine group (β), the latter being further subdivided into groups γ and δ . The quality of the γ -family is, as L. convincingly shows, often inferior to that of the others. However, as manuscripts of this strand were used for the first printed editions of Josephus, their readings are, as L. rightly highlights, still of great importance for understanding which Latin text early modern readers of Josephus were consulting and quoting.

Chapter VI of the introduction, containing a discussion of the language and the translation technique observable in the Latin version of *AJ* 6–7, is highly informative not only for scholars of the *Josephus Latinus* but for anyone interested in the transformation of Latin at the dawn of the Middle Ages and the cultural transfer between the Greek East and the Latin West in the same period. Linguistic phenomena such as the genitive of comparison (*quod horum maius est*, 6.256), the ablative of direction (*ascendens in cacumine*, 7.64), and *consulere* construed as a deponent verb (*consultus est deum*, 6.271) are part of the reason why classically-minded humanists such as Guillaume Budé held this translation in such contempt; for modern scholars studying the development of Late Latin, however, L.'s systematic presentation of the peculiarities of the language in the Latin version of *AJ* 6–7 is extremely fascinating and instructive.

The same goes for his analysis of the translation technique applied by the monks at Vivarium: with many examples, L. shows how, as a general rule, they translated the Greek almost word for word, therefore creating an often very unnatural-sounding Latin syntax. However, at times they also handled their *Vorlage* rather freely, either because they did not understand the – in some cases already defective – Greek manuscripts from which they translated or because they deliberately adjusted the wording, and sometimes even the content, to the text of the Vulgate. L.

concludes his discussion of the quality of the Vivarium translation with the balanced verdict that the translators' linguistic abilities were indeed limited and that their somewhat mechanical approach to translating Josephus gives the appearance of a commissioned work ("Auftragsarbeit", p. CL); at the same time, as L. also stresses, the translation does for the most part still correctly convey the content of the Greek and is, therefore, better than its general reputation (Benedict Niese, the Teubner editor of Josephus' *Opera omnia* in Greek, had said of the Vivarium translation: *infimae est Latinitatis*. For more modern criticism of the quality of this translation, see pp. CXII f. in L.'s edition).

Part two of L.'s edition offers the critical text of *AJ* 6–7 (in which Josephus retells the story of the Kings Saul and David as recorded in the Book of Samuel). The *apparatus criticus* of the edition is, as L. declares (p. CLXIV), positive throughout. Given the rather large number of manuscripts collated, this of course bears the danger of overloading the *apparatus*. However, by only giving the group sigla wherever the reading of the hyparchetype seems certain and by refraining from reporting trivial mistakes and simple orthographical variants, L. has managed to keep the *apparatus* neat and tidy. There are only a handful of cases where the information provided appears not quite clear: on p. 14, for example, we read in the *apparatus* regarding the text of *AJ* 6.71: *obsessionem a.1 β : oppressionem a.2 : obsidionem T*. But what is the reading of the Cimelio papyrus (*A*) in the case of this textual problem? According to L.'s description of this important manuscript (pp. XXVIII f.), it contains no major lacuna at 6.71, but we nevertheless do not get told what it reads. Do we have to assume a minor gap there? If so, why is the *lacuna* not indicated as it is in other cases (e.g. p. 14, *apparatus* line 3: *lac. A*)? This lack of clarity is, however, the exception rather than the rule; for the most part L.'s *apparatus criticus* is very thorough and represents a major improvement to Blatt's practice in his edition of *AJ* 1–5. Another advantage over his predecessor's edition is that L. also offers an additional *apparatus fontium* that allows the reader to easily find the biblical passages on which Josephus' narrative is based.

To highlight the textual improvements achieved in L.'s edition I will, in what follows, make selective comparisons between his text and that of the Froben edition which, albeit 500 years old, until now constituted our only real point of reference for this section of the Latin *AJ*. It has to be said that, as the biblical content of *AJ* 6–7 was well-known to both translators and scribes, the *textus receptus* preserved in the *Frobeniana* is not as deplorable as it is in the later books of *AJ* and particularly in *Ap*. Nevertheless, over the course of the centuries a lot of mistakes have crept into the text. To give just a few of the more notable errors in the 1524 print (most of them consistent with the readings of the γ-family): at 6.68 the *Frobeniana* reads *postmodum* (p. 152) instead of *post mensem*; at 6.173 *pestem* (p. 163) instead of *potestate*; at 6.191 *consistere non valuerunt* (p. 163) instead of *consistere noluerunt*; at 6.341 *his mutare* (p. 177) instead of *eos valde mulcere* (here L.'s *apparatus* wrongly reports the reading *mutare* for the *Frobeniana*); at 6.377 *ieiunium* (p. 180) instead of *luctum*; at 7.8 *eorum virtutem* (p. 181) instead of *opus eorum*; at 7.267

servus suus (p. 205) instead of *puer suus*; at 7.276 *moverentur* (p. 206) instead of *morderentur*. By consulting the manuscript transmission, L. could, as the first modern editor, emend all of these and countless other mistakes.

The Basel 1524 edition also frequently contains additions, some of them potentially by Froben's then-corrector Beatus Rhenanus, that have no foundation at all in the manuscript tradition: e.g. at 6.190 it says of David, standing next to the dead body of Goliath: *stetit super eum et caput incidit eius*. The codices, however, actually only offer *stetit et caput incidit eius* (L. suspects – probably rightly – that the translators had a defective Greek text for this passage; see his discussion on p. CXVI). At 6.197 we find the addition *eo scilicet pacto* (p. 164) that has no counterpart in the transmission; at 7.350 (p. 213) we read *eius amicos non vocatos* while the manuscripts only offer *eius amicos*. L. deleted these additions from the text, often without even citing them in the *apparatus*. In most cases, this is certainly justified, but a handful of the better readings of the *Frobeniana* (and other early editions) would, in the eyes of the reviewer, have at least deserved a mention in the *apparatus*, e.g. *ut totum bellum unius victoria terminetur* (p. 162) instead of *et totum bellum unius victoria terminetur* at 6.173 or *illuc pergens unde* (p. 216) for *illic pergens unde* at 7.383.

L.'s edition also contains some convincing conjectures purely based on the comparison against the Greek text (some of them contributed by Thomas Riesenweber, the co-supervisor of L.'s PhD thesis), e.g. 6.215 *iudicium* (δικαστήριον) for *publicum*; 6.341: *incitabat* (προετρέψατο) for *invitabat*; 7.186: *impetravisse* (ἐπιτυχεῖν) for *impetisse*; 7.369: *ducem* (ἄρχοντα) for *iudicem*. To sum up the discussion of L.'s constitution of the text of *AJ* 6–7: although many of L.'s changes to the *textus receptus* at first sight might appear minor, as a whole they give the Latin of this section of *AJ* a very different shape to what centuries of readers used to consult. His text is much more sound and, therefore, represents a significant step closer to what the monks in Cassiodorus' Vivarium might have actually translated.

The whole volume is well produced and the copyediting was done carefully.³ This book will serve generations of scholars working with the Latin Josephus and sets the bar very high for any subsequent editions of parts of this corpus that are hopefully going to follow in the not so distant future. In short: even someone as critical of the *Josephus Latinus* as Guillaume Budé could not but have wholeheartedly approved of L.'s edition of the Latin version of *AJ* 6–7.

ANDREAS AMMANN

LMU Munich

andreas.ammann@klassphil.uni-muenchen.de

³ I've noticed only very few misprints: on p. XXIV n. 52 read "Leoni"; on p. XXI n. 35 "1524"; on p. L and passim "Ammann"; on p. CXLV n. 33 "Hofmann"; on p. CLI read "im Kolophon"; on p. 16 ἀποστροφήν; recte magnanimitas.

SERGIO YONA, *Epicurean Ethics in Horace: The Psychology of Satire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018, ix+348 pp., ISBN 978-0-19-878655-9.

In this monograph, Yona stresses that one needs to take Horace's philosophical content seriously, although scholars have not always done so. In terms of methodology, one might infer that Yona performs a 'philosophical new historicism': that is to say, he, largely, fills in the intellectual background of Horace's *Satires*, showing to what degree several of them are sympathetic to Epicureanism and aligned, in terms of philosophical content, with the ethical treatises of Philodemus. The text is more expository than argumentative, however, and this makes the book difficult to evaluate. Moreover, the work is synthetic, and it is regularly hard to recognize where Yona develops original ideas rather than summarizes the scholarly *opinio communis*, since he generally does not signpost where he is developing original argument. Furthermore, one wishes that Yona had received more training in academic writing before embarking on this monograph. For example, the subsections generally do not have introductions or conclusions, wherein Yona might do argumentative signposting.¹ Furthermore, a lack of developed theses within the chapters means that the reader regularly has to do a lot of work sifting through text to deduce argument. Moreover, Yona does not appear to be familiar with the importance of keeping the subject matter of paragraphs aligned with topic sentences, and this makes reading the book unnecessarily laborious.² Nonetheless, this is a substantial monograph that makes an important contribution to studies of Horace and Epicureanism.

The introduction addresses fundamental concerns. Yona considers *persona*-theory and states that "this study argues that Horace portrays [sc. his] poetic persona as consistently and competently engaged with Epicurean ethics throughout the entire collection" (2-3). Furthermore, Yona suggests that Horace constructs both a *persona* that is largely interested in its mental health and a *persona* that believes that therapeutic benefits can be gained through conversation. Having

¹ A one-paragraph conclusion to the book as a whole is ungracefully tacked on to the last subsection of the book.

² For example, on page 143, Yona provides a topic sentence that asserts that Epicurus "maintained that all sense impressions are true and therefore absolutely foundational for the formation of knowledge and ethical decisions." He then notes where evidence can be found for this in the works of Epicurus and Lucretius. He then begins talking about Horace's *Satires* (a new paragraph should begin here, since this is a new topic). He then turns to discuss the phrase *nonne vides* in Lucretius (a new paragraph should begin here, since this is a new topic). He then goes on to mention Alessandro Schiesaro's interpretation of Lucretius' use of *nonne vides* (a new paragraph should begin, here since this is a new topic). He then goes on to discuss the use of *nonne vides* in Vergil's *Georgics* (a new paragraph should begin here, since this is a new topic). He then addresses the use of the imperfect tense in Horace as a nod to the "Epicurean didactic tradition" (a new paragraph should begin here, since this is a new topic). In his concluding sentence to this paragraph, Yona raises the question: "in what manner did Horace's persona's exposure to everyday life inform his understanding of the world around him and, perhaps more importantly, how did this effect the way in which he communicated this knowledge?" Unfortunately, such paragraphs are common throughout the book.

overviewed various theories regarding Horace's intended audience, Yona notes that his study will follow the approach of Benjamin Hicks, who views the list of names at the end of *Satires* 1.10 as referencing Horace's idealized, inner circle of readers, which includes poetic luminaries such as Vergil and Varius. In the second half of the introduction, Yona addresses the history of scholarship related to Horace and Philodemus and positions his own study therein. The first section addresses the manner in which themes that can be found in Horace's *Satires*, such as frank criticism, friendship, and free speech, are paralleled in the treatises of Philodemus. The introduction closes with an overview of the chapters to follow.

In chapter 1, Yona turns to philosophical concerns. He begins by noting the wide engagement that Horace exhibits with philosophical thought, referencing Aristotelian, Stoic, Platonic, and Cynic influence, and he stresses that Horace's most extended philosophical engagement is with the Epicurean school. Herein Yona provides a thesis statement, "It is the purpose of this following investigation to enhance the traditional appreciation of Horace's engagement with Hellenistic philosophy by examining the influence on the *Satires* of Philodemus' ethical views, specifically as they pertain to the administration of wealth, the challenges of distinguishing flattery from genuine friendship, and, closely related to this, the therapeutic application of frank criticism" (16). One notes that there is little argument in this thesis statement, given that the idea of 'enhancement' is vague. Thereafter, Yona provides a bibliographical overview for Philodemus, stressing his important relationship with Piso. An overview of numerous editions of texts by Philodemus is here included; it would have been better to place this material in an appendix, since it does not contain original argument.

Yona next turns to address Epicurus and his economic theory. He notes both that Epicurus encouraged individuals to prepare for the future (while employing the hedonic calculus) and that an appreciation for rural living for the purpose of a philosophical life is a related concern. Thereafter, Yona addresses the teachings of Epicurus regarding livelihood, whereby Epicurus supports the idea that the sage should procure money, if necessary, via philosophical teachings, and Yona notes that Epicurus received patronage from Mithres, the financial advisor of Lysimachus. This is important since it sets up a chain of patronage, in relation to Epicureanism, that will be relevant to Horace's interactions with Maecenas. Furthermore, Yona turns to address Philodemus' theory of wealth acquisition and wealth management, and he observes that the Epicurean sage should follow the hedonic calculus in regard to these concerns (37). Wealth is useful, for it allows one to invest in one's friends and agreeable acquaintances. Yona stresses that the Epicurean sage finds it best to acquire wealth from philosophical conversations and that friendship is based on ethical congruity, and this, for the Epicureans, includes patron-client relationships.

Philodemus, flattery, and frankness are the topics of the next sub-section. Having provided background on the social energies that encouraged flattery toward patrons in the Hellenistic era, Yona addresses the manner in which flatterers

and Epicurean sages could be grouped in the same category, given the Epicurean sage's inclination to receive wealth from powerful patrons. Yona concludes the section with an overview of the manner in which frank criticism needs to be offered relative to the recipient (and in accordance with the hedonic calculus), so as to afford maximal benefit. Yona closes the chapter with a section on the manner in which dispositions can be analyzed via particular behaviors: repeated angry outbursts, for example, as signs, can lead one to deduce that an individual has an irascible disposition. Relatedly, Yona shows how deictic *παραδείγματα/exempla* were used both in the Epicurean school and in Horace's *Satires* for the purpose of education.

We turn to chapter two. In the first section, Yona addresses *Satires* 1.1-3 and notes that the diatribic style, practiced by Cynics, Epicureans, Stoics, and others, in its Epicurean manifestation, is noteworthy for its goal of therapy, which may be provided via frank criticism. Yona observes that Horace incorporates sharp diatribe as a form of 'Cynic flare'. Yona also considers the manner in which Philodemus endorses the hedonic calculus in life generally and in relation to economic concerns specifically. Thereafter, he overviews several passages where we can see this advice at play in *Satires* 1.1 (e.g., 32-8, 'on the ant', 41-3, 'on the miser'). The section ends addressing the extremes of poverty and avarice: Yona helpfully overviews the differences between Epicurean and Cynic views on poverty and asserts that Horace's *persona* can be seen to sympathize with the Epicurean view of poverty (98-9); and he notes that Horace's *persona* throws scorn on avarice (e.g., *S.* 1.1.86).

The final section of chapter 2 addresses 'Epicurean frankness' in *Satires* 1.1-3. In relation to *Satires* 1.1 and avarice, Yona observes that Horace's *persona* provides harsh criticism for recalcitrant individuals who are not respondent to the frank criticism that they have received (*S.* 1.1.62, 80-5). Thereafter, Yona turns to *Satires* 1.2 and addresses the theme of sexuality. Building on Lefèvre, Yona observes the importance of the hedonic calculus for Horace's *persona* and discusses several vivid passages (e.g., *S.* 1.2.41-4). Herein, Yona addresses the importance of 'vivid pictorial imagery' that may be used, in Epicurean discourse, for its didactic value. Furthermore, *Satires* 1.2.127-31 comes to the foreground for discussion. Yona concludes, "By 'placing before the eyes' of his audience the formidable consequences of sexual excess...the poet draws a fitting conclusion to his riotously candid, though simultaneously therapeutic, criticism of Roman intemperance" (119).

The first half of the second chapter addresses avarice and miserliness in *Satires* 1.1. Yona starts out by providing an overview of the style of diatribe, addressing its employment by Cynics, Stoics, and Epicureans. Thereafter, he overviews: *S.* 1.1.4-12, with its *mempsimoiria*, 'blaming of one's fortune', theme; *S.* 1.1.28-32, on the topic of 'irrational' wealth acquisition; *S.* 1.1.32-8, with its 'industrious ant'; *S.* 1.1.8-40 and 41-3, with ruminations on avarice. His method in these sections is

to put Horace's text side by side with Epicurean texts to show similarities between them.

The chapter ends with a section on Epicurean 'frank criticism' in *Satires* 1.1-3. Yona notes that Horace, like the Epicureans, employs medical imagery, since the purpose of 'frank criticism' was healing, within the Epicurean school. In a discussion of *Satires* 1.2, Yona observes that Horace exhorts one to follow the hedonic calculus in romantic relationships, and he asserts that Horace employs vivid, 'pictorial imagery' in relation to adultery (*S.* 1.2.38, 127-31) to "deter his audience from a similar fate" (113). Herein Yona develops a section wherein he considers Horace's engagement (*S.* 1.2.120-3) with Philodemus' poetry (*Epigr.* 22) and concludes that it is "reasonable to view his approach as an imitation of the Epicurean's philosophically correct yet entertaining epigrams" (117). While concluding the chapter discussing *Satires* 1.3, Yona, again, notes Horace's "fondness for disarming self-deprecation" (123) and turns to a discussion of anger in relation to Stoicism and Epicureanism.

We turn to chapter three: "Horace's Epicurean Moral Credentials in *Satires* 1.4 and 1.6." Yona begins by addressing Horace's depiction of his father in relation to the tradition of New Comedy, particularly that of Terence. Yona suggests that we should also read Plautus' *Three Coins* (301-4, 313-17) as an important intertext for Horace's depiction of his relationship with his father, given thematic and lexical similarities between the passages. Yona avers that Horace constructs his father as a home-grown advisor on ethics so that Horace's *persona* need not seem overly philosophical in terms of ethical training. But Yona goes on to complicate this reading by noting that Horace's text also subtly overlaps with the Epicureans' concern for sense impressions in relation to knowledge formation (142-3), the Epicureans' use of clear language for philosophical discussion (146-8 [touched on again at 174-5]), and the application of the hedonic calculus in moral deliberations (151). Thereafter, Yona thoughtfully finds further similarities between Horace's *persona* and Epicureanism. These include: an ability to live contentedly with one's lot (153) and reflection on the manner in which skillful moral choices can lead to 'health' (154-5). How exactly Yona accounts for the similarities between Horace's *persona*'s father's home-grown philosophy and Epicureanism remains unexplored, however.

The second half of chapter three includes sections on "Horace's Father and Frank Criticism," "Epicurean Patronage in *Satires* 1.6," and "Epicurean Frankness in *Satires* 1.6." In the first section, Yona notes that "[Horace's] father's pedagogical use of frankness" reflects Epicurean tradition, as witnessed in Philodemus' *On Frank Criticism* and that Horace (*S.* 1.5.44) extols the value of friendship in a manner reminiscent of Epicureans. In the following section, Yona considers Horace's depiction of his relationship with Maecenas in Epicurean terms. Yona observes that Horace refers to Maecenas with language of endearment, that such practice was common in the Epicurean school among friends, and that "it is also a relationship that involves many of the characteristics of Epicurean patronage,

including the peaceful withdrawal from politics, an intimate bond between client and receptive patron, and, as Epicurus stipulates, the exchange of benefits for advice from an ethical expert or sage” (171). Yona closes the section by considering Horace’s “Epicurean Day” passage in *S.* 1.6 (110-28) and notes that Horace depicts himself as being in line with Philodemian economic theory, such that Horace is always happy to acquire more wealth, as long as the acquisition does not cause more pain than pleasure. In the final section, Yona addresses Horace’s self-depiction in terms of his relationship with Maecenas in *Satires* 1.6. Yona asserts that “Horace does not portray himself as an obsequious flatterer” (188); rather, Horace offers ‘candor’ “for the sake of his audience’s moral benefit” (189).

In Chapter 4, Yona focuses on *Satires* 1.9, 2.5, and 2.6. He begins by discussing the ‘toady’ in *Satires* 1.9 in relation to Epicurean theory on flattery, suggesting that the toady can be profitably read in relation to Philodemus’ ethical treatises, particularly in relation to the concept of ‘vice.’ In the following section, Yona reads the Ulysses of *Satires* 2.5 in relation to Philodemus’ treatment of flattery and patronage (213). The passage includes a rich discussion of Ulysses’ adulatory speech in relation to Philodemus’ thoughts on flattery and a rich discussion of the flatterer’s hostility toward potentially rival heirs. In the concluding section on *Satires* 2.6, Yona addresses Horace’s depiction of himself in relation to Maecenas and to the Sabine estate and observes that Horace’s acceptance of the farm is congruent with Epicurean economic theory, particularly that of Philodemus, which encourages individuals ever to accept wealth, provided that it comes in accord with the hedonic calculus. Yona also provides thoughtful discussion of the manner in which Horace portrays his life in agreeable Epicurean terms in the poem (e.g., *S.* 2.6.71-6).

In the final chapter, Yona addresses *Satires* 2.2, 2.3, and 2.7. With regard to *Satires* 2.2, he suggests that it is best to take Ofellus as being exemplary of Epicureanism rather than of Cynicism or Stoicism, although others have argued otherwise. To make his argument, Yona offers numerous valuable parallels. Thereafter, Yona provides a summary overview of *Satires* 2.3, while contrasting Damasippus’ Stoic rant with Epicurean frank criticism. In the final section of the book, Yona suggests that “Aside from both *Satires* 2.3 and 2.7 being merciless Stoic invectives that fail in terms of literary aesthetics and their usefulness for moral correction, both also involve direct and personal criticism of Horace” (279); they ‘fail in terms of literary aesthetics’ because they do not offer Callimachean brevity, and the Stoic criticism (especially in 2.3) is harsh such that it does not compare favorably with the Epicurean practice of frank criticism.

CHRIS ECKERMAN
University of Oregon
eckerman@uoregon.edu

NIKLAS HOLZBERG, *Persius. Satiren, Lateinisch - deutsch*, Sammlung Tusculum, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2022, 139 pp., 29.95€, ISBN 978-3-11-077290-6.

There exists scarcely a student of ancient literature in the German-speaking world who has not, at some point in their academic journey, sought guidance from the works of Niklas Holzberg. In addition to his role as co-editor of the esteemed Tusculum series—a cornerstone for bilingual editions of Greek and Latin texts utilized by students and researchers for over a century—Holzberg is also recognized as a skilled translator. His translations cover a wide range of texts, from Aesop to Virgil, and he has written numerous introductions on genres, including ancient epigram, fable, and elegy, as well as on authors such as Ovid, Horace, and Aristophanes.

His new translation of Persius' Satires is especially noteworthy, considering the work's relative neglect in university courses and its near-total absence from secondary education. The scarcity of German translations of Persius underscores the significance of Holzberg's work. While the 18th and 19th centuries produced several hexameter translations, only Otto Seel (in verse, 1950; 2nd edition 1974) and Walter Kißel (in prose, 1990, as part of his extensive commentary) have ventured into this task since 1950. A contemporary translation that meets the needs of today's readers is both timely and imperative.

Holzberg's new volume, which replaces the bilingual edition by Otto Seel in the Tusculum series, features an introduction (pp. 9-37), the text and translation of the satires and the *vita Persi* (pp. 40-97), an appendix outlining textual deviations from Kißel's critical edition (pp. 101-2), and explanatory notes with paraphrases of each poem (pp. 103-29). The book concludes with a well-organized bibliography (pp. 131-5) and an index of proper names (pp. 137-9). It would have been advantageous to include brief explanations with the index entries, following the practice observed in other volumes of this series and similar bilingual editions. Holzberg's inclusion of conjectures not listed in Kißel's Teubneriana (2007) is valuable, though specific bibliographic references would have been useful. Many of the noted deviations pertain to punctuation. Notably, the typographical error "crititicus" (p. 92, paragraph 5) in the text of the *vita*—where *criticus* should replace *tragicus* as conjectured by Glenn Most—is vexing.¹

In the introduction, Holzberg offers a nuanced discussion of the complexities surrounding biographical details and key aspects of Persius' poetry, including its close connection to Horace's satires. However, an exploration of Persius' frequent use of food metaphors—central to Roman satire—would have been beneficial, particularly in light of Shadi Bartsch's insightful book (*Persius: A Study in Food, Philosophy, and the Figural*, 2015). Bartsch connects Persius' distinctive use of

¹ The conjecture referenced by Holzberg likely originates from pages 2045-6 of Most's ANRW-article: "Cornutus and Stoic Allegoresis", in W. Haase, *Philosophie, Wissenschaften, Technik. Philosophie (Stoizismus)*, Berlin 1989 (=ANRW II.36.3), 2014-65.

(violent) metaphor and (repulsive) imagery to his Stoic thoughts about abstract truth, interpreting them as an anti-Lucretian response to the question of whether philosophy can be conveyed through poetry. Holzberg also draws attention to the stylistic features, such as the use of dense and heavily abbreviated conjunctions that challenge comprehension, and the literal application of metaphor (“Metaphern beim Worte genommen”). However, he interprets these techniques, along with the use of intertextuality, as elements of a sophisticated game of recognition and an intellectual exercise—essentially, a form of entertainment. Furthermore, Holzberg argues that Persius’ *libellus* can be interpreted as a cohesive narrative unfolding across the six satires. This narrative comprises a philosophical course of study (satires 2-5) that parallels the maturation of a young man,² culminating in an epilogue (sat. 6) where the speaker reflects on the ‘golden mean’ and engages in a dialogue with a potential heir. Finally, Holzberg sheds light on the history of Persius’ reception, highlighting Augustine’s crucial role in shaping its trajectory. He also addresses the negative critiques from 17th- to 19th-century writers and scholars, who accused Persius of having an incomprehensible style and a lack of originality. This section transitions seamlessly into the philological study of Persius, which also serves as the foundation for the final part of the introduction.

In this last section of the introduction (“Persius ohne Muhme”, pp. 34-7), Holzberg offers insights into the motivation behind his own work as a translator of Persius. He justifies his decision to provide a new translation, particularly his choice of prose, and outlines his approach to translation. Holzberg himself is renowned for his occasionally explicit translations of ancient obscenities, a facet that, until recently, remained largely unaddressed. He has delivered well-received translations of ancient poetry in both verse and prose. In the case of Persius, Holzberg has opted for a prose translation, adhering to a *verbum ad verbum* principle (p. 35). Acknowledging the needs of the targeted (non-professional) readership (“ein nicht fachlich ausgebildetes Lesepublikum” p. 35-6), he distinguishes the verbatim translation from the explanatory comments which include paraphrasing the meaning of a verse. Furthermore, he argues that the older translations retained outdated vocabulary (such as “Muhme” [~“Tante” (aunt)]) and “classicist patina”. The hexameter renditions, he argues further, adhere to the tradition initiated by Johann Heinrich Voß, this including Kissel’s prose translation, despite claiming otherwise, aligning with the hexameter rhythm, thus creating challenges in maintaining the satirist’s linguistic nuances. As a consequence, he contends that Persius, in particular, with his “idiosyncratic doctrine, compressed formulations, abrupt transitions, the amalgamation of vulgar and poetic language, and other peculiarities,” („mit seiner eigenwilligen Doktrin, den gedrängten Formulierungen, abrupten Übergängen, der Mischung von Vulgär- und Dichtersprache und anderen Besonderheiten”) necessitates a translation that preserves these nuances. Consequently, the cover of the volume already promotes

² Cf. K.J. Reckford, *Recognizing Persius*, Princeton 2009, 144-50.

the translation as “very literal” and “reliable.” This decision for extreme literalness in translation, justified by the unique qualities of Persius’ satires, is underscored by the necessity for detailed explanations, making Walter Kissel’s commentary an indispensable resource despite criticisms. Furthermore, Holzberg presents his literal translation as a deliberate response to more recent interpretations (vaguely distinguishing between philological “Textarbeit” and interpretation, informed by postmodern literary theory) that, in his view, deviate too far from the original wording of the text. While this stance might be somewhat exaggerated, one could argue that his prose translation also pays minor attention to preserving the metrical form, an essential aesthetic feature especially for verse satire in its parasitic relation to epic poetry. Naturally, achieving every objective of a translation simultaneously is not always possible. As this example illustrates Holzberg’s overall helpful introduction is weakened by some unnecessary generalizations and inaccurate critiques of ‘Anglo-American research.’ The claim that Anglo-American researchers tend to ignore foreign scholarship, and particularly Kissel’s commentary, which relies on some criticism of Kissel’s commentary by Zetzel, is easily contradicted by evidence such as Bartsch’s seminal book, which contains approximately 30 references to Kissel’s commentary and includes explicit praise on page 3.³ The same inaccurate generalization applies to Holzberg’s critique (p. 12) that recent Anglo-American research tends to overemphasize political allusions and search for implicit criticism of Nero, a claim he does not substantiate with evidence or references.

The most significant part of the book is, of course, the translation. Overall, the translation has been well-executed and is appropriate. However, it often feels more like a provisional, initial attempt that primarily decodes the Latin grammar—a working tool for deeper engagement with the original text—rather than a polished translation that effectively recodes the text for contemporary German-speaking readers. In accordance with his method, Holzberg seems to endeavor to translate all Latin words into German, which sometimes becomes somewhat unwieldy and cumbersome, such as the literal translation of anaphoric demonstratives – rarely used in German – that simply refer to the following infinitive constructions or subordinate clauses (e.g. 2.63: *quid iuuat hoc, templis nostros immittere mores* [...]?; – „was nützt dies, in die Tempel unser Sitten eingehen zu lassen [...]?”; 5.1: *Vatibus hic mos est, centum sibi poscere voces*. – “Die Dichter haben diesen Brauch, für sich hundert Stimmen zu fordern...”: or 5.98: *naturaque continent hoc fas, ut teneat uetitos inscitia debilis actus*. „[...] und die Natur beinhaltet dieses Gebot, dass schwächliche Unwissenheit sich verbotenen Handelns enthalten soll”). In some cases, an interpretive and explanatory translation, rather than a literal one, would have been more appropriate. For example, in 1.3, *vel duo vel*

³ A similar appreciation can be found in the monographs by D. Hooley, *The Knotted Thong. Structures of Mimesis in Persius*, Ann Arbor 1997, viii, and K.J. Reckford (as above, p. 11).

nemo (“Entweder zwei oder niemand.”), which, as Casaubon already observed,⁴ might be a variant of a Greek colloquial expression meaning ‘one or the other/a few.’ In this instance, a more informative translation or at least an explanatory note would have been advisable. Another example, where the literal translation obscures the meaning, is *nucibus relictis* (1.10), which Holzberg translates as “wenn wir die Nüsse hinter uns gelassen haben.” The term “nuts” (as explained by Holzberg in the notes) refers to “children’s toys,” which would have been easily understood by a Roman contemporary reader. In contrast, Kißel skillfully preserved the cultural unfamiliarity of nuts as children’s toys while providing an explanatory context by translating it as “den Jahren des Nussspiels entwachsen” (outgrown the years of playing with nuts). This approach avoids creating additional obstacles to comprehension. At times, Holzberg proceeds to the opposite extreme, exemplified by his rendering of *populo marcentes pandere uuluas*, (4.36) as “den Leuten die ausgeleierte Arschfotze ausbreiten.” Holzberg undeniably delivers on his commitment to refresh outdated vocabulary. (cf. e.g. Seel’s „dem Volke die Lefzen zu bieten!”). The punchline, which has sparked discussions among editors and commentators prompting conjectures (*bulbos*, *valvas*), warrants clarification. In this context, *vulva* (matrix/uterus) extends to denote the vagina, suggesting that the accused is a pathic, hence his anus being likened to a vagina, a joke often made by Martial. While an argument may be made for retaining the explicit nature of the joke, the translation “Arschfotze” introduces a vulgar nuance not inherent in the Latin word *vulva*.⁵ Holzberg here appears to have transferred the connotation of the vulgar term *cunus* commonly used derogatorily to refer to the anus of a male pathic.⁶

It is a long-standing topos that Persius is difficult to understand—an idea the poet himself reinforced through Cornutus’ characterization of him as skilled in the art of harsh juxtaposition (*iunctura callidus acri*, 5.14) and by describing his own style as ‘condensed’ (literally ‘cooked through,’ *decoctius*, 1.123). Holzberg is certainly right when he points out that Persius requires considerably more commentary than, say, Virgil’s *Aeneid*. Indeed, Kißel’s commentary, which Holzberg praises effusively (though references only twice), leaves little to be desired. It is therefore a difficult task to select and prepare the necessary information in such a way that the text is comprehensible and does not completely exceed the scope of the edition. 26 (small and densely printed) pages of commentary (pp. 103-29) for 56 pages of text and translation (pp. 42-97) appears to be an adequate ratio (Seel had around 20 pages of notes). In general, Holzberg provides valuable insights that enhance the reader’s understanding of the text. However, every user (and reviewer) is likely to identify a few areas for improvement, and this one is no exception. In the introduction, Holzberg identifies literary allusions, particularly the intertextual

⁴ Cf. W. Kißel, *Satiren*. Hg., übersetzt und kommentiert, Heidelberg 1990, 113.

⁵ Cf. J.N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, Baltimore 1990² [London 1982], 101-6.

⁶ Cf. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, 116-17.

dialogue with Horace, as a central feature of the satires, noting that recognizing these references significantly enhances the reading experience. Unfortunately, he does not always follow through on this emphasis in the commentary notes. Here are two examples: First, immediately following the probable quotation from a Lucilius verse with which Persius begins his first satire, an interlocutor interrupts with the question: “quis leget haec?” This phrase was identified by the scholion as a quotation from Lucilius (frg. 2), although this reference has been questioned, with some suggesting it more likely refers to verse 1. In Horace, a similar thought is used to ironically characterize the lack of reader appeal in his own poetry (Sat. 1.4.22f: “cum mea nemo/scripta legat”). Holzberg does not mention either of these points.⁷ Secondly, the above-mentioned expression *iunctura callidus acri* (5.14) highlights the sharp connections that contribute to Persius’ cleverness as a poet. While Holzberg analyzes the reference to Horace’s Satire 1.4.29-31 in the metaphorical comparison of other poets’ works to a bellow in the previous verses (5.10-11), he does not address the reworking of this expression from Horace’s *Ars Poetica* (47-8: *notum si callida uerbum/reddiderit iunctura nouum*). This omission of this reference (which is also absent in Seel’s earlier Tusculum edition) is noteworthy, as the expression is central to Persius’ poetics, illustrating both his peculiar use of metaphor and his method of innovative engaging with literary tradition, as multiple studies have highlighted.⁸ Although it is impossible to list every possible allusion in the notes, the absence of these two references is particularly regrettable.

In summary, Holzberg’s new bilingual edition of Persius’ Satires, while occasionally biased in the introduction and at times overly literal in the translation, is a valuable resource for navigating the complexities of Persius’ satire. Its faithful rendering serves as an excellent tool for making the text more accessible, especially for students grappling with intricate syntax and grammar, encouraging deeper engagement with the text. Readers seeking a more interpretive ad sensum translation for quicker understanding may need to look elsewhere. Consequently, Holzberg’s work lays a strong foundation for incorporating Persius more frequently into the classroom, a contribution that is invaluable and deserves high praise.

DANIEL WENDT
Universität Graz
daniel.wendt@uni-graz.at

⁷ Nor does J.R. Jenkinson in his notes (*Persius. The Satires. Text with Translation and Notes*, Warminster 1980). For a detailed discussion of the problematic statement by the scholion, see Kißel 1980, 109-12; for the Horace reference, see 112-13.

⁸ See, for instance, W.S. Anderson, “Persius and the rejection of society”, in W.S. Anderson, *Essays on Roman Satire*, Princeton 1982 [first 1966], 185-6; Cynthia S. Dessen, *Satires of Persius: Iunctura Callidus Acri*, 1996² [first 1968], x; A. Cucchiarelli, “Speaking from silence: the Stoic paradoxes of Persius”, in K. Freudenburg, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*, Cambridge-New York 2005, 77-8, and the excellent discussion by S. Bartsch, *Persius: a Study in Food, Philosophy, and the Figural*, Chicago 2015, 141-60.

PAUL ROCHE, *Reading Lucan's Civil War. A Critical Guide*, Oklahoma series in classical culture 62, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2021, x+338pp., \$34.95, ISBN 978-0-8061-6939-2.

En los últimos años hemos asistido a la aparición de ediciones revisadas del *Bellum Civile* de Lucano, como las de los libros primero y noveno preparadas por Paul Roche, y estudios, entre los que destacamos la extensa bibliografía de Paolo Esposito, autor de uno de los ensayos que conforman la guía que aquí venimos a reseñar. Se trata de señales inequívocas de que el interés por el poema de Lucano viene avivándose, a pesar de su casi total exclusión de los planes de estudio de nuestras universidades.

En esta ocasión, nos encontramos ante una guía de lectura del *Bellum Civile* preparada con rigor por excelentes especialistas en este poema latino. Esta guía crítica ha sido confeccionada principalmente para lectores del poema de Lucano traducido al inglés, con el propósito declarado de resultar útil a una audiencia lo más amplia posible, ofreciendo *adaptable frameworks* para comprender e interpretar el texto; sin embargo, resulta igualmente enriquecedora para lectores de la obra en latín o en cualquier otra lengua, para quienes se acercan al poema por primera vez y para quienes lo frecuentamos con más asiduidad. Así pues, el objetivo principal de la guía es dotar de una herramienta adecuada a los lectores para acercarse al poema de Lucano, abordando aspectos fundamentales para comprender la obra o para revisar su lectura. Es importante destacar y celebrar que los estudios que conforman esta guía de lectura no se alejan del texto de Lucano y son constantes las citas del mismo, que se presentan en latín y en inglés. A lo largo del trabajo se toma como referencia el texto latino establecido por Housman (1926) y la traducción al inglés de Susanna Braund (1992).

Siguiendo el modelo de Christine Perkell, *Reading Vergil's Aeneid: An Interpretive Guide* (Norman 1999), se presenta primero una introducción, elaborada por Paul Roche, que viene encabezada por un mapa geográfico del Imperio Romano con las campañas de César, Pompeyo y Craso consignadas. En este capítulo introductorio, "Reading Lucan's Civil War" (1-17), se ofrecen las coordenadas básicas para comprender la obra de Lucano. Partiendo de la biografía del poeta, se apuntan las cuestiones principales que marcaron tanto la composición como la temprana difusión del poema. Igualmente, se reflexiona sobre cuál sería el propósito de Lucano y hasta dónde habría tratado de llevar su obra, si hubiese podido terminarla. A continuación, se analiza la voz narrativa y el posicionamiento del poeta, enlazando esta cuestión con la caracterización de los personajes principales: César, Catón y Pompeyo. Se presentan también los principales rasgos del estilo del autor y se explican los fundamentos filosóficos y religiosos de la obra. Se mencionan hitos de la tradición y recepción del texto literario, centrados en el ámbito de la literatura anglófona.

Estas nociones y los aspectos más polémicos sobrevuelan los ensayos que siguen, se retoman y explican de nuevo en función de su pertinencia y aparición en

cada libro del *Bellum Civile*. La manera de retomar estas cuestiones puede llegar a ser repetitiva, pero, sin embargo, facilita la lectura de cada uno de los ensayos por separado y, a la vez, permite al lector comprender que esas características generales, a veces manidas en la bibliografía, se extraen, se actualizan y se sustentan en el análisis del texto latino.

Destacamos que desde el principio se van destacando motivos, escenas y caracteres que se repiten o tienen ecos a lo largo de la obra –del poema y de la guía de lectura–, envolviendo al lector: se subraya el vocabulario relativo a la locura, el crimen y la destrucción, las imágenes morbosas y cruentas, todo en relación con el término *nefas* (v. 6), que hacen de todo el poema algo que no debería ser dicho; estas claves se recuperan en el índice general final. También a lo largo de la guía se analizan cuidadosamente los discursos directos –recordemos la referencia de Quintiliano, “Lucano debe ser más imitado por los oradores que por los poetas” (10.1.90)–, con los que el poeta presenta a César y Pompeyo, a Catón e incluso la alegoría de la propia Roma a los pies del Rubicón. Muy acertadamente, nos parece, y como aviso para continuar la lectura, se destaca en el primer ensayo que hay que estar atentos a la identificación de la voz del narrador con los emisores de los discursos directos que se suceden en el poema. Otra de las constantes a lo largo de los ensayos que componen la guía es la identificación y análisis de los modelos literarios, cómo dialoga o se opone el *Bellum Civile* a ellos, y también de las fuentes historiográficas del poema.

Cada ensayo comienza con un resumen de la trama, el esquema del libro que se analiza y la presentación de los motivos principales del mismo, centrándose después en el análisis de los aspectos más reseñables. A modo de ejemplo, nos gustaría apuntar algunos de los contenidos más destacados, para dar cuenta de cómo se revisa el *Bellum Civile* y de la diversidad de temas que se abordan en esta guía.

En el primer ensayo, “Book 1. A New Epic Program”, de Lavinia Galli Milić y Damien Nelis (pp. 18-35), se desgranar los primeros versos del poema, analizando el tema, el estilo y la dedicatoria a Nerón. Los aspectos principales tratados en este ensayo son: el estilo del poema, a partir de la sucesión de pequeños cuadros unidos por una supraunidad temática, la ausencia de la invocación a la Musa y el papel de lo divino (su ausencia) en la obra, la intertextualidad en el inicio del poema (resulta especialmente interesante el análisis de la relación con la obra Calpurnio Sículo y sus posibles implicaciones ideológicas, con el objeto de deconstruir el programa propagandístico neroniano). Se cierra el capítulo destacando la abundancia de símiles y comparaciones –es fundamental la equiparación de la destrucción de Roma con la misma disolución del universo– y la combinación de elementos históricos con su recreación dramática.

Sigue “Book 2. Civil War in Italy: Past, Present, and Future”, de Annemarie Ambühl (pp. 36-51). El inicio de este segundo capítulo es una buena muestra de cómo se hilvanan los ensayos de la guía entre sí y se entretajan las cuestiones transversales, ya mencionadas. Igualmente, se da un paso más en la interpretación

de la ausencia de dioses: Lucano elige destacar el papel de los humanos, cómo sus miedos y esperanzas determinan sus decisiones y actos. El análisis de los versos 2.166-73 permite profundizar en la sintaxis “tortuosa” del poema, en la razón que esconden las imágenes cruentas y el motivo de la muerte violenta de pares de hermanos. Hace su aparición Catón de Útica y se profundiza en las implicaciones filosóficas y políticas de una guerra fratricida; sorprende que se dedique tan poco espacio a este episodio y es casi refrescante que la autora desarrolle con más exhaustividad el análisis del paisaje, que funciona como un espejo de los acontecimientos, y su relación estratégica con la guerra civil.

En “Book 3. Crime and Reward”, de Markus Kersten y Christiane Reitz (pp. 52-72), la palabra *vain* preside el ensayo y aparece en prácticamente todos los subapartados del mismo: la visión de Pompeyo resulta inútil, como también lo son la resistencia de Metelo ante César en Roma, la gloria del catálogo de tropas que auxilian a Pompeyo y la pretensión de paz de Marsella. Resulta especialmente interesante la atención prestada al análisis y las posibles interpretaciones de la deforestación del bosque sagrado en Marsella y su relación con la religiosidad en el mundo antiguo, bárbaro y romano.

A continuación, en “Book 4. The Triumph of Paradox and Exemplarity”, de Paolo Esposito (pp. 73-88), se presenta primero el desarrollo histórico de la batalla de Ilerda e indirectamente esto permite al lector profundizar en el género de la obra. Destacamos también la preeminencia dada al análisis de un episodio que el poeta introduce sin que, sin embargo, sea esencial en el desarrollo de la guerra civil: el suicidio de Vulteyo y sus hombres funciona como “a miniature version of the civil war: Lucan transforms the deaths of these men into a symbol of his entire epic; they commit all the crimes of war by their action. Vulteijs represents a *uirtus* (‘courage, bravery’) that is perverted: he dedicates his courage wrongfully in the service Caesar” (p. 75). Después, la invectiva contra Curio da buena cuenta de que, desde el punto de vista del estoicismo que impera en la obra, todo hombre revela su carácter y su *uirtus* en el momento de su muerte. Siguiendo la brillante lectura de Esposito, la deformación de la *uirtus* a causa de la locura (*furor*) es el motivo que une los tres episodios de este libro.

El análisis de los episodios contenidos en el libro quinto, en “Book 5. Mortal Authority and Cosmic Order”, de Christopher L. Catherine (pp. 89-104), conduce a la reflexión sobre el liderazgo en una guerra civil: la legitimidad del poder reside en la elección realizada, bien por parte del Senado (Pompeyo), bien por parte de los comicios centuriados (César), en representación de la ciudadanía romana; sin embargo, la guerra civil supone una ruptura con estos mecanismos tradicionales. Se plantea además la relación entre un general y sus hombres. Los episodios protagonizados por César se oponen drásticamente al tono elegíaco de la escena en la que Pompeyo se separa de Cornelia en Lesbos. Son clave los conceptos *fortuna* y *securitas*.

Partiendo de la estructura y de los modelos de los que Lucano disponía para componer el libro sexto, Andrew Zissos, en “Book 6. Thessalian Preludes” (pp.

105-20), es rotundo en la interpretación total del poema: “*The Civil War is a fervently anti-Cesarian poem*” (p. 107). El retrato de la megalomanía de César frente a la prudencia de Pompeyo destaca el ya inevitable triunfo del mal en el universo. Sin embargo, la gran batalla se retrasa por la enorme digresión que supone el episodio de la maga Ericto, muestra del estilo barroco de Lucano, de su gusto por lo morbosos y, también, de su alejamiento de la épica de contenido histórico. En la solvente interpretación de Zissos, los dos polos de este libro, que generalmente no se encuentra entre los más atendidos –sí algunos de sus episodios, pero no el libro en su conjunto– permiten problematizar sobre la noción épica tradicional de la providencia divina y el carácter del héroe, erigiéndose el poema como antítesis de la *Eneida* y, por tanto, y más importante, de la glorificación de Roma.

En nuestra opinión, el séptimo ensayo, “*Things Fall Apart*”, de Paul Roche (pp. 121-36), supone el clímax de la guía. Lucano logra convencer del profundo significado de un solo día, de una sola batalla: en Farsalia se decidió el destino de Roma y, por ende, de la humanidad. Se destaca la presencia central de la voz del narrador que convierte el fracaso de Pompeyo en una victoria moral (*uincere peius erat*, 7.705). Sin embargo, este acontecimiento trae un nuevo estado de esclavitud para las generaciones posteriores que, además, ya no tendrían oportunidad de enfrentarse a los tiranos que les gobiernan. El análisis de este destino obliga a su vez a reflexionar sobre el lugar que ocupa la divinidad en este devenir de Roma: o los dioses permitieron que César venciera, o todo dependió de las acciones de los hombres, y estos desde entonces divinizarían a sus gobernantes.

Siguen los ensayos “*Book 8. The Remains of the Day*”, de Martin T. Dinter (pp. 137-57) y “*Book 9. Author and Authority. Caesar and Liberty*”, de Michael Dewar (pp. 158-78). En el ensayo sobre el libro octavo se indaga en la caída de Pompeyo a través de los conceptos de *fama*, de la incertidumbre y del imaginario de los cuerpos desmembrados. En el noveno ensayo se destaca que la obra podría haber terminado justo antes, pero que, sin embargo, recupera nuevo vigor con Catón al frente. Dejando en un segundo plano el comentario sobre el episodio de las serpientes, resulta más sugerente el interrogante sobre la figura de Catón: “*Hero or Fanatic?*” (p. 167). Destacamos además que en este noveno ensayo se atiende en mayor medida al estilo del poeta. Por último, llegamos a “*Book 10. The Living End*”, de Paul Roche (pp. 179-91), con César actuando ante una corte egipcia que no cree su discurso, resultando el retrato de un hipócrita. La interpretación de un Lucano con una mirada más irónica concuerda con nuestros tiempos.

La última parte de la guía de lectura la ocupan cinco estudios en los que se profundiza en cuestiones ya reiteradas a lo largo de los ensayos precedentes, ahora tratadas de manera global. Se trata de aspectos y motivos abordados tradicionalmente por la crítica, pero que aquí se revisan y actualizan: “*Charging the Canon: Lucan and Vergil*”, de Robert Cowan (pp. 192-210); “*Religion and Ritual in Lucan*”, de Konstantinos Arampaslis y Antony Augoustakis (pp. 211-26); “*Philosophy and the Aesthetics of Apostrophe in Lucan*”, de Francesca

D'Alessandro Behr (pp. 227-45); "Lucan as Caesar's Epic Successor", de Lauren Donovan Ginsberg (pp. 246-65); "Sex and Violence: Gender in the *Civil War*", de Robert Cowan (pp. 266-81). Este último es probablemente el más novedoso de estos capítulos por las cuestiones que plantea y por la perspectiva de género adoptada: primero, modelos de masculinidad y, después, el papel que juegan los personajes femeninos que aparecen en el *Bellum Civile*; se analizan, así, los personajes de Cleopatra, Marcia y Cornelia.

Para finalizar la guía, se presenta una serie de recursos útiles para el lector: un glosario de términos técnicos para no especialistas (pp. 283-8), una completa y actual bibliografía (pp. 289-310), la lista de autores de la guía con una breve semblanza de cada uno de ellos (311-14) y dos índices, el primero dedicado a los pasajes de obras clásicas citados (315-27) y un índice general que recoge términos de diversa naturaleza –principalmente nombres propios de personajes históricos, de personajes literarios y de lugares, conceptos de teoría literaria, *realia* y otras entradas importantes dentro de la obra y el estilo de Lucano, tales como "death scenes", "madness", "snakes" o "storms", que vienen a ser la última muestra del carácter práctico de esta excelente y completa guía de lectura– (329-38).

En definitiva, nos encontramos ante una guía actual y necesaria, pues "Lucan has now definitively emerged from a period of being undervalued in the Anglophone world" (vii) –cabría preguntarse y profundizar en las razones de esta emergencia y en si esto sucede en el mundo hispanohablante–. La disponibilidad de nuevas traducciones al alcance de un mayor número de lectores hace conveniente disponer de una guía como esta, valiosísima ayuda para comprender el poema de Lucano. En esta nueva guía de lectura encontraremos respuestas, pero también nuevas preguntas que nos invitan a seguir leyendo y reflexionando sobre la obra y sobre las cuestiones que han acompañado al poema a lo largo de toda la historia de su transmisión. Todo ello se presenta de manera clara y accesible para estudiantes y nuevos lectores; al mismo tiempo, se analiza el texto replanteando motivos ya clásicos en la tradición del texto y se revisa la bibliografía, añadiendo referencias actuales, de interés para especialistas en la materia.

ROSA MARÍA DÍAZ BURILLO
UNED - BECLaR
rmdiaz@flog.uned.es

FEDERICA BESSONE, *Dalla 'Tebaide' alla 'Commedia' (e oltre). Nuovi studi su Stazio e la sua ricezione. Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale*, lxiv.1, Pisa-Roma: Fabrizio Serra, 2022, 300 pp., ISSN 0035-6085.

Il fascicolo monografico della “Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale” oggetto di questa recensione raduna gli undici interventi presentati all’omonimo convegno, *Dalla 'Tebaide' alla 'Commedia' (e oltre). Nuovi studi su Stazio e la sua ricezione*, tenuto online tra febbraio e marzo del 2021. Come Federica Bessone, curatrice del volume,¹ segnala nella Premessa, le relazioni sono state tenute da rinomati studiosi “di ambiti, provenienza e generazioni diverse, impegnati in lavori di edizione, commento, interpretazione delle opere di Stazio, o interessati a indagarne la ricezione nella letteratura latina e italiana, fino al Medio Evo” (p. 15). Si tratta, quindi, di un volume che, come indicato anche dallo stesso nome, ripercorre gli studi staziani in svariati campi di ricerca. Mi soffermo in seguito su sei lavori che hanno particolarmente attirato la mia attenzione.

Stefano Rebeggiani (“From civil war to foreign expansion: cultural identity and the Hellenization of the empire in Statius and Valerius Flaccus”) indaga su due degli effetti dell’ellenizzazione dell’Impero Romano sotto i Flavi nella poesia epica: il rinnovato interesse per il tema della conquista straniera e l’incontro con i barbari, e il cambio della percezione dell’identità culturale dell’Impero. Ciò si allontana da una concezione del Mediterraneo come una realtà frammentaria nella quale si enfatizzano le divergenze tra Grecia e Roma, verso una concezione di esso come un insieme culturale, la cui caratteristica principale è la fusione culturale dei due popoli in contrapposizione al mondo barbarico. Per dimostrarlo, l’autore fa leva principalmente sulle riletture dei miti della guerra di Troia e soprattutto del viaggio degli Argonauti messe in atto da Valerio Flacco e da Stazio.

¹ Autori e titoli

Federica Bessone, Premessa

1. Carole E. Newlands, “Sound and Reception in Statius’ *Silvae*”

2. Stefano Rebeggiani, “From civil war to foreign expansion: cultural identity and the Hellenization of the empire in Statius and Valerius Flaccus”

3. Stefano Briguglio, “‘Sediziose voci.’ Paesaggio e guerra civile nella sezione nemea della *Tebaide*”

4. Francesca Econimo, “Illusione e morte: effetti del Sonno nella *Tebaide*”

5. Federica Bessone, “Grecia e Roma nell’*Achilleide*”

6. Valéry Berlincourt, Lavinia Galli Milić, Jean-Philippe Goldman, Damien Nelis, “Verso un’edizione critica digitale dell’*Achilleide* di Stazio”

7. Antonino Pittà, “Critica fra le righe: scelte lessicali pregnanti (nelle *Silvae*) e un problema testuale (in Petronio)”

8. Elena Merli, “‘Cortigiani, vil razza dannata.’ Il ritratto di Vibio Crispo fra Stazio e Giovenale”

9. Luca Marcozzi, “‘Lo dolce poeta’: Dante lettore di Stazio e dei suoi commenti”

10. Valter Boggione, “Le sinopie di Stazio (*Purg.*, XXII)”

11. Paolo Rigo, Sabrina Stroppa, “‘*Carum nobis*’. Stazio in Petrarca tra fortuna e funzioni poetiche”

Rebeggiani comincia adombrando i precedenti del fenomeno. Quanto alla Grecia, quando i poeti volevano parlare di conquista straniera e incontro con i barbari, quasi tutti facevano ricorso al mito del viaggio degli Argonauti e a quello della guerra di Troia. Nel primo, gli eroi andavano fuori dal mondo greco verso una terra barbarica, mentre nel secondo c'era uno scontro tra la Grecia e i barbari, e cioè tra occidente e oriente (pp. 43-4). Passando all'ambito latino, com'è risaputo, la letteratura arcaica si presenta in uno stato fortemente frammentario, ma possiamo comunque supporre che anche i poeti latini di quell'epoca abbiano fatto una tale lettura di questi due miti. Catullo è la nostra prima testimonianza di un'interpretazione ideologica della guerra di Troia e del viaggio degli Argonauti. Per es., nel carme 68, egli presenta la guerra di Troia come uno scontro tra Europa e Asia (pp. 44-6). Nell'*Eneide*, invece, il tema della conquista straniera non è tanto importante quanto quello della guerra civile. D'altro canto, Virgilio non è interessato a presentare Romani e Greci come parte di un medesimo gruppo culturale, schierati contro i popoli barbarici. Anzi, egli sottolinea le differenze culturali tra i due popoli e suggerisce una visione del Mediterraneo come frammentato in gruppi che sono in concorrenza tra loro (pp. 47-9).

La situazione è ben diversa nell'epica flavia. Infatti, esiste un rinnovato interesse per il tema dell'espansione e la formazione dell'impero, l'idea di Grecia e Roma come parte di uno stesso gruppo si consolida, e il mito di Troia perde importanza. Queste dinamiche vengono associate a una tendenza a riallacciare i valori più importanti di Roma alla cultura greca, per rafforzare in questo modo l'idea di un'eredità greco-romana condivisa come fondamento dell'identità dell'impero. Ciò viene saldamente dimostrato dallo studioso appoggiandosi su un'abbondante serie di esempi. Per es., nel proemio delle *Argonautiche* di Valerio Flacco (1.7-18), le conquiste di Vespasiano vengono accostate alla spedizione degli Argonauti (p. 50). L'autore individua anche diversi episodi del poema che esemplificano guerra civile derivata da conflitti con nemici esterni. È il caso del libro 6, dove Minerva aiuta gli Argonauti a respingere l'attacco di Ariasmeno creando scompiglio tra i nemici: Valerio paragona il disordine a una guerra civile in cui sono coinvolte truppe romane (6.402-12) (p. 54). Rebeggiani poi passa all'analisi di diversi passi della poesia epica di Stazio. Qui mi limito ad accennare al fatto che egli, sulle orme di Federica Bessone, illustra il fenomeno del riallacciamento dei valori tramite il caso della *clementia*, le cui origini sono spiegate da Stazio in *Tebaide* 12 attraverso un mito greco (p. 58).

In conclusione, Stefano Rebeggiani non solo propone un interessante ed innovativo tema, ma anche, come egli stesso spera, suggerisce "some avenues for further research on this subject."²

² Il discorso è molto nitido e facile da seguire nella sua articolazione. Comunque, credo che sarebbe stato utile al lettore avere una numerazione o intitolazione dei diversi paragrafi che inglobano le diverse idee. Ringrazio Sergio Casali per i preziosi suggerimenti offerti.

Finora, diversi rapporti sono stati stabiliti tra la *mora Nemea* (*Theb.* 5-6) e il resto del poema staziano. Nel ricco lavoro “‘Sediziose voci.’ Paesaggio e guerra civile nella sezione nemea della *Tebaide*, ”, Stefano Briguglio ora ci offre una nuova lettura della sezione, dove approfondisce “la correlazione tra paesaggio ‘epico’ e le manifestazioni del *nefas*” (p. 64), che illustra con il confronto di alcuni passi di Lucano e Virgilio, sottolineando alcune innovazioni staziane nella leggenda dei Sette a Nemea e l’incontro con Ipsipile, e la loro funzione narrativa. L’autore comincia (§ L’assalto al fiume: Euripide, Lucano, Stazio) proprio dalle prime cause della sosta a Nemea, e cioè dagli Argivi che, patendo una terribile sete, stanno cercando dell’acqua. Il motivo della ricerca d’acqua è trattato da Stazio in maniera innovativa rispetto alla versione euripidea della leggenda dove essa è dovuta ad altri motivi, dialogando piuttosto con l’episodio della sete patita dai soldati di Cesare a Ilerda in Luc. 4: in Stazio è provocata da Bacco; in Lucano, da Cesare.³

Vengono poi (§ Guerra civile: a Nemea e nel Lazio) presi in considerazione due esempi di guerra civile. Il primo è la parte finale della vicenda di Ipsipile dove l’esercito argivo si scontra col popolo di Licurgo, che vuole giustiziare l’eroina per la morte del figlioletto Ofelte. Il discorso con cui Anfiarao placa il conato di guerra civile tra Argivi e Nemei (infatti, entrambi sono consanguinei, come riconosce lo stesso Licurgo in 5.683-4), ‘*ne, quæso! absistite ferro, | unus auum sanguis, neue indulgete furori, | tuque prior*’ (*Theb.* 5.669-71) riecheggia le parole con cui Anchise si rivolge a Cesare e Pompeo: *ne, pueri, ne tanta animis adsuescite bella | neu patriæ ualidas in uiscera uertite uiris; | tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo, | proice tela manu, sanguis meus!* (*A.* 6.832-5).⁴ Si tratterebbe quindi di “una triangolazione tra Virgilio, Lucano e Stazio” (p. 67). Il secondo esempio è il tentato assalto alla reggia di Licurgo ad opera degli Argivi in *Theb.* 5.691-8 (un’altra presunta innovazione del poeta flavio nella sua rielaborazione del mito) che viene accostato – se non erro, per la prima volta negli studi staziani – in maniera molto convincente a quello alla città di Latino in *A.* 12.579-611.

In seguito (§ Una nuova bucolica? Virgilio, Lucano e il paesaggio “senza provvidenza”), Briguglio passa ad alcune considerazioni sugli aspetti bucolici nell’episodio: “Stazio recupera tratti bucolici (contenutistici e stilistici) per mostrare l’effetto distruttivo di un epos del *nefas* che irrompe nel *locus amoenus*” (p. 72). In questo modo, viene tracciato un parallelo tra i boschi di Nemea inariditi dalla siccità causata da Bacco e il deserto della Libia attraversato dall’esercito di Catone in Luc. 9. Nello specifico, esiste uno stretto rapporto tra la descrizione del corpo di Ofelte ucciso dal serpente nemeo (*Theb.* 5.596-8) e quella del corpo di

³ Non sono d’accordo, invece, con l’affermazione di Briguglio “l’azione di Bacco è un’offensiva,” in quanto il dio sta difendendo la sua città natale dall’attacco degli Argivi.

⁴ In realtà, Briguglio cita *Theb.* 5.669-71 come “*ne, quæso, absistite ferro, | unus auum sanguis, neue indulgete furori | tuque prior*”, ma in questo modo *ne* va letto con *absistite ferro* (“non gettate le armi”), che è proprio il contrario di ciò necessario per tracciare un parallelo con Virgilio. Per averlo, bisognerebbe allora accettare nel testo staziano un’aposiopesi dopo *ne*, oppure leggere la variante di alcuni manoscritti secondari *adsistite* (M2 M3 Z19) come fanno Hall et al. (Cambridge 2008-9).

Sabello morso dal sepe (Luc. 9.767-72).⁵ Infine, Briguglio analizza due aspetti bucolici dell'episodio. Il primo è la "pathetic fallacy" bucolica che viene adoperata in maniera perversa da Stazio in riferimento al paesaggio che piange la morte del serpente che ha ucciso Ofelte (*Theb.* 5.579-82), da accostare, per es., ai pini, fonti e arbusti che si lamentano dell'assenza di Titiro (*Ecl.* 1.38-9). Il secondo sono gli onori divini tributati a Ofelte (*Theb.* 5.748-52) che possono essere comparati al passo virgiliano dove Menalca dice che tutta la natura riconosce Dafni come un dio (*Ecl.* 5.61-3).⁶ Il lavoro, insomma, offre una nuova lettura molto interessante e stimolante di questa sezione del poema attraversata da "sediziose voci."

Il contributo di Francesca Econimo, "Illusione e morte: effetti del Sonno nella *Tebaide*," mostra come, a differenza dal suo precedente ovidiano, nella *Tebaide* il Sonno non è solo oggetto di descrizioni, ma anche soggetto di azioni, e cioè esamina "l'estetica del Sonno e gli effetti del suo intervento nel poema staziano" (p. 82). L'autrice comincia (§ 1. Immagini del Sonno: illusione e paradosso) dal Sonno come oggetto di descrizioni. In primo luogo, la studiosa compara accuratamente l'ecfrasi della casa del dio in Stat. *Theb.* 10.84-117 con il suo modello ovidiano (*Met.* 11.592-615), mettendo in risalto le abilità ecfrastiche staziane, che rielabora la scena quasi su modelli iconografici: "attraverso questa rappresentazione che si muove sul margine ambiguo tra arte e realtà, Stazio esalta l'aura misteriosa di una figura che nella sua apparente immobilità di statua [...] genera meraviglia e illusione in chi la osserva" (p. 84). In seguito, Econimo analizza altre tre scene dove il Sonno compare nel poema: la sua prima entrata in *Theb.* 1.339-41, la comparsa come auriga della Notte in 2.59-61, e l'ambasceria di Iride nel suo antro nel libro decimo (in particolare il fatto che, diversamente dal modello ovidiano, in 10.121-3 il dio non riesce a svegliarsi per ascoltare le indicazioni della dea).⁷

A differenza delle *Metamorfosi*, dove il Sonno delega l'adempimento delle istruzioni di Giunone a Morfeo, nella *Tebaide* è il dio stesso a eseguire quanto chiesto dalla dea. Così, nella seconda parte dello studio (§ 2. Il sonno e la "scenografia" della morte: riadattamento del massacro notturno), Econimo considera il Sonno in quanto soggetto di azioni nel suo ruolo nel massacro notturno di *Theb.* 10.156-

⁵ Nella pagina staziana, il lucaneo *fugit rupta cutis* (9.768) viene ripreso con *rapta cutis* (5.597). Alcuni manoscritti di Lucano, però, leggono *rapta*. A favore di *rupta* in Lucano Briguglio sostiene (p. 73, n. 3): "l'accostamento *rupta fugit* avrebbe potuto suggerire a Stazio un'ulteriore compressione del nesso nel sintetico *rapta*, che tiene in qualche modo insieme l'idea della lacerazione e del venir via della cute." Bisogna, però, tenere in considerazione che alcuni codici di Stazio (J1 S2ac) leggono anche *rupta*.

⁶ A p. 77, n. 1, Briguglio osserva sulla frase *ne plangite diuos* (*Theb.* 5.750): "proprio l'avvenuta divinizzazione di Ofelte spinge a intendere la frase come 'non piangete gli dèi,' quindi 'chi è già uno degli dèi,' piuttosto che 'non incolpate gli dèi.'" Aggiungerei che è proprio questa l'interpretazione di *diuos* degli scoli dei manoscritti R, T: *pluralis numerus pro singulari* (i.e. *ne plangite diuum*).

⁷ Finalmente il Sonno annuisce in uno stato di semioscienza al monito di Iride: *Theb.* 10.134-5 *ille deae iussis uultu, quo nutat, eodem | adnuat*. Econimo osserva sul testo: "[v]ultu, quo nutat, eodem è la lezione di P, accolta da tutti gli editori più recenti, mentre ω presenta *dubium mixtumque sopori*; altri manoscritti conservano entrambe le varianti," ma *uultu, quo nutat, eodem* è la lezione anche di G Hul P S2 U4pc J5 Z19 (vd. app. primario e secondario di Hall et al., Cambridge 2007-8).

448 per mano dei trenta giovani capeggiati da Tiodamante, Attore e Agilleo, che assalgono i Tebani, una scena basata sulla *Dolonia* (*Il.* 10.194-579), e, soprattutto, che rimodella profondamente la sortita notturna di Niso ed Eurialo in *A.* 9.176-458, come lo dimostra l'affascinante e dettagliata analisi dell'autrice. Infatti, nella *Tebaide* il Sonno, su ordine di Giunone, fa addormentare i Tebani per allestire lo scenario perché essi vengano uccisi dagli Argivi sferrando colpi a loro piacimento, non solo stravolgendo la tipica scena di massacro notturno, ma anche pervertendo la misura eroica.⁸

Federica Bessone "Grecia e Roma nell'*Achilleide*" studia "lo sguardo sulla Grecia dell'*Achilleide* nella sua dimensione storico-culturale e politica, che coinvolge il dedicatario imperiale [sc. Domiziano]" (p. 102), a partire da un penetrante esame della similitudine animale per il raduno dei Greci in Aulide in *Ach.* 1.459-66. La studiosa prende le mosse (§ 1) dal retroterra culturale di Stazio: essendo un poeta con un ampio bagaglio culturale e che si muove tra Roma e Napoli, la Grecia è un tema centrale nella sua poesia. Per di più, la posizione di Stazio è anche influenzata dal filellenismo di Domiziano. In seguito (§ 2), l'autrice, analizzando una sezione del proemio dell'*Achilleide* (1.1-19), inquadra le dimensioni del poema ampliate a un livello ecumenico. Infatti, a differenza della *Tebaide*, nel cui epilogo Stazio vanta che il suo poema fosse già imparato a memoria dalla *Itala iuventus*, nell'*Achilleide* poeta, imperatore ed eroe sono ammirati non solo da Roma ma anche dalla Grecia.

Bessone (§ 3) passa alla similitudine su cui si incentra il suo studio: i Greci riuniti in Aulide da un solo capo per lottare insieme contro i Troiani sono paragonati ad animali racchiusi gradualmente in una rete, sgomenti di convivere pacificamente tra loro, uniti dalla paura comune di una forza più grande (*Ach.* 1.459-66). L'autrice si sofferma sulla relazione di questa similitudine con l'anfiteatro, a cui possiamo supporre che gli animali in questione fossero destinati:⁹ "[n]ello specchio della

⁸ Come esempio del fatto che nelle sortite notturne i nemici sono già addormentati, Econimo cita *Theb.* 5.197-200 *cum consanguinei mixtus caligine Leti | rore madens Stygio morituram amplectitur urbem | Somnus et inplacido [ul inplacito: implicito] fundit gravia otia cornu | secernitque uiros*. Condivido pienamente la sua osservazione sul passo: "[n]el passaggio dall'*Eneide* alla *Tebaide* [...] il Sonno è diventato una vera personificazione: lo dimostra, oltre al corno, la volontà di addormentare solo gli uomini e non le donne (*secernitque viros*), in modo simile alla Morte che sceglie le sue vittime sul campo di battaglia (*Theb.*, 8, 380-1 *cruento / ungue notat*" (p. 91, n. 3). Viene quindi da pensare se per questa scena, il lettore non debba immaginare che il dio sia stato sempre inviato da un'altra divinità (forse Venere) per intervenire; altrimenti, perché il dio collaborerebbe spontaneamente al massacro? Del resto, il massacro di Lemno ha diversi punti di contatto con il massacro notturno di *Theb.* 10. Credo che un approfondimento in merito sia molto opportuno: in fine dei conti, quello a Lemno non solo è sempre un massacro notturno, ma anche ha delle sfumature di un'imboscata.

⁹ Sulle orme di Alessandro Barchiesi, la studiosa, nello specifico, fa riferimento a un mosaico del IV sec. d.C. del museo di Annaba, in Algeria. Aggiungerei che ci sono giunte tramite disegni alcune immagini di affreschi contenenti scene di questo tipo di caccia provenienti dalla tomba dei Nasoni, databile all'età severiana: cf. Pietro Santi Bartoli, *Le pitture antiche del sepolcro de' Nasonii nella Via Flaminia disegnate, ed intagliate alla similitudine degli antichi originali*, Roma 1680, vol. 1, tavv. xxvi-xxx. Per il riferimento, cf. V. Flores Militello, "Ikonographische Strategien Claudians.

valle-arena, gli animali-sudditi, prede e spettatori a un tempo, vedono sé stessi assoggettati a un cacciatore-capo; mentre i lettori-spettatori imperiali, anch'essi sudditi e, per analogia, prede animali, riconoscono l'immagine di se stessi, sottomessi a un potere sovrano che è insieme costrizione e garanzia di convivenza" (p. 110).

Bessone dimostra poi (§ 4) come nel passo in questione Stazio rifletta sulle diverse teorie filosofico-politiche sulla nascita dello stato e di una forma di governo di un solo governante (Tucidide, Polibio, Cicerone). In seguito (§ 5), la studiosa considera i termini e le espressioni con valenza politica impiegati qui dal poeta (per es., *in corpus uultumque coit e rege sub uno*). L'autrice poi (§ 6) passa a un'altra idea fondamentale della sua esposizione: "[l]a similitudine animale, che è la norma nell'epos, qui diventa un apologo animale. Addomesticare le forze selvagge della natura è un segno del potere carismatico dell'imperatore" (p. 117). Così, arriviamo alla brillante conclusione del lavoro (§ 7): "la guerra di Troia è stata il primo esperimento di unione tra i Greci discordi, un'unione politica che solo l'Impero Romano ha infine realizzato ed esteso" (p. 120), una visione condivisa più tardi dalla Seconda sofistica.

Valéry Berlincourt, Lavinia Galli Milić, Jean-Philippe Goldman e Damien Nelis "Verso un'edizione critica digitale dell'*Achilleide* di Stazio" riportano i progressi di un'edizione critica digitale tutt'ora ancora in corso dell'*Achilleide* di Stazio, frutto dei progetti "Towards a digital edition of the *Achilleid* of Statius" e "Digital Statius: the *Achilleid*," svoltisi tra il 2016 e il 2022, e finanziati dal Fondo Nazionale Svizzero.

Finora, per fissare il testo dell'*Achilleide*, gli editori hanno adoperato soltanto sei o sette dei ca. 224 testimoni superstiti del poema staziano. L'unica eccezione è l'edizione di Hall et al. (Cambridge 2007-8) che ne hanno impiegato 50, ma 42 di essi di forma asistemica, facendo inoltre diversi interventi congetturali.¹⁰ Gli studiosi, quindi, hanno giustamente sentito la necessità di una nuova edizione critica dell'*Achilleide*, e si sono proposti la titanica impresa di produrre un nuovo

Zum Jagdepos in Claud. *Stil.* 3 und in drei römischen Mosaiken der Spätantike," *Mnemosyne* 76, 2023, 307-39, p. 312 n. 22.

¹⁰ Gli studiosi osservano che, all'ed. di Hall et al. (Cambridge 2007-8), "riserve di fondo sono state sollevate dalla comunità scientifica in particolare riguardo [...] a scelte editoriali (di natura spesso congetturale) che tendono a banalizzare il dettato poetico dall'autore [sic] perché inficiate dal presupposto, non necessariamente condivisibile, che Stazio compose dei versi destinati ad essere immediatamente compresi dal suo pubblico" (p. 127), citando a n. 2 l'affermazione di Hall et al. (Cambridge 2007-8), secondo cui "Statius was a popular author who wrote to be understood on a first hearing" (vol. 1, p. vii) (cf. anche la recensione di H. Lovatt su questo stesso giornale, 14, 2010, 387-91, a p. 388). Hall et al. (Cambridge 2007-8), però, poco più avanti scrivono: "[w]e must go with the flow of the sense, and we must not be content except with a text which makes immediate sense. Are we to suppose that the non-sense which still passes for the work of Statius is what drew contemporary audiences to come running when they heard that a recitation had been advertised?" (pp. viii). L'idea chiaramente proviene dalla testimonianza di Juv. 7.82-3 *curritur ad uocem iucundam et carmen amicae | Thebaidos*. Che la conclusione sia audace ed eccessiva è fuori discussione, ma non è priva di fondamento.

testo collazionando tutti i manoscritti della tradizione e impiegando la tecnologia digitale con tutti i suoi vantaggi.

Gli autori poi (§ 2. Il sito web) descrivono le diverse pagine del sito allestito. Tra i tanti altri pregi, ho apprezzato particolarmente che, come descritto dagli studiosi, nella pagina “The Poem/Le poème,” la parte principale del sito, e dove si concentrano diverse risorse, si possono visualizzare le immagini dei manoscritti, che, molto notevolmente, inquadrano verso per verso e scorrono quando si seleziona uno di essi o una parola nel testo latino che è a fianco. Ma c’è di più. Le immagini hanno apposite icone che rinviano l’utente all’immagine intera del codice oppure alla sua descrizione nel catalogo di Anderson (Arlington, VA, 2009 (revised ed.)).¹¹ Il sito contiene anche altre pagine, su due delle quali (“The Manuscripts”/“Les Manuscrits” e “Dilke’s Interactive Apparatus”) si soffermano in seguito gli autori.¹²

Alcune osservazioni generali vengono poi esposte (§ 3. L’edizione: considerazioni generali), tra cui spicca la promessa degli autori di produrre in un futuro un commento testuale dell’opera (“il sito renderà disponibili le annotazioni editoriali riguardanti le scelte testuali, nonché gli strumenti di utilità più generale sopramenzionati,” p. 131). Per ultimo, gli autori fanno alcune osservazioni sulla metodologia adoperata per raccogliere i dati dei codici utili alla produzione dell’edizione (§ 4. Metodologia: la registrazione dei dati; § 4.1 *Descrizione del contenuto delle pagine*; § 4.2 *Collazione delle lezioni*; § 4.3 *Funzionamento del sito web*) e delle diverse sfide superate a tale scopo.¹³

Il contributo di Antonino Pittà, “Critica fra le righe: scelte lessicali pregnanti (nelle *Silvae*) e un problema testuale (in Petronio)”, discute tre tratti stilistici delle *Silvae* e infine propone un emendamento in Petronio. L’autore comincia (§ 1. *Bene καὶ καλῶς*: grecismi auto-riflessivi nelle *Silvae*) con una discussione sull’abbondante presenza di termini greci che vengono accuratamente bilanciati con parole tipicamente latine da Stazio. Ciò riflette una “applicazione concreta della doppia formazione del poeta e della natura ibrida della sua poesia” (p. 148). Pittà poi (§ 2. *In nova fert animus ...*) esamina due usi staziani di sintassi a sorpresa, sul tipo dell’attacco delle *Metamorfosi* ovidiane, *in noua fert animus*

¹¹ Un aspetto che non è previsto nel progetto finora, credo sia l’esame dei materiali paratestuali nei manoscritti – alcuni dei quali hanno diverse glosse (ad es. R) – che, oltre ad avere un valore per la tradizione esegetica del poema, possono pure fare luce sui rapporti tra testimoni. Tuttavia, con un accesso ai codici così agevolato grazie a questo progetto, altri studiosi potranno intraprendere il lavoro.

¹² La pagina “The Manuscripts”/“Les Manuscrits” contiene i *sigla* adoperati dagli studiosi. A questo riguardo, è veramente ingegnosa e soddisfacente la soluzione degli editori per far fronte al problema dell’escogitazione dei *sigla* di ca. 224 manoscritti: impiegare la numerazione del catalogo di Anderson.

¹³ Per raccogliere i dati dei codici gli studiosi hanno impiegato fogli di calcolo. Nei primi paragrafi di questa sezione essi spiegano come hanno fatto per riportarvi i diversi fenomeni attestati nei manoscritti sia nella descrizione (aggiunte marginali, trasposizioni, ecc.) che nella collazione delle lezioni (lezioni *ac* e *pc*, ecc.), illustrando gli esempi con immagini dei codici. Credo che sarebbe stato utile al lettore avere anche alcune immagini dei fogli di calcolo per poter seguire meglio il discorso.

mutatas dicere formas | corpora. in noua fert animus induce il lettore a pensare che Ovidio stia per proporre qualcosa di nuovo, ma dal seguito, *mutatas dicere formas | corpora*, egli si accorge che non è affatto così.¹⁴ Gli esempi presi in considerazione sono *Silv.* 4.9.1 *est sane iocus iste*, e *Ach.* 1.34-5 *uideo iam mille carinis | Ionium Aegaeumque premi; nec sufficit*, dove Stazio gioca con le aspettative del lettore. Nel primo caso egli prima pensa che quello che sta per leggere sia uno scherzo, nel secondo che, alle mille navi greche, non bastino lo Ionio e l'Egeo. Solo andando avanti nella lettura, si rende conto che il poeta vuol dire ben altro. In seguito (§ 3. Lessico a doppio taglio), sulla base dell'analisi di quattro passi (*Silv.* 1.3.101-4, 5.3.233-4, 3.161-7, 4.5.59-60),¹⁵ l'autore dimostra come "l'uso pregnante degli aggettivi permette a Stazio di segnalare uno scarto rispetto ai modelli, pur richiamati in modo inconfondibile" (p. 160).

Per ultimo (§ 4. Un problema in Petronio), Pittà propone la congettura *festiua* al posto del trádito *fortuna* in *Petr.* 5.17-9 *interdum subducta foro det pagina cursum | et festiua sonet, celeri distincta meatu; | dent epulas et bella* (la sua resa è anche molto efficace: "[t]alvolta, sottratta al foro la pagina prenda l'abbrivio e, marcata dal suo passo veloce, risuoni festosa; ma anche le guerre forniscano vivande (al futuro oratore)"), che trovo molto convincente: "[c]on *festiva* la caratterizzazione della *pagina* indica la natura giocosa, di 'evasione' dal mondo formale dei generi impegnati, di questa letteratura 'festosa'."¹⁶

Insomma, come mostrano questi sei contributi, si tratta di un volume pieno di nuove letture e spunti stimolanti per ulteriori discussioni. Sono certo che, come spera Federica Bessone nella *Premessa* (p. 16), questa silloge promuoverà altre iniziative del genere e stimolerà gli studi di poesia latina e ricezione.¹⁷

BARUCH MARTÍNEZ ZEPEDA

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

baruch.martinez@hotmail.com

¹⁴ Secondo Pittà, il modulo sarebbe agevolato dalla *scriptio continua*. Credo, però, che esso si basi piuttosto sulle cesure, che fanno così che il lettore si fermi in un certo punto, interpretando quanto letto prima come un'unità; poi, andando avanti, egli si accorge che la frase è ancora incompiuta e quindi il senso diverso, dovendo tornare indietro per rileggerla.

¹⁵ Il primo esempio di quest'uso si basa su un testo congetturale. Data la natura ipotetica, forse andava discusso con più cautela in nota.

¹⁶ Trovo altrettanto condivisibile la difesa di Pittà del trádito *sic ... | ... sic* in *Silv.* 1.3.31-2, al posto della correzione di Shackleton Bailey *nec ... | ... nec*: "[I]o stretto artificiale di Vopisco vanta acque tranquille e innocue, in contrasto con i flutti tempestosi e letali dei suoi omologhi greci, i quali, trasportati in territorio italico, perdono gli aspetti negativi" (p. 151). Ricordo qui anche la congettura di Leo *sed ... | ... sed* e l'espunzione di Hall et al. (Cambridge 2021) dei vv. 1.3.31b-33, che, alla luce del ragionamento di Pittà, risultano altrettanto superflui.

¹⁷ Il libro è edito in maniera molto accurata e con attenzione. Ho trovato soltanto pochi refusi. P. 23, n. 1, manca l'anno del libro di Hinds, 1998; p. 62, n. 3, invece di "ζανθοδερκής," leggi "ξανθοδερκής"; p. 66, n. 1, invece di "5, 473" leggi "5, 743 s."; p. 69, n. 4, invece di "*Aen.*, 12, 655," leggi "*Aen.*, 12, 656"; p. 161, nella numerazione dei versi di Petronio, invece di "5," leggi "15."

ANTONY AUGOUSTAKIS, R. JOY LITTLEWOOD, *Silius Italicus: Punica, Book 3. Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford Commentaries on Flavian Poetry, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2022, xvi+394 pp., £157.50, ISBN 978-0-19-882128-1.

After the publication of P.J. Davies' commentary on V.Fl. 7 (Oxford 2020), this book is a very welcome new volume in the series Oxford Commentaries on Flavian Poetry.¹ Antony Augoustakis and R. Joy Littlewood are noted and prolific scholars of Flavian Poetry. As to commentaries, the former has published a commentary on Stat. *Theb.* 8 (Oxford 2016); the latter, a commentary on Sil. 7 (Oxford/New York 2011) and another on Sil. 10 (Oxford/New York 2017). Furthermore, Augoustakis, with Neil W. Bernstein, has recently produced a splendid translation of the *Punica* (London/New York 2021).

The book is divided into General Introduction (pp. 1-62), Sigla, Text, Translation and Apparatus Criticus (pp. 63-145), Commentary (pp. 147-329), Bibliography (pp. 331-57) and Indexes (pp. 359-94). The introduction deals with all necessary topics to fully understand the text. Section 1 ("The Political Life and Literary Formation of Silius Italicus") narrates the events Silius experienced during his life, lists the various political offices he held, and describes the circumstances under which he composed his epic, how it was received in his own times, and its position regarding Neronian and Flavian poetry. Section 2 ("Hannibal's Enterprise") investigates the motivations both of Hannibal in invading Italy and attacking Rome, and of Silius in creating the character. Section 3 ("Hannibal and Imilce") analyses the figure of Imilce, Hannibal's wife, and "Silius' own creation," and the episode in which she and her husband are the main actors. Section 4 ("Hannibal's Army") considers the historiographical foundations and poetic elements of the catalogue of Hannibal's troops, and its political and cultural overtones. Section 5 ("Hannibal's Alpine Crossing") examines Hannibal's Alpine crossing from a historical, literary, and philosophical point of view. Section 6 ("Divine Prophecy") is devoted to the role of the divine prophecy in Book 3, the dialogue between Jupiter and Venus, and Hammon's oracle. Section 7 ("Language and Style") deals with some points of Silius' language and style, diction and figures of speech, epic similes, and metre and prosody. Section 8 ("Text and Transmission") provides a brief and incisive overview of the text and transmission of the poem. It is welcome that the introduction is extensively illustrated with four maps and three reproductions of the iconographic sources (there are also several further images illustrating the commentary).

¹ As I was writing this review, the commentaries by N. W. Bernstein on Sil. 9 (Oxford 2022), by C. Castelletti (posthumously edited by A. Augoustakis, M. Fucecchi, and G. Manuwald) on V.Fl. 8 (Oxford 2022), by C. McNelis on *Achilleid* (Oxford 2024), and by C. M. van der Keur on Sil. 13 (Oxford 2024) were published in this series. I wish to thank Sergio Casali, Stephen Harrison, and Luis Rivero García for reading this review and giving me valuable advice.

The translation is accessible, even for those who, like me, are not native English speakers. The commentary is very rich on inter- and intratextual, historical, linguistic, literary, metrical, and mythological subjects, and some textual issues are discussed sensibly and concisely. I will present some instances.

The note on 69-72, *spes o Carthaginis altae, | nate, nec Aeneadam leuior metus, amplior, oro, | sis patrio decore et factis tibi nomina condas, | quis superes bellator auum*, identifies the principal intertexts and clarifies their complex relations. Hannibal's words first evoke Lucan, then Hector's farewell to Andromache in *Iliad* 6.467-81 and Virgil's Aeneas to his son in *A.* 12.435-40. Furthermore, the apostrophe echoes and reverses Virg. *A.* 2.281 *spes o fidissima Teucrum*. The second Virgilian intertext "becomes very important for Silius here as he is looking at Homer through Virgil, since Aeneas is addressing Hector at *A.* 2.281 and Silius' Hannibal assumes a Hectoresque stance in *Punica* 3."

At 122-4 *tibi gloria soli | fine caret, credisque uiris ignobile letum | belligeris in pace mori. tremor implicat artus*, A. and L. identify the intratext of Imilce's words at 10.573 *tibi gloria leto*, where Hannibal praises dead Paulus on his pyre, with the punctual observation "in the same *sedes*."

I agree with the view of the authors who, at 200-2 *ardua quae sit, | scitatur, pestis terrasque urgentia membra | quo ferat et quosnam populos depascat hiatu*, in place of the transmitted *deposcat*, accept Heinsius' conjecture *depascat*, which here has "connotations of feral consumption," comparing Verg. *A.* 2.215 *morsu depascitur artus* (the snake and Laocoon). The translation is admirably precise and clear: "Hannibal sought to know what this monster was and in what direction the snake would heave its limbs that were crushing the lands and which people it would swallow in its gaping jaws."

The note on 354-6, *hos Viriatus agit Lusitanumque remotis | extractum lustris, primo Viriatus in aeuo, | nomen Romanis factum mox nobile damnis*, is illustrated with the Figure 4, a granite statue of Lusitanian warrior, first century AD, from Museu Nacional de Arqueologia. The production of these sculptural materials could demonstrate the prominence of the historical Lusitanian Viriatus (born c. 190 AD) in resistance to Rome's effort to conquer the northern Spanish peoples in the first half of the second century AD.

At 458, *fluminea sonipes religatus ducitur alno*, A. and L. rightly observe: "[t]he heavily dactylic rhythm (DDDS) appears to simulate the sound of horses' hooves." I can add that the lexical choice of *sonipes* by Silius is very fitting here: *inde et sonipes, quod pedibus sonat* (Isid. *Etym.* 12.1.43); cf. also *EV* s.v. *sonipes*.

Jupiter's prophesy is clearly and effectively summarized in the brief introductory note on 557-629. The speech—echoing of the first Book 1 of Virgil's *Aeneid* (223-96)—is divided in two parts: in the first (571-93), Jupiter deals with Venus' worries about the future of the roman people in view of the Carthaginian threat and explains the Second Punic War "as a lesson that the Romans need to learn after centuries of sloth and inactivity"; in the second (594-29), he prophecies

the coming of a new era under Flavians, enumerating their future *res gestae*. In sum, the note prepares the reader well for an easy and fluid reading of the passage.

The poetic commonplace of the palm-trees of Palestine and Judaea at 600, *palmiferamque senex bello domitabit Idumen*, corresponds to an iconic image from contemporary coinage. The authors fairly illustrate the adjective *palmiferamque* with a bronze sestertius (Fig. 5), 71 AD, from Rome, which shows on reverse the emperor Vespasian holding spear and parazonium, and with foot on helmet at right, and the personified Judaea seated under palm-tree at left.

In the note on the final lines of the Book, 713-14, *talia portabat laetis oracula Bostar | implebatque uiros pugnae propioris amore*, A. and L. stress a notable characteristic of Silius' epic style: "[a] striking characteristic of Silius' epic style is his careful and often heavily intertextual choice of words in the final two lines of a book", referring to 10.657-8 *haec tum Roma fuit. post te cui uertere mores | si stabat fatis, potius, Carthago, maneres*, where, e.g., many Propertian and Virgilian intertext are present. Here, we have an intratext (9.36-7 *turbidus aegra | pestifero pugnae castra incendebat amore*) and a Virgilian intertext (*A.* 6.314 *ripae ulterioris amore*).

The bibliography is exhaustive. It is noteworthy that in the first part of every section there is a list containing the general bibliography that can guide the reader on the topic (differently from some other volumes in this series). The four indexes (Latin words and phrases, Greek words and phrases, *index locorum*, and general index) are helpful and make the volume usable.

However, as for the text and apparatus, some issues merit discussion.

A. and L. follow Delz's 1987 Teubner edition. They declare (p. 62) that they differ from Delz at nine points: 229 *ruptis* Delz/*raptis* A. and L.; 328 *prima/pigra*; *saxo/taxo*; 329 *saxo/taxo*; 356 *†pactum†/factum*; 395 *†ortano†/ornatu*; 532 *prona/plana*; 597 *denabit/durabit*; 678 *Thebes/Hebes*; 682 *†niueis† ... alis/nigris Afris*. I can add: 73 *numeret/numerat* (see below); 235 *ac/at*; 320 *huic/huc* (see below); 322 *huic/huc* (see below); 659 *aut/et*.²

A. and L. claim in the Sigla (p. 64): "The following sigla have been adopted from the preface in Delz (1987) as they pertain to the apparatus criticus of this edition of *Punica* 3." But this adoption – or rather adaptation – is not always so clear.

The siglum C "codex deperditus Coloniensis, Stamp. Ross. 1446" (p. 64) seems a mixture between the "codex deperditus Coloniensis" (for which see Delz LIV-LXIV), that has no siglum in Delz, and an exemplar of the second Roman printed edition, i.e. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Stamp. Ross. 1446 (for which see ISTC No. is00504000, consulted on 08/29/2024). This enigmatic siglum is used only once by A. and L. in their apparatus, and this gives rise to the following note, clearly incorrect:

² In all these places, A. and L. agree with Duff's 1927-34 Loeb edition.

14 clauigeri Δ² bl *et marg. exemplarium r2 C v1 Vat. Inc. II 427, fort. emendatio Calderini: corni- ω Cm Ep. 34, sed de testimonio licet dubitare ('plane legendum reponendumque uideri')*.

Delz's apparatus reads:

14 clauigeri Δ² bl *et marg. exemplarium r2 Stamp. Ross. 1446 v1 Vat. Inc. II 427, emendatio ut puto Calderini: corni- ω Cm Ep. 34, sed de testimonio licet dubitare ('plane legendum reponendumque videri')*.

Delz says that *clauigeri* is also in the margin of certain copies of r2 (= second Roman edition) and v1 (= first Venetian edition), namely in the margin of Stamp. Ross. 1446 and of Vat. Inc. II 427 (both from Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana) respectively. A. and L. have at their disposal the note of the commentary to clarify the situation, and possibly justify their unexpected replacement of "Stamp. Ross. 1446" with C (= "codex deperditus Coloniensis, Stamp. Ross. 1446"); but in their note ad loc. this is all they say about the textual problem in question: "Delz considers *clauiger* an emendation by Calderini, but see Muecke and Dunston (2011) 198, who do not think the authorship of the correction is certain" – which, by the way, is not much different from what Delz claims ("ut puto").

Even from this example alone, it is clear that not only the sigla but also the apparatus itself is an adaptation of Delz's. There are many cases in which the apparatus inherited from Delz registers variants and/or conjectures that are not discussed at all in the commentary (e.g. at 104 van Veen's conjecture *regnabat* instead of the transmitted *regnarat*; at 530 Summer's conjecture *quocumque* in place of the transmitted *quacumque*; see below).

For Venetian editions (p. 65), A. and L. offer two sigla, v1 ("editio Veneta cum commentariis Petri Marsi (a. 1483)") and v2 ("editio Veneta cum commentariis Petri Marsi (a. 1492)"), but v3 ("editio Veneta cum commentariis Petri Marsi (a. 1493)") and v ("editiones Venetae cum commentariis Petri Marsi [i.e. the consensus of v1, v2 and v3, of course]," Delz p. LXX) are missing, notwithstanding the fact that the second is quoted 25 times in the apparatus.

These are some of my observations on the text:

73: A. and L. print *numerat*, but the apparatus reproduces that of Delz, who prints *numeret*. Nothing is said in the commentary on the issue.

181: both Delz and A. and L. print *ille*. A. and L.'s apparatus reads:

ille Delz coll. Coripp. Ioh. 1.451-4: sic Iuppiter ille, | ut ueteres aiunt gentili carmine uates | ... | ... monebat: ipse Liwineius, cf. Virg. A. 7.110.

From the apparatus of A. and L. it follows that *ille* is a conjecture of Delz, advanced by him on the basis of a comparison with Corippus; *ipse* would be Livineius' conjecture, advanced on the basis of a comparison with *Aen.* 7.110. What the reading of the manuscripts is remains obscure. The situation is quite different, as can be seen from Delz's apparatus:

ipse Livineius, cf. Verg. Aen. 7, 110, ubi v.l. ille praetulerim coll. Coripp. Joh. I, 451 sq. sic Iuppiter ille, / ut ueteres aiunt gentili carmine uates / ... monebat.

ille is the reading of the mss.; Livineius conjectured *ipse* on the basis of *Aen.* 7.110, but – according to Delz – even in *Aen.* 7.110 the variant *ille* is to be preferred, as the comparison with Corippus would demonstrate. The mistake persists in A. and L.’s note ad loc.: “The deictic *ille* seals Mercury’s message; this is Delz’s correction of *ipse*, according to Coripp. *Ioh.* 1.451-3 etc.”

229: A. and L. print *raptis*. This is their apparatus:

raptis r1 v: ruptis ω Ch: iunctis Delz [sic].

Combined with the information at p. 62, according to which Delz prints *ruptis*, this would seem to indicate that Delz prints *ruptis*, but also advances *iunctis* as a conjecture of his own. In their note ad loc. A. and L. say: “Delz (1987) adopts the more difficult reading (ω) *ruptis* [...] But he later (1997) 165-6 changes it to *iunctis*.” In fact, in his article “Nachlese zu Silius Italicus,” *MH* 54 (1997), 163-74, Delz does express his preference for *iunctis*, but he correctly attributes it to G. Thilo.

320: A. and L. print and lemmatize *huc coit aequareus Nasamon*. Their apparatus reads:

huic F G Ch: hinc L γ: huc Heinsius, *edd. rec.*

That is, they reproduce the apparatus of Delz, who, however, prints *huic*. The problem is not discussed in the commentary. The same happens at 322.

395: A. and L.’s apparatus reads:

ornatu Delz, *sed posuit signum corruptelae*: hortano V² P *edd. a* v: hortando δ ς: arcano G² E J M K² R² U² Ch (? ‘ita certe Coloniensis codex cum allis [sic] quibusdam’) *edd. rec.*

From A. and L.’s apparatus one cannot understand which is the situation in Delz’s edition. The note ad loc. is clearer: “Delz obelizes the transmitted *ortano* [...] suggesting *ornatu* in his apparatus, which we follow here.” A. and L. should have said that the references to Dict. 3.2 and *Aen.* 1.686, which they quote in their note, were already present in Delz’s apparatus.

479-81: *cuncta gelu canaque aeternum grandine tecta | atque aeui glaciem cohibent; riget ardua montis | aetherii facies*. In his apparatus Delz observes: “locus varie temptatus mihi sanus esse videtur: *cuncta ... tecta* sc. sunt (de ellipsi cf. 1, 366 sq.; 3, 503 sqq.; 6, 74 sq.) *atque aeui glaciem* i. aeternam glaciem *cohibent* i. solvi non sinunt, cf. 14, 66 sqq.” In A. and L.’s commentary, one would expect some discussion of the various conjectures to which Delz alludes in his note; instead, they only say: “In his apparatus, Delz correctly defends and glosses the elliptical *atque aeui glaciem* as *aeternam glaciem* and *cohibent* as *solui non sinunt*.” One could have mentioned, for example, the proposal by J.S. van Veen (“Notulae criticae ad Silium Italicum,” *Mnemosyne* 17 (1889), 368-77, at 371): *atque aeui glacie cohibens riget ardua montis | aetherei facies* (van Veen’s article is mentioned in A. and L.’s bibliography).

599: this is A. and L.’s apparatus:

ripis susp. [= “suspexit,” according to Abbreviations and notes, p. 65] *Delz*: *uiridis fort. Delz coll. Sen. Con. 4 praef. 3: remis Schrader secundum Haupt (1870) 345, cf. Luc. 1.370.*

Delz's apparatus reads:

ripis suspectum: remis Schrader, cf. Luc. 1.370: an uiridis? cf. Sen. Con. 4 praef. 3 audiui ... illum et uiridem et postea iam senem.

Delz's doubts about ripis should not have been mentioned in the apparatus, but only discussed in the commentary. Moreover, the use of “susp.” (= “suspexit”), and that of “fort.” in this way to indicate his conjecture instead of the mere mention of it followed by his last name are strange.

682: A. and L. print *nigris ... Afris*; their apparatus reads:

nigris ... Afris fort. Delz, nam et alis suspectum propter ales: nigris Beger, u. Drakenborch: furuis Heinsius.

Delz prints †niueis† ... alis, and his apparatus reads:

nigris Beger, v. Drakenborch: furuis Heinsius: an nigris ... Afris? nam et alis suspectum propter ales.

Apart from the fact that instead of “*nigris ... Afris fort. Delz*” one should have said “*nigris ... Afris dub. Delz*,” A. and L.’s annotation does not make much sense, because they forget to mention the reading of the mss., that is *niueis ... alis*.

All in all, this is a very good commentary, and it will be undoubtedly useful to both students and specialists, but it could have been even better if the authors had paid more attention to its more strictly philological aspects.³

BARUCH MARTÍNEZ ZEPEDA

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

baruch.martinez@hotmail.com

FRANCES B. TITCHENER, ALEXEI V. ZADOROJNYI, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Plutarch*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023, x+502 pp., ISBN 978-0-521-76622-7 [Hardback]; 978-0-521-17656-9 [Paperback].

Plutarchan scholars have at their disposal a new Companion to explore the vast and rich literary production of our beloved Plutarch. The book contains a list of Figures (p. vii), a list of Contributors (pp. viii-ix), the Acknowledgments (p. x), the Introduction (pp. 1-10), nineteen contributions (pp. 11-402), the Bibliography (pp. 403-69), an Appendix with Plutarch’s *Moralia* (pp. 470-3), and two Indexes (pp. 474-502).

³ There are several typos (e.g. p. 5 n. 32 “Fuccechi”; p. 343: “Nachless”), especially in the apparatus.

The contributions are placed numerically without further arrangement. Chapter 1, “Plutarch and Biography,” explores Plutarch’s contribution to the shaping of the biographic genre. Structuring the chapter around the ten rules for biography suggested by Hermione Lee, Ch. Pelling analyzes Plutarch’s use of each of them, thus bridging the gap between ancient and modern biography and consequently proving the great influence Plutarch has exerted in the field.

In ch. 2, “Romanness and Greekness in Plutarch,” M. Tröster focuses on the *Lives of Philopoemen, Flaminius, Marius* and *Lucullus*, and completes the analysis with passages from *Moralia*, to determine that Plutarch’s “writings are in no small measure shaped by broader phenomena of hybridity and modes of cultural dominance, assertion, and resistance” (p. 33).

T. Duff, in his contribution “Plutarch as a Moral and Political Educator,” highlights the extent of Plutarch’s main interest, morality, and proves how pervasive this notion is throughout the corpus by paying particular attention to works on literary criticism, practical morality, politics, and the biographies. These suggest the need of an active involvement from readers in order to evaluate and judge for themselves the moral anecdotes and advice.

Ch. 4, “In the Spirit of Plato,” analyzes Plutarch’s relationship with philosophy, both contemporary and subsequent, and highlights his commitment to Platonism, albeit via his own personal interpretation of Plato’s works (i.e. being influenced by Pythagoreanism, the skeptical outlook within the Platonic school, and Aristotelianism). In order to present Plutarch’s idea of Platonism, J. Opsomer focuses on three core notions: the soul, the divine, and the cosmos.

J. Dillon and A. Zadorojnyi explore a side of Plutarch less notorious: his polemical writings against certain philosophers, previous historiographers, and even poets. When polemicizing with philosophical ideas, his treatises against Epicureans and Stoics are well known, but interestingly he also criticizes his own philosophical school, as in *De animae procreatione in Timaeo*, with Xenocrates’ and Crantor’s interpretation of the creation of the world. The authors demonstrate that Plutarch was an accomplished polemicist who often resorted to the rhetorical technique of reducing the opponents’ argument to the absurd.

In “Religion and Myth in Plutarch,” R. Lamberton explores part of the corpus (*De superstitione*, the Delphic dialogues, *De Iside et Osiride*), to demonstrate that, while we often find religious references, anecdotes and considerations, there are obvious difficulties to extract Plutarch’s own views on the matter. The author also summarizes the three theosophical myths included in *De facie*, *De genio* and *De sera*, to investigate how Plutarch, in the line of Plato, uses myth to convey difficult and abstract truths.

K. Oikonomopoulou, in “Plutarch at the Symposium,” categorizes the sympotic scenes and treatises as “undoubtedly idealistic, serving purposes of literary self-presentation” (p. 139), and as a continuation and development of the sympotic works of Plato and Xenophon. Notwithstanding this, Plutarch not only is an imitator but also a creator, and his own presentation of the genre made him a model for later

authors, such as Aulus Gellius, Athenaeus and Macrobius. The author centers the study on the *Septem sapientium convivium* and *Quaestiones Convivales* to show the characteristics of Plutarch's symposia, such as their panhellenism and their use for philosophical inquiry and moral character development.

D. Russell was in charge of ch. 8, "Language, Style, and Rhetoric," where he emphasizes Plutarch's versatility to vary the style according to genre and to different characters, but also the richness of imagery and comparisons, allusions, quotations and rhythmic patterns. To showcase these features, the author offers an in-depth analysis of passages from the *Life of Antony*, *Life of Agesilaus*, *De fortuna Romanorum*, *De vitando aere alieno*, *De curiositate*, and *De Pythiae oraculis*.

Ch. 9, "Plutarch and Classical Greece," focuses on our author's relationship to the glorious past of his country. While acknowledging that the new era in which he lived was superior, more peaceful, than the distant past, Plutarch oftentimes idealizes Classical Greece, through its arts, culture, and education. Ph. Stadter is able to prove this by looking at the depiction of this period present both in *Moralia* (*De gloria Atheniensium*, *De Herodoti Malignitate*, and *De genio Socratis*) and in the *Parallel Lives* devoted to heroes of that period (Solon, Themistocles, Lysurgus, Alcibiades, Dion).

M. Beck writes about "Great Men. Leadership in Plutarch's *Lives*" and resorts to modern theories on leadership to analyze the characters selected by Plutarch, based on the five components that structure emotional intelligence (without which there is no true leader): self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. The author also looks at the types of leadership, transformational and transactional, undertaken by the characters in the *Lives* as well as the role of *mimesis* as a helpful instructive tool for the readers.

In "Thinking 'Private Life': Plutarch on Gender, Sexuality, and Family," F. Frazier discusses the concepts of *oikos*, family, and marriage in Plutarch's work from the perspectives of civil, moral and familial duty. In this sense, several works from Plutarch's corpus are inspected (*De fraterno amore*, *Amatorius*), as well as the behavior of the heroes from several *Lives*.

Ch. Pelling, in "Wealth and Decadence in Plutarch's *Lives*," explains that, for Plutarch, the issue with wealth lies in an improper use rather than in the possession of wealth in itself. The author reflects on the luxury and decadence present in several *Lives*, particularly looking at the criticism expressed in the Spartan *Lives* and the "more surprising mutedness" (p. 247) in the Roman *Lives*. Through the analysis of Agesilaus and Pompey, Agis, Cleomenes and the Gracchi, Ch. Pelling observes that wealth is often barbarized and feminized.

E. Almagor, devotes ch. 13 to "Plutarch and the Barbarian Other." As the author explains, "while barbarians do appear in Plutarch as the traditionally stereotyped and denigrated 'others' of classical literature [...], they also have other roles to play, which reflect the more specifically Plutarchan agendas" (p. 261). The author examines the adjectives with which barbarians are qualified in the corpus, concluding that both negative and positive traits may be found (depending

on the intended portrayal) and that oftentimes the references to the 5th century BCE may be implicitly referring to the Rome of Plutarch's day.

Ch. 14, "Plutarch and Animals," discusses the relationship the Chaeronean had with animals: while he is often seen as an advocate for the rights of animals, the authors, J. Mossman and A. Zadorojnyi, offer a more muted, less anachronistic panorama of Plutarch's views. In their analyses of passages of both the *Lives* and *Moralia*, they showcase how Plutarch had a fundamentally anthropocentric view of the world and explain that his resource to animals in the discussion often happens in an attempt to better understand human nature.

"Plutarch in Byzantium," written by N. Humble, focuses on the transmission of Plutarch's corpus and on six specific examples from the 9th to the 12th centuries: the patriarch of Constantinople, Photius; the archbishop, Arethas; the court of the emperor Constantine VII; the professor of philosophy, Psellos; the princess, Anna Komnene; and the Grand Logothete, Theodoros Metochites.

M. Pade, in "Plutarch in the Italian Renaissance," points out how Plutarch was rediscovered and widely read by Italian humanists and how he influenced the country, both politically and ethically during the 15th and 16th centuries.

Follows ch. 17, "Plutarch and the Spanish Renaissance," by A. Pérez Jiménez. Knowledge of Plutarch in Spain begins even earlier than in Italy, with a first translation of the *Parallel Lives* into Aragonese in the 14th century. From there, both the *Lives* and *Moralia* had a great impact on religion, philosophy, literature and general scholarly endeavors. The author offers a wide panorama of Spanish erudites who turned to Plutarch's work from the 15th to the 17th c., providing a clear overview, including four figures, of the popular trend of emblems.

J. Griffin focuses on "Plutarch and Shakespeare: Reviving the Dead." After establishing Shakespeare's knowledge of Plutarch, through Th. North's English translation, the author focuses on his treatment of the sempiternal figures of Julius Caesar, Antony, Cleopatra, and Coriolanus.

The last chapter, "Plutarch in France," centers around the first French translation of Plutarch's corpus by Amyot mid-16th c. and the influence both this translation and the Greek text had on the following two centuries in French literature. K. MacDonald starts the analysis with the *Moralia*, highlighting its use by François Rabelais, Pierre de Saint-Julien, Michel de Montaigne, and Agrippa d'Aubigné; and continues with the *Lives*, and their use by Jean Bodin, Charles de Saint-Évremond, Voltaire, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, or Gabriel Bonnot de Mably.

The aim of the volume, as the editors clearly express in the Introduction, is "to provide general information on Plutarch and his intellectual position in the discursive and sociocultural context(s)" (p. 1); after which they offer a summary of Plutarch's work, his life, and significance. They close the Introduction devoting the book to D. Russell, a great scholar who unfortunately passed away in 2020. The caring words of the editors showcase Russell's character as a professional colleague and genuine person. On a personal note, given that the volume includes a contribution by the late F. Frazier, who passed away a few years earlier, it

would have been a nice touch to dedicate some words to this relevant scholar of Plutarchan studies as well.

As mentioned above, there seems to be no particular arrangement of the contributions. The editors explain that it “will be addressed from different angles, yet working toward a joined-up vision of the ancient author [...]”. It is for this reason that the contributors were not assigned a rigid agenda, with the editors preferring to reach out to readers, whether general or expert, in different areas looking for a *tour d’horizon* as a background, or perhaps a launching pad, for some more specific interest” (p. 10).

The intention of assuring a variety of topics that arouse curiosity in the reader is most certainly laudable, but this intention results in two problematic issues. Firstly, while all the contributions cover a wide spectrum of perspectives regarding Plutarch and his work, the volume lacks any structure, and, consequently, unity. There are a couple of chapters devoted entirely to the *Lives* (10 and 12) but none to *Moralia*; some deal with literary questions, like genre (1, on biography; 7, on sympotic scenes) or style (8); others seem to focus on the context surrounding Plutarch (2, on Romanness and Greekness; 9, on his relationship to the past of Greece); yet again, others focus on his thought (3, on morality; 5, on polemics; 11, on family; 13, on barbarians) —notice that similar themes are not subsequent—; and the last five chapters deal with reception —a topic which received full attention in Brill’s *Companion to the Reception of Plutarch*, 2019, which incidentally shares the same authors for Plutarch’s reception in the Renaissance—. Secondly, the lack of a clear configuration has allowed for the appearance of repetitions of information across chapters as well as of information that feels should have been placed differently in the book. To mention a couple of examples: the description of the project of *Parallel Lives* is included in the Introduction and ch. 3 (pp. 2 and 65); the explanation of what the Catalogue of Lamprias is and its composition is included in the Introduction and in ch. 15 (pp. 3, 304); the ch. on Shakespeare —who used North’s translation of Amyot’s earlier French translation of Plutarch— is placed before the ch. on Amyot.

These issues do not necessarily diminish the value of individual contributions; a proper structure, however, would have allowed for less overlapping of themes between chapters and would have lent cohesion to the book as a unitary approach to Plutarch. The reiteration of information does not only affect the volume itself: given the fact that this is the third *Companion* devoted to Plutarch (including also Blackwell’s, 2014, and the aforementioned in Brill), the reader would hope for contributions with new material; yet, several chapters present similar contents to those included in the earlier books (for example, chs. 4, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19). Concerns for new material affect the bibliographic section too. It is abundant and covers a wide range of approaches to Plutarch’s oeuvre; however, given that the volume appeared in 2023, it is surprising that some of the contributions’ “further reading” (chs. 2, 4, 6, 11, 13) barely include publications from the last decade, a period in which Plutarch studies offered much valuable research.

The aforementioned problems seem to derive from a delay in the publication of the volume —this circumstance is not clarified by the editors in the Introduction, though—, but, unfortunately, they do affect the overall quality of the Companion.

LUISA LESAGE-GÁRRIGA
 Universidad de Córdoba
 llesage@uco.es

F. GARRIDO DOMENÉ, *Alipio. Introducción a la música*, introducción, traducción y notas, Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas, 2023, 140 pp., ISBN 978-84-7882-882-1.

Fuensanta Garrido Domené es Doctora en Filología Clásica (Griego) por la Universidad de Murcia y actualmente ejerce como profesora de la Universidad de Córdoba en calidad de miembro docente del Departamento de Estudios Filológicos y Literarios. Garrido está bien familiarizada con el estudio de la teoría musical griega antigua. Lo demuestra, por un lado, el análisis dedicado a los tratados de algunos teóricos musicales griegos recogidos por Carl von Jan en *Musici scriptores graeci*, Lipsiae 1895. El fruto de este análisis se materializó en su libro *Los teóricos menores de la música griega. Euclides el Geómetra, Nicómaco de Gerasa y Gaudencio el Filósofo*, Barcelona 2016. Otra edición crítica con traducción de su autoría es el “Libro IX. Sobre la Música. Liber IV. De Musica”, en F. Navarro Antolín, ed., *Las nupcias de Mercurio y Filología*, Madrid 2022. Por otro lado, se ocupó, junto con Antonio Astorgano Abajo, de la edición, introducción y notas de la obra de 1798 del jesuita Vicente Requeno *Ensayos históricos para servir al restablecimiento de la música de los antiguos griegos*, edición bilingüe, Córdoba 2021. Asimismo, en su producción científica destacan importantes estudios de teoría musical griega, como: “La división de los intervalos según Gaudencio el Filósofo” (2014), “Nómos y phýsis en la teoría musical griega antigua: música ‘normativa’ y música ‘natural’”, junto con F. Aguirre Quintero (2019), o “El pentacordo en Marciano Capela (§IX 962-963)” (2023). Todo ello confiere a F. Garrido la capacidad necesaria para abordar con autoridad el análisis, la traducción y la interpretación crítica de la obra de Alipio, labor que ha cumplido en este volumen con maestría.

En el estudio de la obra recogida en este libro —un fragmento conservado de un tratado de teoría de la música griega antigua— se pone de manifiesto la dificultad que existe a la hora de identificar a su autor (p. 9). La mayoría de los expertos lo identifican con Alipio¹ de Alejandría, pero se conocen (a través de manuscritos y fuentes epigráficas) otros personajes con el mismo nombre, si bien de distinta procedencia; por ejemplo, y en orden cronológico: Alipio de Bizancio

¹ O Alejandro (Ἀλέξανδρος). La forma “Alipio” aparece atestiguada a partir de Agustín de Hipona y Juliano el Apóstata (Garrido “El pentacordo”, p. 9).

(o bien Olimpio), obispo del siglo II, activo entre los años 166 y 169)²; Alipio de Antioquía, geógrafo que a mediados del siglo IV fue prefecto de la provincia de Britania; Alipio de Tagaste, obispo de la Iglesia católica de fines del siglo IV, discípulo de Agustín de Hipona³; Alipio de Constantinopla, sacerdote del siglo V de la misma localidad que se resistió a la herejía de Nestorio⁴, y Alipio de Adrianópolis (llamado el Estilita), asceta del siglo VII. Alipio de Alejandría no aparece en la Suda, pero Garrido (p. 11) informa que es identificado por Meursius⁵ con el filósofo neoplatónico de Alejandría y podría ser el teórico citado por Eunapio de Sardes en su vida de Jámblico (en *Vidas de los sofistas*) y por Casiodoro (*Inst.* 2.5.10). Una treintena de manuscritos le atribuyen la obra Εἰσαγωγὴ μουσικὴ (pp. 11-12).

Las propuestas de datación de esta obra son variadas y comprenden desde el siglo II hasta los inicios del siglo V de nuestra era, aunque con predominio entre los siglos III y IV. Garrido (p. 13) remite a Mathiesen⁶, según el cual la obra se podría haber completado entre fines del siglo IV y principios del V. La treintena de manuscritos que transmiten esta obra pertenecen a los siglos XII, XIII, XV, XVI y XVII, coincidiendo la última fase con el movimiento de recuperación de la música griega antigua promovido especialmente en Italia en torno a Vincenzo Galilei y Girolamo Mei.

Las ediciones conocidas corresponden a Joannes Meursius (1616), Athanasius Kircher (1650), Marc Meibom (1652) y Carl von Jan (1895). Para la traducción, Garrido se ha basado en la edición de Jan y ha tenido en cuenta también la de Meibom, así como las anotaciones de este al texto alipiano. Tal y como constata Garrido (pp. 24-5), las traducciones disponibles son escasas, en comparación con los estudios dedicados a la notación musical griega, como los publicados por Bellerman y Fortlage en 1847, Vincent en 1847 y Gevaert en 1875, así como los más recientes de Bataille en 1961, Gamberini en 1962, Anderson en 1994, Pöhlmann en 1997, Mathiesen en 1999 y 2002 y Hagel⁷ en 2009 y 2020 (entre otros estudios), a los que Garrido se refiere en numerosas ocasiones en su introducción y a lo largo de sus comentarios. En cuanto a las traducciones,

² Según el portal del Patriarcado Ecuménico de Constantinopla: <https://ec-patr.org>.

³ Véanse sus principales datos biográficos en San Agustín, *Confesiones*, c. 6.7.11; 6.10.16; c. 6.11-16; c. 6.25; c. 9.14. Más datos en Th. Campbell, “St. Alypius”, en *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 1, 1907.

⁴ Según una epístola de Cirilo de Alejandría. Véase: *Conciliarum Nova Collectio* en Mansi, vol. V. p. 1463 y A.J. Christie (1867), “Alypius”, en W. Smith, ed., *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, 1, p. 135.

⁵ J. Meursius, *Aristoxenus. Nicomachus. Alypius. Auctores musices antiquissimi*, 1616. Referencia en p. 189.

⁶ T.J. Mathiesen, *Apollo's Lyre. Greek Music and Music Theory in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Lincoln-London 1999. Referencia en p. 594.

⁷ Es oportuno remitir aquí, por su utilidad y amplitud, a la tabla elaborada por Hagel (en *Ancient Greek Music. A New Technical History*, Cambridge 2009, p. 13, diagrama 2), que presenta el sistema de notación griego antiguo plenamente desarrollado.

menciona la realizada por Charles Émile Ruelle al francés (publicada en 1895) y la de Luisa Zanoncelli al italiano (publicada en 1990). Cabe añadir otra más reciente, al griego moderno, a cargo de Athanasios Siamakis (2003).

En cuanto al contenido, la *Introducción a la música* de Alipio es un compendio de teoría musical incompleto del que se conservan unas líneas introductorias explicativas y una lista de los signos musicales (σημεῖα). Alipio (en 367-8) presenta, en primer lugar, las partes de las que consta la Música, a saber: la Harmónica, la Rítmica y la Métrica. De ellas considera preeminente la primera (la Harmónica). En segundo lugar, expone y define las siete partes de la Harmónica: las notas, los intervalos, las escalas, los géneros, los tonos, las modulaciones y la composición melódica. Garrido (p. 67 n. 7) aclara que estas categorías se remontan por lo menos a Aristóxeno de Tarento y se mantuvieron en autores posteriores. En tercer lugar, Alipio presenta los modos y los tonos, así como su orden, empezando por el lidio. En cuarto y último lugar, se refiere a las notas. Nos dice que unas son fijas o invariables (en número de ocho) y otras son móviles o variables (en número de diez). La distinción que el autor alejandrino nos ofrece radica en si cambian o no “en las diferencias de los géneros”; las primeras no lo hacen, mientras que sí lo hacen las segundas, que “cambian a otros grados de entonación”. Por último, Alipio clasifica las notas fijas en baripícnicas (cinco en total) y apícnicas (tres en total). Garrido (p. 71 n. 14) explica que tal clasificación obedece a la “posición del *pyknon* dentro del tetracordo”, y nos muestra la siguiente definición de Ruelle⁸ para *pyknon*: “un grupo de tres sonidos melódicos, en el que los dos extremos forman, en el tetracordo dado, un intervalo más pequeño que el intervalo situado inmediatamente en la parte aguda de este grupo”.

A continuación, Alipio expone la lista de signos del sistema de notación musical griego (en 368-406). Estos aparecen con su nombre y forma, y representan las notas de los distintos modos griegos para cada uno de los géneros: diatónico, cromático y enharmónico. A cada género pertenecen, respectivamente, quince series de signos (aunque con partes mutiladas en el enharmónico), que se corresponden con las tres escalas de cada uno de los cinco modos o τρόποι⁹ principales: lidio, eolio, frigio, jonio y dorio, siendo tres de ellos griegos autóctonos (eolio, jonio y dorio) y dos foráneos (lidio y frigio). Estas series o modos se despliegan de la siguiente manera: lidio, hipolidio, hiperlidio, eolio, hipoeolio, hipereolio, y así sucesivamente hasta quince por cada género (con las lagunas ya mencionadas). En el elenco se presenta en primer lugar el signo de la notación vocal (para el texto ο λέξις) y, en segundo lugar, el signo de la notación instrumental o de acompañamiento (κρούσις). A pesar de que el total de series debería ser de cuarenta y cinco, ello no es así, pues se ha perdido un número considerable de las pertenecientes al género enharmónico: por un lado, faltan las últimas notas

⁸ Ch.E. Ruelle, “Alypius et Gaudence, Bacchius l’Ancien”, en *Collection des auteurs grecs relatifs à la musique*, V, 1895. Referencia en p. 2 n. 4.

⁹ También denominados τόνοι y ἁρμοῖαι en distintas fuentes.

del modo eolio y las primeras del modo hipoeolio (que posiblemente estarían anotadas en un folio perdido del arquetipo, según Jan); por otro lado, faltan los últimos signos del modo hiperfrigio y todos los de los modos jonio, hipojonio, hiperjonio, dorio, hipodorio e hiperdorio, además de la continuación del tratado musical. En este sentido, Garrido (p. 72 n. 14) aporta la sugerencia de Ruelle¹⁰ según la cual, en la parte extraviada, Alipio definiría las notas mesopícnicas (las centrales) y las oxipícnicas (las agudas) y explicaría las partes o elementos que integran la Harmónica enumerados al principio.

La traducción de Fuensanta Garrido Domené destaca por ser la primera en lengua española y por abordar un tema poco conocido en la comunidad científica, más allá de personas expertas versadas en materia musical. Por otra parte, la importancia de la obra reside en el hecho de que se trata del compendio de notación más completo y detallado conservado hasta hoy de la música griega antigua. Además, este sistema se refleja en documentos de uso práctico que se han preservado hasta nuestros días: algo más de sesenta piezas musicales en soporte lapídeo, papiráceo o manuscritos y consistentes en himnos, canciones, partes dramáticas con música y piezas instrumentales que cubren, en total, un arco temporal de más de seis centurias desde el siglo III a.C. hasta un momento incierto del siglo IV d.C.¹¹ El fragmento conservado de Alipio pudo formar parte, según informa la traductora (pp. 15-16), de un tratado más amplio y pormenorizado que incluso podría haber sido recogido y comentado por tratadistas musicales de la Antigüedad tardía, siendo considerado tradicionalmente, a su vez, como el último estudio de la tratadística musical griega tardía. Garrido expone que autores como Aristides Quintiliano, Gaudencio, Baquio, Marciano Capela y Boecio incluyeron en sus trabajos signos musicales de la notación transmitida por Alipio, lo cual permite sugerir que todos ellos partieron de una tradición común en este aspecto, una tradición que se transmitiría a los lectores latinos de la Edad Media de la mano de Capela, Boecio y Casiodoro (pp. 19-20).

Pasando a las aportaciones de esta publicación, como se ha dicho, es la primera que reproduce la obra de Alipio en lengua española. Se trata de una traducción rigurosa en el contenido y cuidadosa en la forma, que es complementada por una valiosa introducción sobre los principales conceptos de la teoría musical relacionados directamente con el escrito de Alipio. Es lo que Garrido llama “una primera presentación” sobre la notación griega antigua y que, según anuncia (p. 26), precede a la aparición futura de “otro trabajo más detenido” sobre el tema. Los contenidos de la introducción brindan el contexto teórico necesario junto con las claves de significado esenciales para facilitar al lector una mayor comprensión de la obra traducida.

¹⁰ Referencia en p. 3 n. 2.

¹¹ Analizadas por numerosos expertos y compendiadas por E. Pöhlmann, M.L. West, *Documents of Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 2001, y E. Pöhlmann, *Ancient Music in Antiquity and Beyond. Collected Essays (2009-2019)*, Berlin-Boston 2020.

En esta introducción se ocupa de cuestiones relevantes sobre la teoría musical griega. Un primer aspecto versa sobre el “arte de ubicar los símbolos” (παρασημαντική, en la expresión empleada por Aristóxeno) sobre las sílabas del texto cantado, consistiendo primero solo en signos melódicos, a los que más tarde se incorporarían también los rítmicos (p. 26). Aborda el tema de la aparición escalonada de los signos de notación y su falta de estandarización, y pone sobre la mesa la discusión sobre el proceso de establecimiento del sistema de notación instrumental con anterioridad al sistema de notación vocal, surgido este del alfabeto jonio (pp. 28-30). En este sentido, expone la problemática sobre el origen, el significado y la interrelación de los signos de la notación instrumental (pp. 34-6), muchos de ellos agrupados en tríadas del tipo *pyknon*, que la traductora define como “tres notas relativamente cercanas en el tono y que abarcan no más de cinco cuartos de tono” (p. 37), lo que, según comenta Garrido, podría hacer pensar que, “en su origen, la notación se designaba para las escalas cromática y enharmónica” (p. 37). También informa sobre la conformación inicial del repertorio de signos para representar una octava¹² o dos¹³; repertorio creado al parecer, en sus comienzos, para el modo lidio, al que se añadirían nuevos signos para nuevas notas¹⁴ (p. 38). Profundiza en la configuración de la notación vocal y plantea la problemática de su correspondencia con el sistema de notación instrumental y su estructura en tríadas, a la vez que comenta el proceso de adición de nuevos signos para abordar todas las notas del repertorio musical (pp. 39-42). Garrido ilustra, a través de útiles tablas y gráficos de expertos, los distintos conjuntos formados por cada tipo de notación, que comenta ulteriormente para dar paso a la cuestión de las anomalías generadas en el sistema triádico al incorporar nuevos modos en la notación, como el mixolidio (pp. 44-8). Seguidamente, trata el aspecto del ritmo musical. Se refiere a la consideración de su derivación inicial a partir del metro del texto y a su desarrollo ulterior con independencia de este. En dicha fase, tal y como se recoge en la obra *Elementos rítmicos* de Aristóxeno, el ritmo se fundamentaría en la unidad básica de tiempo o *chronos* (χρόνος) –unidad que corresponde a la duración de una sílaba breve– y a partir de él se formarían agrupaciones de tiempos determinadas por el pie rítmico o *pous* (πούς), constituido, según Dionisio de Halicarnaso, por un tiempo marcado (βάσις) y otro no marcado (ἄρις) (pp. 48-50). Termina esta introducción informando sobre el sistema de notación rítmica, a saber, sus fuentes y sus tipos de signos, entre los que distingue las marcas de duración de cada nota, las agrupaciones de notas para una sílaba, las marcas de silencio y las del fraseo (estas últimas propias de los aerófonos de madera¹⁵ (pp. 50-5).

¹² Según J.G. Landels, *Music in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Abingdon 1999.

¹³ Según Mathiesen, *Apollo's Lyre...*

¹⁴ Según S. Hagel, *Ancient Greek Music*, 304-5 (“Notation”, en T.A.C. Lynch, E. Rocconi, eds., *A Companion to Ancient Greek and Roman Music*, Hoboken-New Jersey 2020, 297-310).

¹⁵ Según Hagel, *Ancient Greek Music*, 306 (“Notation”).

Antes de presentar la traducción del texto de Alipio, Garrido señala unas puntualizaciones. La primera consiste en la justificación del uso de la ‘h’ en los términos “enharmónico”, “harmonía” y sus derivados. La segunda se refiere a la adopción del vocablo “tetracordo” en lugar de “tetracordio”. Al fin, con la tercera informa sobre las expresiones empleadas para explicar la posición en la que son representados los signos en la tabla (pp. 56-7). Añade una bibliografía selecta de ediciones, traducciones y estudios críticos publicados por autores y autoras de referencia (pp. 57-64) y se adentra ya, sin más, en la traducción. En esta, las notas al pie aportan ante todo las variantes e interpretaciones conocidas del texto, como corresponde. Pero en ellas también se justifica el porqué de la importancia de la Harmónica por encima de las demás partes de la Música y se aclaran conceptos como los de *modo* (τρόπος), *tono* (τόνος), *harmonía* (ἁρμονία) o *acompañamiento instrumental* (κρούσις). Además, se incluyen explicaciones sobre la variabilidad en el número de modos y su origen, la predilección del modo lidio por parte de teóricos y filósofos (excepto por Platón, quien admitía solo el dorio), o sobre la diferencia entre notas fijas y notas móviles, entre otras cuestiones.

En último lugar, Garrido dota el libro con tres índices de términos musicales en tres lenguas: español-griego-latín, griego-latín-español y latín-español-griego. Estos índices, aparte de ser de gran ayuda por recopilar la terminología esencial empleada en el texto alipiano, constituyen un aporte no menos importante al vocabulario musical en lengua española.

Tal vez habría sido oportuno proveer las imágenes con un pie explicativo y recoger estas descripciones en un índice de figuras al final del libro. Aun así, estas imágenes son perfectamente introducidas en el texto y de ellas consta la información de procedencia en notas al pie.

En conjunto, cabe decir que, aun no pretendiendo con su introducción presentar un estudio profundo (según manifiesta en p. 26), en realidad Garrido logra exponer los rasgos fundamentales definitorios de la teoría musical griega en cuanto a la notación y los puntos de discusión más destacados sobre el tema en una remarcable síntesis. Se trata de un complemento idóneo para una obra importante por su unicidad, pero mutilada. A su vez, las notas al texto traducido, especialmente en la primera parte de la obra (previa a la tabla de signos), incorporan claves indispensables para entender el texto sintético de Alipio y contextualizarlo dentro de la teoría musical griega antigua.

En definitiva, la obra de Alipio posee un carácter didáctico y, a lo que parece, fue concebido como un manual para aquellos que en su tiempo pretendían formarse en música y teoría musical. Constituye un material imprescindible para conocer la configuración del sistema en el que se anotaba la música griega antigua. Este libro es útil e interesante tanto para filólogos clásicos como para estudiosos del mundo antiguo en general. Es también adecuado para teóricos e historiadores de la música y músicos profesionales en general. Para quien se inicia en el ámbito de la música griega antigua se recomienda complementar (o anticipar) la lectura de

este libro con algún manual o publicación introductoria como las de Henderson¹⁶, Michaelides¹⁷, Chailley¹⁸, Barker¹⁹, Landels²⁰, West²¹ o García López *et al.*²².

M. ISABEL PANOSA DOMINGO
 Universidad de Lleida
 mariaisabel.panosa@udl.cat

FEDERICA FAVERO, ROSSANA GUGLIELMETTI, eds., In parabolis Salomonis, In Ecclesiasten, In canticum canticorum. *Tre esposizioni iberiche*, Firenze: Sismel, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2023, v+957 pp., ISBN 978-88-9290-280-0.

El presente volumen ofrece el estudio y la edición crítica de diez comentarios anónimos a los libros sapienciales, la mayor parte de los cuales no contaban con edición crítica hasta ahora. Se trata de cuatro comentarios a los Proverbios (*Prov a, b, c y d*), cuatro comentarios al Eclesiastés (*Eccl a, b, c y d*) y dos comentarios al Cantar de los cantares (*Vox ecclesiae [primaria] = Vox y Vox ecclesiae [aucta] = Vox*). El germen del estudio lo constituye una suerte de tríptico de carácter exegetico, nacido probablemente en la Península Ibérica en torno al s. IX y anónimo, que debía de agrupar un comentario a cada uno de los libros bíblicos citados (ω). A partir de estos tres comentarios primigenios se desarrollaron diversas versiones, con particularidades propias, que, tal y como demuestran las autoras del libro, merecen un tratamiento individual y un estudio propio. A lo largo de las páginas que conforman el volumen, se demuestra que la tradición exegetica es por naturaleza móvil e inestable, por lo que aquellas que a priori pudieran parecer meras recensiones de una misma obra, a menudo deben ser consideradas distintas versiones con un carácter particular.

La obra se divide en tres secciones: “Sezione I: I commenti ai proverbi e all’Ecclesiaste” (pp. 5-796), a cargo de F. Favero, “Sezione II: Il commento al canticum dei cantici *Vox Ecclesiae*” (pp. 797-918), realizado por R. Guglielmetti, y “Sezione III. Conclusioni” (pp. 921-30), llevada a cabo a cuatro manos por ambas

¹⁶ I. Henderson, “Ancient Greek Music”, en E. Wellesz, ed., *The New Oxford History of Music*, I, *Ancient and Oriental Music*, Oxford 1957, 336-403.

¹⁷ S. Michaelides, *The Music of Ancient Greece. An Encyclopaedia*, London 1978.

¹⁸ J. Chailley, *La musique grecque antique*, Paris 1979.

¹⁹ A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings*, vol. I, *The Musician and his Art*, Cambridge 1984.

²⁰ J.G. Landels, *Music in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Abingdon 1999.

²¹ M.L. West, *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992.

²² J. García López, F.J. Pérez Cartagena, P. Redondo, *La Música en la Antigua Grecia*, Murcia 2012.

autoras. A continuación, ofrece una bibliografía conjunta (pp. 931-41) y dos índices: “Índice de manoscritti” (pp. 945-8) e “Índice dei nomi, dei testi anonimi e dei luoghi” (pp. 949-57).

La primera sección se ocupa de examinar y editar los comentarios *Prov a, b, c y d* y los comentarios *Eccl a, b, c y d*, todos ellos procedentes de una forma originaria no conservada actualmente —como se adelantaba *supra*. En primer término, Favero presenta los cuatro comentarios, que divergen entre sí a causa de su longitud, de los versículos comentados, de la amplitud de su transmisión manuscrita y de las fuentes empleadas, y concluye que tres de ellos son independientes, mientras que *Prov d* descende directamente de *Prov b*. Esta dependencia está ampliamente sustentada por las evidencias textuales, de un lado, y por las estructurales, de otro: ambas comentan exactamente los mismos versículos. En el caso de los cuatro comentarios al Eclesiastés —que comparten tradición manuscrita con los de los Proverbios— las conclusiones extraídas son prácticamente idénticas, si bien en este caso los datos textuales no son tan certeros como para confirmar por sí mismos la dependencia $b > d$.

Por lo que a las fuentes se refiere, *Prova, b, c y d* se componen fundamentalmente de pasajes procedentes de las obras de Gregorio Magno, a menudo filtrados por Tajón de Zaragoza, quien, en su *Liber sententiarum* y en sus *Excerpta* transmite una suerte de antología a partir de los textos del pontífice. La dependencia pedisecua que a menudo muestra Tajón con respecto a Gregorio, sin embargo, a menudo dificulta el poder determinar si la fuente es uno u otro. Otros autores empleados, aunque con menos profusión, son Isidoro de Sevilla, Jerónimo, Gregorio de Elvira, Casiano y Euquerio de Lyon. Mención aparte merece el uso que se hace de Beda, ya que no es común a los cuatro comentarios, sino únicamente a *b* y, por consiguiente, también a *d*: con el fin de ampliar el comentario con versículos que no debían estar en el modelo primigenio, el anónimo autor de *b* recurre con frecuencia a los textos del Venerable (hasta tal punto, que *b* dobla en longitud a *a* y *c*). Tal y como señala Favero, el uso que realiza el autor anónimo de sus fuentes “è rispettoso ma non sempre passivo” (p. 51); las dos modificaciones más sobresalientes son la reducción y omisión de algunos fragmentos y la simplificación de otros, con el fin de hacer llegar el texto a un público, probablemente, menos culto que el de la obra de Beda.

Tras la descripción de las fuentes, Favero concluye que el comentario primigenio a los Proverbios (*Prov*) debió de ser construido con un objetivo temático y no tanto motivado por las fuentes de las que dispusiera su autor, como sí ocurre en otras antologías coetáneas. Asimismo, propone un origen monástico, basándose en los versículos elegidos y los temas que estos tratan; geográficamente, se decanta por una realización en la península ibérica entre el s. VII^{ex} y el s. IXⁱⁿ. En el caso de las cuatro versiones de *Eccl*, éstos hacen uso, fundamentalmente, de Gregorio Magno —en ocasiones también a través del filtro tajoniano— y, en menor medida, de Agustín, Fulgencio de Ruspe y Apringio de Beja, siendo estos dos últimos elementos interesantes para

sustentar la hipótesis del origen hispano del comentario original. Solamente *Eccl b* (y, por consiguiente, *d*) utiliza también fragmentos de Jerónimo. Este hecho es particularmente relevante ya que permite desechar la hipótesis de que este comentario fuese un epítome de los *Comentaria in Ecclesiasten* de Alcuino, una hipótesis contenida en la descripción del código P (Paris, BnF, lat. 2822) —único supérstite de esta forma— proporcionada por el *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, III, p. 115. Favero argumenta que esta hipótesis no es válida, puesto que los pasajes jeronimianos utilizados en uno y otro (*Eccl b* y Alcuino, respectivamente) no coinciden. Finalmente, al igual que había afirmado para *Prov*, Favero propone para *Eccl* un origen ibérico, sosteniendo como uno de los argumentos principales la utilización de la obra *Liber ad Scarilam de incarnatione Filii Dei* de Fulgencio de Ruspe (CPL 822), ya que ésta solamente se conserva en un manuscrito procedente de Ripoll (ms. 151). Indica también la editora que la utilización del *Tractatus in Apocalypsin* de Aprincio de Beja es otro elemento a favor, sin embargo, en este caso, no indica nada sobre la transmisión manuscrita de la obra.

Especialmente interesante resulta el capítulo que Favero dedica al texto utilizado de la Biblia por el anónimo comentador (II. 3. “Il testo biblico di riferimento”, pp. 91-9), en el que concluye que aquellas lecturas que se apartan de la Vulgata se asemejan a las del texto principal (no así al de las manos subsidiarias) del ms. Autun, Bibliothèque Bussy-Rabutin, S.18. De ello deduce que el arquetipo de los comentarios conservados pudo tener acceso a algún código relacionado con éste; un hecho que volverá a sacar a relucir Guglielmetti en el estudio que dedica a los comentarios al Cantar de los cantares. Por otra parte, algunos pasajes (p. ej. Prov 9.3) presentan una interpretación muy cercana a la del *Missale Mozarabicum*, lo que nuevamente apoya la hipótesis de un origen de los comentarios en área ibérica.

El tercer capítulo de esta primera sección está dedicado a la tradición indirecta de los comentarios. La forma más empleada es la *a*, seguida de la *b*, probablemente —según Favero—, por el hecho de que fueron difundidas en territorio francés en época carolingia y llegaron, por consiguiente, a manos de autores como Ps. Salonio, Ambrosio Autperto, Esmaragdo de Saint-Mihiel y Erico d’Auxerre. Por último, resulta muy llamativa la inclusión de algunos fragmentos de los comentarios (fundamentalmente de *d*, en este caso) en una edición del s. XVIII del comentario a los Proverbios de Beda, realizada por J. Martianay. La tradición indirecta comentada es muy heterogénea en términos cuantitativos y, en base a ello, también lo son las líneas dedicadas a cada autor. Sin embargo, consideramos que el punto dedicado a Ambrosio Autperto es extremadamente sucinto; una explicación algo más amplia habría sido de gran interés.

Aunque a priori, al examinar el índice, puede sorprender que no haya un capítulo específico dedicado a la descripción de los manuscritos empleados, esta se encuentra dentro del capítulo IV. “La costruzione dello stemma”. Ambos aspectos se encuentran en el volumen bastante coligados; por ejemplo,

al hilo de la descripción paleográfica del ms. P se incluye el listado con las correcciones realizadas en dicho testimonio (P p.c.), fruto del cotejo que realiza el compilador con las fuentes de la obra. Las páginas dedicadas a la construcción del *stemma* de *Prov* se abren con la demostración de la existencia de un arquetipo a la cabeza de *a*, *b*, *c* y *d*; su existencia se ve probada por una serie de errores conjuntivos que la autora analiza de manera detallada. Otras corruptelas examinadas a continuación, en cambio, no pueden imputarse con absoluta certeza al arquetipo, ya que podrían derivar también del propio original o del texto que se haya empleado para la consulta de las fuentes. Algunas de ellas, de hecho, podrían considerarse meras desviaciones gráficas de la norma clásica. El *stemma* reconstruido es de carácter bífido: una de las ramas da lugar a las versiones *a* y *b* (*d*), y la segunda, a *c*, un hecho que se sustenta, además, en la diversidad de las fuentes empleadas por parte de los tres primeros y el último, respectivamente.

El *stemma* de *Eccl* es, a grandes rasgos, muy similar a *Prov*. Y, aunque los errores que sustentan la existencia de un arquetipo a la cabeza de la tradición son menos numerosos, uno de ellos constituye una laguna de envergadura suficiente como para defender su existencia sin necesidad de más pruebas. En el caso de *Eccl* existe una dificultad añadida: dónde situar el origen de la recensión *a*, dado que su estructura y la de la redacción primigenia parecen ser idénticas. Para ello, la editora decide proceder tomando como modelo el *stemma* de *Prov*, ya que — como hemos señalado — en el resto de puntos son casi idénticos. Nuevamente en este caso, la bipartición del *stemma* se basa tanto en cuestiones estructurales como estrictamente textuales: *a* y *b* (*d*) derivan de un mismo hiparquetipo, mientras que *c* representa la segunda rama de la tradición. Además, también en este caso *Eccl d* constituye una ampliación de *Eccl b* y, por ello, a nivel estemático deriva directamente de él.

En cuanto a la edición propiamente dicha, Favero ha optado por editar, en ambos casos, *Prov* y *Eccl a*, *c* y *b a fronte* (*a* y *c* en la página de la izquierda y *b* a la derecha), y la recensión *d*, de manera independiente. Por lo que a la *facies graphica* se refiere, como es habitual en los textos de esta época, no existe homogeneidad entre los manuscritos, a lo que se suma, en este caso, el desconocimiento seguro del origen de los textos. Por ello, Favero ha decidido estampar el texto de acuerdo con la norma clásica. El aparato crítico es positivo y, además de los errores *stricto sensu*, recoge las variantes ortográficas cuando pueden provocar una confusión léxica. Cada recensión tiene su propio aparato crítico y, además, hay un aparato de fuentes (en el que también se incluye la tradición indirecta), común a las tres recensiones y situado en la página derecha bajo el aparato crítico de *b*. El texto *d* va acompañado de su propio aparato crítico y su aparato de fuentes. En Apéndice se incluyen los pasajes añadidos en el ms. Madrid, BNE, 37, que afectan a la recensión *C* de ambos comentarios (*Prov* y *Eccl*). Tras los criterios de edición y antes del texto crítico, se incluyen varios listados con las correcciones realizadas por las manos secundarias que intervienen en todos los códices.

La segunda parte del volumen (“Sezione II. Il commento al Cantico dei cantici *Vox ecclesiae*”) ofrece la edición del comentario al Cantar de los cantares conocido como *Vox ecclesiae* en sus dos redacciones (*primaria* = *Vox* y *aucta* = *Vox₂*), y un apéndice dedicado a la *Vox antiquae ecclesiae* (*Vox a. e.*), que no incluye la edición del texto, sino una actualización de su tradición manuscrita y la repercusión que esta tiene en el aparato crítico. Ambos textos (*Vox* y *Vox a. e.*) habían sido publicados por Guglielmetti en 2004¹, si bien tres motivos de peso han llevado a la estudiosa a realizar una nueva edición del primero: a) el no haber tenido en cuenta en la edición previa las dos redacciones existentes de *Vox* (en la edición actual las edita *a fronte*: *Vox ecclesiae* [forma primaria] y *Vox ecclesiae* [forma aucta]); b) la selección más acertada de variantes, a partir de la edición crítica del texto de Justo de Urgel, editado por ella misma en 2011 y del que no disponía, por tanto, en 2004² y c) el descubrimiento de cinco nuevos testimonios manuscritos que arrojan luz a la hora de reconstruir el texto crítico. Por lo que a este último punto respecta, nos hallamos ante un caso en el que la máxima *recentiores non deteriores* cobra especial relevancia. Los manuscritos más recientes conservan un prólogo de *Vox* que había sido suprimido de los códices carolingios y que, dado que se basa fundamentalmente en el capítulo introductorio del comentario de Gregorio de Elvira —fuente principal de la obra— parece a todas luces auténtico. La consideración de estos manuscritos tardíos ha permitido poder incluir el prólogo en la presente edición.

El comentario conocido como *Vox* tiene su origen en un testimonio manuscrito transmisor de las tres obras que constituyen sus fuentes principales: los comentarios de Gregorio de Elvira y Justo de Urgel, y los *Excerpta* de Tajón de Zaragoza. El uso de este último autor fija el *terminus post quem* de su composición —dado que la utilización de Beda no se puede probar de manera indiscutible—, mientras que la utilización de *Vox* por parte de Angelomo de Luxeuil en sus *Enarrationes in Canticum Canticorum* (a. 851) establecen el *terminus ante quem*. Por otra parte, al igual que ocurría con los dos comentarios editados por Favero, se debe buscar su raíz en la Península Ibérica, dado que la rama del código utilizado como fuente se sitúa en este territorio. Asimismo, *Vox a. e.* deriva directamente de *Vox₂*.

Una de las mayores complejidades que implica la individualización y el tratamiento de las dos recensiones (*Vox* y *Vox₂*) es la identificación de los pasajes omitidos o añadidos en cada una de ellas con respecto a lo que podría considerarse un texto original anterior a ambas. En un principio podría considerarse que los

¹ R.E. Guglielmetti, ed., *Alcuino. Commento al Cantico dei cantici – con i commenti anonimi Vox ecclesie, Vox antiquae ecclesie*, Firenze 2004.

² R.E. Guglielmetti, ed., *Giusto d’Urgell, Explanatio in Cantica Canticorum. Un vescovo esegeta nel Regno Visigoto*, Firenze 2011. En varias ocasiones señalan las autoras que las ediciones críticas recientes de algunas de las obras que los anónimos comentaristas emplean como fuente han sido de gran ayuda para la fijación del texto y el estudio del mismo. Este hecho es fundamental ya que refleja la utilidad y la importancia de editar críticamente textos medievales no sólo por el interés que puedan despertar por sí mismos, sino por el que tienen para la realización de otros estudios en paralelo.

manuscritos transmisores de *Vox*, Pv (Paris, BnF, lat. 5363) y Lo (London, BL, Harley 213) conservan, estructuralmente hablando, el texto original; sin embargo, el cotejo con *Vox*₂ refleja que no es así: la forma originaria debía incluir ciertos pasajes que en los códices mencionados han sido suprimidos, mientras que sí se conservan en los transmisores de *Vox*₂. El hecho de que no se trate de *addenda* de *Vox*₂—como sí los son otros— se ratifica mediante el cotejo con las fuentes, que en este caso también se siguen de manera muy literal, y el estilo, que no es igual al del compilador que realiza las adiciones propiamente dichas.

Al hilo de lo anterior, es preciso mencionar que otro de los rasgos que caracterizan a *Vox*₂ es la adición de didascalias que clarifican la intervención de los distintos personajes. Estas didascalias se corresponden con las que ofrece el ms. Autun S. 18, ya mencionado previamente por Favero, hecho que, sumado a los indicios textuales que comparten este manuscrito y *Vox*₂, llevan a postular que el creador de esta última versión empleó como modelo bíblico un manuscrito relacionado con el de Autun, muy probablemente de origen hispano.

Una novedad textual respecto a la edición precedente la constituye la bipartición entre el ms. *P* y la *Vox a. e.* frente a los *recentiores E, R, L* y *B*, que no habían sido tenidos en consideración hasta ahora. La presencia de errores separativos de ambos grupos avala esta bipartición. En el caso de *Vox a. e.*, el descubrimiento de un nuevo testimonio (Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 718) no tiene repercusión en la fijación del texto crítico, si bien sí permite a la editora ampliar y pulir el *stemma* e incluir sus variantes en aparato.

En la tercera sección del volumen, mucho más breve que las dos precedentes, Favero y Guglielmetti, a modo de conclusión, plantean una cuestión que surge de las páginas previas: qué vínculo existe entre los tres comentarios o, más concretamente, entre *Prov* y *Eccl*, por una parte, y estos dos con *Vox*, por otra. Respecto a la primera cuestión, parece claro que ambos comentarios tienen un origen en común: ambos proceden de un mismo ambiente o, incluso, podrían haber sido escritos por el mismo autor. Dos argumentos apoyan esta tesis: a) la tradición manuscrita de ambos es casi idéntica (solamente tres manuscritos conservan únicamente *Prov* [*a* y *c*, respectivamente], pero no *Eccl*). Asimismo, los núcleos temáticos en torno a los cuales se incardinan ambos comentarios son también homogéneos. El caso de *Vox ecclesiae* es más complejo, ya que, aunque los hechos remiten al mismo ambiente de origen, sus similitudes con los otros dos comentarios son mucho menores; sí es cierto, sin embargo, que en un momento dado los tres textos se unieron pasando a tener una transmisión conjunta (tan sólo *Vox* presenta una transmisión conservada independiente). Ello lo muestran las autoras en un *stemma* conjunto (p. 924), en el que ω representa este punto de unión de los tres comentarios. En las páginas subsiguientes al *stemma*, a modo de colofón de la edición, se intenta contextualizar geográficamente la tradición conservada plasmada en él: si bien el origen de los tres comentarios debe buscarse en territorio ibérico, su unión pudo producirse en el círculo intelectual hispano de Lyon, al que conduce la utilización del ms. bíblico Autun S. 18, citado ya en numerosas ocasiones. La tradición conservada de *Prov*,

Eccl y *Vox*₂, por su parte, presenta una rama de descendientes mayoritariamente franceses y una segunda, representada por un testimonio procedente de Einsiedeln y un número mayor de códices italianos. La tradición independiente de *Vox* se da también en territorio francés. Esta dispersión, que aleja a la tradición conservada del suelo hispánico, tal y como indican Favero y Guglielmetti al final de su obra, también es una de las dificultades más patentes a la hora de entender la complejidad que entraña establecer la relación entre los textos primigenios y las versiones de ellos derivadas.

A modo de conclusión, es preciso indicar que el que aquí se reseña es un trabajo soberbio, en el que Favero y Guglielmetti abordan una problemática realmente compleja con gran efectividad y resultados óptimos. En cada capítulo se aprecia el rigor científico con el que se abordan las dificultades y con el que se debaten las numerosas hipótesis planteadas para resolverlas. Por otra parte, el lector agradece la claridad de las explicaciones y los numerosos ejemplos aportados, discutidos siempre al detalle. Es preciso destacar también la honestidad que se desprende de estas páginas: ninguna de las dos autoras muestra recelo a la hora de exponer aquellas cuestiones que no han podido ser resueltas por el momento o en reconocer errores metodológicos cometidos en el pasado, que ahora subsanan con la mayor solvencia. Todo ello lo convierte en un volumen de referencia y en un ejemplo de método de gran valor para filólogos, editores y estudiosos en general de la literatura exegetica.

JULIA AGUILAR MIQUEL
julia.aguilard@uv.es
Universitat de València

DIETER BITTERLI, *Die Berner Rätsel / Aenigmata Bernensia: Lateinisch – deutsch*, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2023, 200 pp., 39,95€, ISBN 978-3-11-133307-6.

Die *Aenigmata Bernensia* oder *Berner Rätsel* sind eine anonyme Sammlung von insgesamt vierundsechzig lateinischen Versrätseln, deren Kern vermutlich um 700 im westlichen Mittelmeerraum entstand. Sie sind in jüngster Zeit als wichtiges Bindeglied zwischen Antike und Mittelalter wieder ins Blickfeld der Forschung gerückt,¹ doch wer die gesamte Sammlung in deutscher Übersetzung

¹ Vgl. insbesondere G. Farina, *Indovina chi sono: Per uno studio degli Aenigmata Tullii*, Carghe 2020, sowie A. Orchard, *The Old English and Anglo-Latin Riddle Tradition. Edited and translated*, Cambridge, Mass.-London 2021 und *A Commentary on the Old English and Anglo-Latin Riddle Tradition*, Washington DC 2021. Die Website <https://theriddleages.bham.ac.uk/riddles/collection/the-bern-riddles/> (letzter Aufruf: 27.08.2024) bietet eine englische Übersetzung und blogartig gestaltete Kommentare, die jedoch keinen wissenschaftlichen Anspruch erheben.

lesen wollte, musste bislang auf die oft fehlerhafte Nachdichtung von K. Minst in der kritischen Textedition von F. Glorie aus dem Jahre 1968 zurückgreifen.² Daher ist es sehr zu begrüßen, dass der Schweizer Anglist Dieter Bitterli (im Folgenden B.), ein Kenner der altenglischen und anglo-lateinischen Rätselliteratur,³ nun eine neue deutsche Übersetzung mit ausführlichem Kommentar in der Sammlung Tusculum vorgelegt hat.

In seiner Einführung (7-38) geht B. ausführlich auf die handschriftliche Überlieferung der *Berner Rätsel* ein, deren ältester Zeuge, ein Berner Codex, in die erste Hälfte des 8. Jahrhunderts datiert. In seinem Überblick über die bisherigen Ausgaben und Übersetzungen setzt er sich ausgewogen mit deren Vorzügen und Nachteilen auseinander und begründet überzeugend, warum er seiner Arbeit nicht die oben erwähnte textkritische Ausgabe von F. Glorie zugrunde legt, sondern die ältere Edition von K. Strecker.⁴ In Hinblick auf Datierung und Herkunft der *Berner Rätsel* schließt sich B. der älteren Forschung an, der zufolge zumindest der Kern der Sammlung an der Wende vom 7. zum 8. Jahrhundert im westlichen Mittelmeerraum, vielleicht im langobardischen Oberitalien, entstanden ist. Spätestens ab dem 9. Jahrhundert zirkulierten die Texte als Rätselfragen und Stilmuster für den Rhetorik- und Lateinunterricht. Die Überlegungen zu Datierung und Herkunft lassen sich durch Erkenntnisse aus den Handschriften, das im italischen Kulturkreis beheimatete Versmaß der „rhythmischen Hexameter“ (23), die zahlreichen Rätselthemen aus der belebten und unbelebten Natur rund um das westliche Mittelmeer und die Verortung der Sammlung in der antik-frühmittelalterlichen Rätseltradition stützen. So steht fest, dass die Berner Rätsel von den spätlateinischen *Aenigmata* des Symphosius (4./5. Jhd.) in Inhalt und Form beeinflusst wurden, deren pagan-spätromischer Lebenswelt sie in vielem näher stehen als der christlichen Lebenswelt der angelsächsischen und karolingischen Rätselsammlungen. Thematische Parallelen lassen es jedoch möglich erscheinen, dass auch die christlichen *Aenigmata* des Aldhelm († 709/710) und des Tatwin († 734) in den Berner Rätseln nachgewirkt haben. Die sprachlichen Eigentümlichkeiten der Sammlung sagen dagegen nichts über ihre Datierung und Herkunft aus, denn sie finden sich auch sonst in der lateinischen Dichtung des Frühmittelalters. Als stilistische Besonderheiten der *Berner Rätsel* hebt B. die Personifikationen der meist in der Ich-Form sprechenden Dinge, Pflanzen, Tiere und Naturerscheinungen hervor, die „typische Bildlichkeit der Geburts- und Familienmetaphern, die vielfach zu kleinen Geschichten des Werdens und Sich-Veränderns versponnen sind“ (35), die starke Antithetik und die

² F. Glorie, *Tatvini Opera Omnia. Variae Collectiones Aenigmatvm Merovingicae Aetatis. Anonymus De Dubiis Nominibus. Pars altera*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 133A, Turnhout 1968.

³ Vgl. insbesondere D. Bitterli, *Say What I Am Called: The Old English Riddles of the Exeter Book and the Anglo-Latin Riddle Tradition*, Toronto 2009.

⁴ K. Strecker, *Rhythmi Aevi Merovingici et Carolini*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini IV.2, Berlin 1914. Die wenigen textkritischen Abweichungen von Strecker sind auf S. 123-4 aufgelistet.

Abwesenheit rätseltypischer Einleitungs- und Schlussformeln oder auch obszöner Doppeldeutigkeiten.

Für die lateinischen Texte der zweisprachigen Ausgabe (39–121) übernimmt B. die Nummerierung von Strecker,⁵ ordnet die Rätsel jedoch neu nach sieben thematischen Gruppen an, die dem groben Schema der Handschriften entsprechen und sehr gut Parallelen zwischen inhaltlich zusammengehörigen Gedichten erkennen lassen:⁶ „Hausrat“, „Technisches“, „Bäume und Nutzpflanzen“, „Aus dem Garten“, „Tiere“, „Die Elemente“ und „Himmlisches“. Jeder Gruppe geht eine kurze thematische Einleitung voraus. Für die vier in den Handschriften und in Streckers Ausgabe titellosen Rätsel 48, 50A, 53 und 54 schlägt B. lateinische Titel und damit „Lösungen“ vor.⁷

Auf die Prinzipien seiner deutschen Übersetzung geht B. in den Vorbemerkungen zu seiner Ausgabe (37-8) nicht näher ein. Sie seien hier exemplarisch im direkten Vergleich zur Nachdichtung von K. Minst (im Folgenden M.) herausgearbeitet:

Nr. 37 *De pipere* (Pfeffer)

<i>Pereger externas vinctus perambulo terras</i>	1
<i>Frigidus et tactu praesto sumenti calorem.</i>	2
<i>Nulla mihi virtus, sospes si mansero semper;</i>	3
<i>Vigeo nam caesus, confractus valeo multum.</i>	4
<i>Mordeo mordentem morsu nec vulnero dente.</i>	5
<i>Lapis mihi finis, simul defectio lignum.</i>	6

Übersetzung K. Minst ⁸		Übersetzung D. Bitterli ⁹	
Fremdling bin ich, gefangen durchwander’	1	Als Fremdling durchwandere ich gefesselt	
ich ferneste Länder,		ferne Länder,	
Kalt und zerstoßen gewähr’ ich dem, der	2	und kalt anzufühlen, wärme ich den, der mich	
mich nehmen will, Wärme.		verzehrt.	
Tugend besitz’ ich nicht, doch heilsam	3	Bleibe ich stets unversehrt, habe ich keine	
bleib’ ich immer,		Kraft,	
Auch noch zerschlagen leb’ ich,	4	denn ich bin stark, wenn man mich haut, und	
zerbrochen vermag ich noch vieles.		zerbrochen vermag ich vieles.	
Werd’ ich zerbissen, so beiß’ ich wieder,	5	Wer mich beißt, den beiße ich mit einem Biss,	
doch nimmer mit Zähnen.		doch verletze ich nicht mit Zähnen.	
Bringt mir der Mühlstein das Ende, so	6	Stein bedeutet mein Ende und Holz meinen	
fall’ ich in hölzerne Truhe.		Untergang.	

⁵ Strecker, *Rhythmi Aevi Merovingici et Carolini*.

⁶ So folgen in B.s Ausgabe etwa die in den Handschriften und in der Ausgabe von Strecker getrennten Rätsel 34 und 52 zur Rose unmittelbar aufeinander, die Rätsel 50 und 63 zum Wein oder die Rätsel 43 und 28 zu Seidenspinner und Seide.

⁷ 48 [*De nuce*] „Walnuss“, 50A [*De membrana*] „Pergament“, 53 [*De pistillo*] „Mörserkeule“ und 54 [*De follibus*] „Blasebalg und Geldbeutel“.

⁸ Glorie, *Tatvini Opera Omnia*, 583.

⁹ Bitterli, *Die Berner Rätsel*, 85.

Im Unterschied zur Nachdichtung von M., der das hexametrische Versmaß nachzuempfinden bestrebt ist und daher zu einer mehr oder weniger freien Übersetzung gelangt, liefert B. eine relativ wörtliche, versweise gegliederte Prosaübersetzung. Immer wieder, und so auch hier, ersetzt er offensichtliche Übersetzungsfehler von M. durch eine korrekte Wiedergabe. So ersetzt er das grammatikalisch falsche „Kalt und zerstoßen“ (v. 2 *Frigidus et tactu*) durch „und kalt anzufühlen“, und das völlig missverstandene „Tugend besitz’ ich nicht, doch heilsam bleib’ ich immer“ (v. 3 *Nulla mihi virtus, sospes si mansero semper*) durch „Bleibe ich stets unversehrt, habe ich keine Kraft“: Hier geht es nämlich darum, dass Pfeffer, wenn er nicht zerstoßen wird, seine Schärfe nicht entfaltet, wie B. in seinem Kommentar erklärt (150). Missverstanden hat M. auch v. 4 *Vigeo nam caesus* („Auch noch zerschlagen leb’ ich“), denn dieser Satz liefert gerade die Begründung dafür, dass der Pfeffer zur Entfaltung seiner Kraft zerstoßen werden muss. Wieder trifft B.s wörtliche Übersetzung „denn ich bin stark, wenn man mich haut“ genau den Sinn. Den letzten, in seiner Bedeutung besonders obskur wirkenden Vers versucht M. durch eine interpretierende Wiedergabe zu erhellen („Mühlstein“, „fall’ ich in hölzerne Truhe“), während B. es bei einer schlichten wörtlichen Übersetzung belässt („Stein“, „Holz“). Die Deutung trennt er m.E. sinnvoll von der Übersetzung und liefert sie im Kommentar nach (150): Es wird hier darauf angespielt, dass der Pfeffer im Mörser (und nicht etwa in der Mühle!) zermahlen und dann im Topf über dem mit Holz geschürten Herdfeuer gekocht wird.

Gleichzeitig zeigt das Beispiel auch, dass B.s Übersetzung sich gelegentlich maßvoll von Wortlaut und Syntax des lateinischen Originals entfernt, wenn dadurch mehr Geschmeidigkeit und eine bessere Verständlichkeit im Deutschen erzielt werden kann. So übersetzt er v. 5 *Mordeo mordentem morsu* (wörtlich „Ich beiße den Beißenden mit einem Biss“) freier und eleganter mit „Wer mich beißt, den beiße ich mit einem Biss“, ohne dass das alliterierende Wortspiel gänzlich verloren geht.

An manchen Stellen hätte B.s Übersetzung m.E. jedoch von größerer Wörtlichkeit profitieren können. Beispielsweise lässt sich Nr. 18 v. 4 *vili solo* (B.: „auf den bloßen Boden“, 49) sinnvoll mit der wörtlichen Bedeutung „auf den verächtlichen Erdboden“ wiedergeben. In Nr. 19 v. 3 sagt das Bienenwachs *Dum nascor sponte* (B.: „Obgleich selbst gezeugt“, 101), meint damit aber wohl eher, dass es „aus freiem Willen“ gezeugt wurde, denn es stellt dieser freiwilligen Zeugung seine gewaltsame Entnahme aus dem „Bauch“ seiner Mutter gegenüber. In Nr. 35 v. 4 *Et leviter tactos incurvat aegra senectus* übersetzt B. frei „und kaum berührt, krümmen wir [d.h. die Lilien] uns, krank und alt“ (83), doch die wörtliche Übersetzung „krümmt uns das kranke Alter“ lässt die Macht des Alters über die Lilien wesentlich deutlicher hervortreten.¹⁰

¹⁰ Ferner gibt B. *veto* („man verbietet mir, ich darf nicht“) mehrmals unnötigerweise mit „ich kann nicht“ wieder, was zwar die eigentümliche Formulierung glättet, aber den Sinn leicht verändert, vgl. Nr. 7 v. 2 (93), Nr. 38 v. 3 (111) und Nr. 39 v. 5 (89).

Eine andere grammatikalisch-syntaktische Auffassung könnte man in Nr. 17 vv. 4–5 vertreten (*Quas amitto currens, [...] / Meliora cunctis, mihi nam vilis servans*), wo das Sieb über seine Tätigkeit des Scheidens von Grobem und Feinem spricht. B. macht den Akkusativ *meliora* von *amitto* abhängig und übersetzt „verliere ich sie [d.h. die Eingeweide] laufend, [...] / als das Bessere für alle, das Wertlose aber behalte ich für mich“ (51). Durch den antithetischen Chiasmus *meliora cunctis, mihi [...] vilis* sind die Akkusativobjekte *meliora* und *vilis* jedoch eng miteinander verbunden und sollten daher beide von *servans* abhängig gemacht werden, etwa „wobei ich das Bessere für alle beiseitelege, für mich aber das Wertlose zurückbehalte“. In Nr. 45 v. 2 *Reddo libens omnes escas* besteht m.E. kein Grund, *omnes* zum Dativobjekt zu machen (B.: „allen gebe ich willig die Nahrung zurück“, 113), denn die wörtliche Übersetzung „ich gebe willig alle Nahrung zurück“ ist im Kontext passend. Als weiterer Streitfall sei Nr. 58 v. 6 angeführt, wo der Mond spricht (*Infantia pars est simul et curva senectus*). B. wandelt den Nominativ *curva senectus* in einen Genitiv um, den er von *pars* abhängig macht, und übersetzt „so ist meine Kindheit zugleich Teil meines krummen Alters“ (119). In seinem Kommentar (169) hat B. sicherlich Recht damit, dass hier auf die gleichzeitige Präsenz von sichtbarer Sichel des abnehmenden Mondes (Alter) und unsichtbarem Rest des Mondes (vormalige Kindheit) angespielt wird. Dieser Sinn kommt aber auch dann zur Geltung, wenn man den Satz wörtlich übersetzt („so ist gleichzeitig Kindheit ein Teil [von mir] und krummes Alter“). Selten scheinen sinntragende Wörter ohne erkennbaren Grund nicht übersetzt worden zu sein.¹¹

Der Kommentar (125–71) umfasst pro Rätsel etwa eine halbe bis ganze Druckseite und ist damit im Vergleich zu anderen zweisprachigen Ausgaben der Reihe *Tusculum* überdurchschnittlich ausführlich. Dies ist sehr zu begrüßen, denn die Rätsel sind oft schwer verständlich, und bisweilen müssen verschiedene Interpretationen erwogen werden wie etwa in Nr. 53 (Mörserkeule oder Waage?) und in Nr. 56 (das geschriebene und gesprochene Wort oder Sonne und Mond?), wo B. plausibel für die von ihm selbst vertretenen Lösungen „Mörserkeule“ und „Wort“ argumentiert (131, 137–8).

Ein fester und für das Textverständnis sehr hilfreicher Bestandteil aller Kommentareinträge ist die Kombination aus Strukturanalyse und Inhaltsparaphrase mit zusätzlichen inhaltlichen Erklärungen. So erfährt man etwa im Kommentar zu Rätsel Nr. 2, dass mit den blinden „Augen“ der Öllampe die „zwei Einfülllöcher für das Öl“ gemeint sind und mit dem offenen „Mund“ die „hervortretende Schnauze für den Docht“ (126). Hinzu kommen stets kulturhistorische Erläuterungen zu den jeweiligen Rätseldingen, durch die sich vielfältige Einblicke in die uns heute oft fremden Lebenswelten an der Schwelle von der Spätantike zum Frühmittelalter eröffnen, von der Pergamentherstellung (135–6)¹² bis hin zur Verwendung von

¹¹ Nr. 10 v. 2 *roganti* („niemandem, der mich darum bittet“, 49), Nr. 12 v. 5 *subterrena* („in einer wertlosen Urne unter der Erde“, 75), Nr. 35 v. 2 *confixos* („zusammengeheftet an einem Stängel“, 83), Nr. 57 v. 4 *videar* („zu tragen scheine“, 117) und v. 6 *semper* („stets durchlaufe“, 117).

¹² B. hat sicherlich Recht damit, dass mit Rätsel Nr. 51A das Pergament gemeint ist. Im Kommentar (136) erklärt er v. 2 *reddor de minimo maior* („werde ich von sehr klein zu sehr

Tierblasen als Haushaltsgefäße oder Spielgeräte (153-4). Die Erläuterungen stützen immer wieder die von B. vertretene These, dass die *Berner Rätsel* im westlichen Mittelmeerraum bzw. im langobardischen Oberitalien entstanden sein dürften, z.B. der Hinweis zu Rätsel Nr. 2, dass Öllampen „vor allem im Mittelmeerraum verbreitet [waren], während sie nördlich der Alpen mit dem Ende der Römerherrschaft außer Gebrauch kamen und zunehmend durch Laternen und [...] hängende Glaslampen ersetzt wurden“ (126).

Wertvoll sind auch die feinen Beobachtungen zur stilistischen Gestaltung und Bildlichkeit sowie die intertextuellen Hinweise, insbesondere auf thematische oder sprachliche Parallelen zu anderen Versrätseln (v.a. Symphosius und Aldhelm), zur Naturgeschichte des Älteren Plinius oder zu Columellas landwirtschaftlicher Fachschrift. Mit Recht betont B. immer wieder das auffällige Fehlen christlicher Allegorese bei Themen, die sich dafür anbieten würden, etwa bei den Rätseln zum Saatkorn (Nr. 12) und zur Rose (Nr. 34 und 52). Wer mit dem Mittellateinischen nicht so sehr vertraut ist, würde sich über die knappen Hinweise in der Einführung hinausgehend (33–34) vielleicht auch im Kommentar den einen oder anderen Hinweis zu Abweichungen vom klassischen Latein wünschen, etwa zum scheinbaren Gerundium *quaerendi* (Nr. 33 v. 6), bei dem es sich in Wirklichkeit um ein Partizip Präsens (*quaerenti*) handelt.

Der Band wird abgerundet durch Tabellen zu thematischen und sprachlichen Parallelen zwischen den *Berner Rätseln* und weiteren spätantik-frühmittelalterlichen Rätselsammlungen (172-87),¹³ eine einschlägige Bibliographie, gegliedert in „Nachschlagewerke“, „Textausgaben, Übersetzungen und Forschungsliteratur“ sowie „Ausgewählte Literatur zu den Themengebieten“ (188-96), und durch ein „Verzeichnis der Rätsel und ihrer Lösungen“ (197-200), das die Rätsel in numerischer und alphabetischer (i.e. „in numerischer und alphabetischer Reihenfolge darbietet.“). Reihenfolge darbietet.

Mit seiner neuen zweisprachigen Tuscolum-Ausgabe hat B. ein Instrument geschaffen, das eine zuverlässige und zeitgemäße deutsche Übersetzung mit vielschichtigen und gut lesbaren Kommentaren zu den oft schwer verständlichen *Berner Rätseln* auf dem aktuellen Stand der Forschung verbindet. Es ist für Lehrende und Forschende im Bereich von Philologie, Literaturwissenschaft und Kulturgeschichte ebenso wertvoll wie für ein breiteres interessiertes Publikum.

HEDWIG SCHMALZGRUBER

Universität Graz

hedwig.schmalzgruber@uni-graz.at

groß“) dahingehend, dass aus dem Tier die Haut geschnitten wird, „um ein möglichst großes Stück Pergament zu gewinnen“. Dies erklärt jedoch nicht, warum die Haut bzw. das Pergament seine Größe ändert. M.E. spielt v. 2 bereits auf den fertigen Codex an, in dem viele kleinere Pergamentblätter zu einem großen Konvolut zusammengeheftet werden.

¹³ Die thematischen Parallelen umfassen Symphosius, Aldhelm, Tatwin, Eusebius und die Lorscher Rätsel, die sprachlichen Parallelen umfassen Symphosius, Aldhelm und Tatwin.

JOSÉ MARTÍNEZ GÁZQUEZ, FERNANDO GONZÁLEZ MUÑOZ, *Alchoran siue lex Saracenorum, Petro Cluniacensi Abbate precipiente a Roberto Ketenensi translatus. Glossae in Alchoran fortasse a Petro Pictaviense redactae*, Nueva Roma 55, Madrid: CSIC, 2022, 580 pp., ISBN 978-84-00-11041-3.

La edición crítica del *Alchoran* es un acontecimiento cultural y un monumento filológico. La última vez que se publicó fue bajo los auspicios de Bibliander (Theodor Buchmann, 1504-1564), Basilea 1543, con reimpressiones posteriores. Las circunstancias de esta primera publicación fueron ampliamente explicadas por Segesvary¹ y su edición resultó excelente desde el punto de vista textual, como queda bien demostrado en la edición del *Alchoran* que vamos a comentar. Lo cierto es que Bibliander publicó en 1543 un texto con cuatrocientos años de antigüedad, ya que la traducción latina del Corán (es decir, el *Alchoran*) apareció entre 1142-1143, motivada por razones totalmente diferentes de las que tuvo el impresor de Basilea para su difusión². Si el contexto de la traducción está relacionado con la instigación política y militar de la mal llamada *reconquista* y de la organización de la segunda cruzada, el contexto de la edición de Bibliander es el humanismo de la Reforma y la amenaza otomana ante las puertas de Viena. Se puede afirmar que esta traducción, elaborada por Robert de Ketton, en comparación con la transmisión y recepción de otras versiones latinas del Corán existentes, ha sido la más conocida en el mundo latino medieval y –gracias a la edición de Basilea– también en el mundo moderno. Pero no hay que soslayar el complejo contexto actual en el que aparece esta nueva edición, que, a nuestro juicio, se muestra objetivamente como un ejemplo del esfuerzo que hace mundo contemporáneo para comprender las relaciones históricas entre cristianismo e islam, de manera que el *Alchoran*, especialmente en sus glosas, muestra con claridad una inveterada retórica de denostación hacia el islam que no escandalizó ni al mundo medieval, ni al moderno, ni a buena parte del período reciente. La elección de mantener el título *Alchoran* nos parece un acierto poco evidente pero muy significativo ya que, sencillamente, el *Alchoran* no es lo mismo que el Qur'án. El doblete *lex Saracenorum* (gentilicio que entraña una amplia discusión desde san Jerónimo, entre si debía escribirse con una -r- simple o doble -rr-) es también profundamente ideológico. Buena parte de la tradición que llega hasta la actualidad, incluidos los escritos de Pedro el Venerable, se refirió también al Corán como *lex Mahumeti*

¹ V. Segesvary, *L'Islam et la réforme: Étude sur l'attitude des réformateurs zurichois envers l'Islam (1510-1550)*, Genève 1978.

² Puesto que es un testimonio importante (al menos en cuanto que difundió el texto del *Alchoran* largamente), Martínez-Muñoz dedican el capítulo V de su estudio de introducción (pp. 143-52) expresamente a esta edición, pero más que enmarcarla en el contexto cultural de la Reforma protestante –aunque también se hace mención al estudiar la actuación de Calvino, Lutero y Melanchthon para favorecer esta publicación (pp. 149-50)–, la explican desde el punto de vista filológico. El *Alchoran* apareció en el Tomo I de los tres que dispuso Bibliander, acompañado de una enorme compilación de fuentes latinas sobre el islam, antología que sigue siendo fundamental para los estudios sobre esta imagología.

(con variantes), otro gran dolor que ha provocado la percepción de tradición cristiana sobre este libro sagrado. Solamente con estos datos creo que se puede decir, sin caer en un vacío retórico, que la nueva publicación del *Alchoran* es un acontecimiento cultural que debe servir para seguir reflexionando sobre todo ello.

Hay que tener en cuenta que la traducción del Corán es un texto largo, con un latín poco transparente –para la comprensión del cual, en ocasiones es necesario recurrir al árabe–, en la que se encuentran numerosas glosas que varían en su transmisión; además de que sus editores han tenido que colacionar los 26 manuscritos conocidos, junto con las varias impresiones de Bibliander y algunos epítomes³. Este trabajo fue iniciado por Martínez Gázquez en 1996 y ha sido el eje de trabajo del grupo *Islamolatina* fundado por él mismo, entre cuyos miembros se cuenta a González Muñoz, otro de los expertos más importantes para el estudio de los textos latinos sobre el islam. En torno al *Alchoran* han aparecido decenas de trabajos publicados y ha sido el centro de formación de varios doctorandos. Esta dimensión envuelve el resultado de esta edición y explica el impacto académico que ha tenido durante su elaboración. Ahora que ha salido publicado, las repercusiones se multiplicarán. Cuanto menos por estas razones, también puede afirmarse que la edición de Martínez-González (2022), además de un acontecimiento, es un monumento filológico.

El estudio de introducción dedicado al *Alchoran* describe las circunstancias culturales en las que se produce. Consigue resumir un estado de la cuestión sobre la génesis del texto y, por lo tanto, un punto de partida para comprender las características de esta traducción. Conviene recordar que, además del *Alchoran*, los intelectuales que trabajan bajo los auspicios de Pedro el Venerable ofrecen además varias obras, casi todas ellas transmitidas por la misma tradición manuscrita. Aunque aquí no sea necesario enumerarlos, hay que saber que, en su conjunto, fueron transmitidos en forma de *corpus*, tras haber sido sometidos a un cierto proceso de edición, al incluir prólogos y paratextos. Los investigadores de *Islamolatina* han llamado a este conjunto *corpus islamlatinum*. Algunos de los textos ya tienen ediciones contemporáneas, y cuando surjan las que faltan, se podrá comprobar hasta qué punto la tradición manuscrita es compartida por ellos. Nos referimos especialmente a la *Chronica mendosa* (CM), el *Liber de generatione Mahumet* (GM)⁴. Por este motivo, la publicación del *Alchoran*, al

³ En las págs. 166-71 pueden verse las descripciones del *Compendium Alchorani* (primera mitad del s. XVI, identificado en correspondencia con el índice del ms. D y transmitido por cinco testimonios más –véase la nota 48 del Estudio de introducción–) y del epítome de Widmanstetter, publicado en Nüremberg 1543 (independiente de la edición de Bibliander, aunque elaborada contemporáneamente).

⁴ Los otros dos textos del *corpus* que son resultado de una traducción del árabe son, por un lado, el *Liber de doctrina Mahumet* (DM), recientemente publicado, en su versión latina, por C. Finiello y R. Gleis, y en su versión árabe por U. Cecini, en el volumen: U. Cecini, C. Finiello, *Masā'il 'Abdallāh ib Salām (Doctrina Mahumet)*, kritische Edition des arabischen Textes mit Einleitung und Übersetzung. Mit einem Anhang zur lateinischen *Doctrina Mahumet* von Concetta Finiello und Reinhold F. Gleis, col. Corpus Islamo-Christianum. Series Arabica-Latina (SA-L 2), Wiesbaden 2021. Por otro lado,

compartir la tradición manuscrita con ellos, marcará metodológicamente los trabajos de edición que están por venir.

El estudio de Martínez-González aporta varias novedades. Una de ellas es la observación de que los diversos traductores debieron trabajar al mismo tiempo en los varios textos que estaban traduciendo. Así, la afirmación “no se advierten coincidencias entre el *Alchoran* de Ketton y las versiones de los numerosos pasajes coránicos contenidos en la *Doctrina Mahumet* de Hermann de Carinthia o en la *Epistola Sarraceni* y el *Rescriptum christiani* de Pedro de Toledo” (p. 38). Nuestras notas de trabajo nos permiten comprobar que lo mismo sucede en cuanto a la *Chronica mendosa*. Aportemos un solo ejemplo:

Alch. 113.4 (Q. 105.4) [ed. Martínez-González 2022, 546, ll. 4-5]: inmittens illis uolucrum multimodarum cohortes quam plurimas, que per nigrorum lapidum iniectum illos uelud tritici corticem euacuabant?

CM⁵: ...et in partes minutas, quasi grana frumenti redactus, iniectu lapidum nigrorum ab auibus multimodis diuinitus missis, uindicatum scelus illud.

Ni siquiera, pues, Robert de Ketton, al que se atribuye la principal intervención en la traducción del *Alchoran* y de la CM, utiliza su traducción del Corán. En el GM tampoco hay rastro del *Alchoran*.

Martínez-González afrontan también uno de los problemas más controvertidos del *Alchoran*: el modelo árabe sobre el que traduce Robert de Ketton y, especialmente, su método y, en consecuencia, la calidad de la traducción. El resultado –debatido desde época de Juan de Segobia a mediados del s. XV⁶ es una traducción no estrictamente literal con el texto árabe –en parte, porque el traductor acude a comentarios del texto coránico (*tafsīr*) que mediatizan en el resultado–, un método que no es comparable con el que se aplicaba en las traducciones de la Biblia (*verbum a verbo*)⁷. En este sentido parece que Ketton

también forma parte del *corpus* el llamado comunmente *Alkindi*, en realidad dos textos epistolares, editados por F. González Muñoz, *Epistula Sarraceni* y *Rescriptum christiani*, en *Exposición y refutación del Islam. La versión latina de las epístolas de al-Hašimī y al-Kindī*, A Coruña 2005. En cuanto a los prólogos y los índices, fueron publicados por R. Gleis, *Petrus Venerabilis. Schriften zum Islam*, col. Corpus islamico-christianum 1, Altenberge 1985; y J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*, Princeton 1964.

⁵ Citamos la CM y el GM a partir de nuestras notas de trabajo, aunque pueden comprobarse en la edición de Bibliander, referida anteriormente.

⁶ J. Martínez Gázquez, “El prólogo de Juan de Segobia al Corán (Qur’ān) trilingüe (1456)”, *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch* 38, 2003, 389-410; F. González Muñoz, “Juan de Segobia y los manuscritos de la traducción latina del Corán de Robert de Ketton”, *Al-Qantara* 42, 2021, 1-18 (en versión digital).

⁷ M. Castells Criballés, *La traducció llatina de l’Alcorà de Robert de Ketton (s. XII) en confrontació a l’original àrab: context, anàlisi i valoració* (tesis doctoral Universitat de Barcelona 2012), analiza el modelo de Corán árabe del que pudo haber dispuesto Ketton, identificando fuentes

quiso alejar deliberadamente al lector del recuerdo del texto bíblico, incluso en los pasajes compartidos entre Biblia y Corán. Vemos la misma actitud en su traducción de la CM. Al mismo tiempo la traducción del *Alchoran* transparenta una sintaxis y un léxico obviamente influenciado por el texto árabe. De ello dan cuenta los ejemplos que se ofrecen en el estudio de introducción (pp. 38-43).

El análisis del *Alchoran* continúa atendiendo otro rasgo característico de esta traducción, como es la aparición de glosas al texto (pp. 46-53), “alrededor de 800 anotaciones” (p. 46), que son ofrecidas en esta edición en su *apparatus glossarum*. El estudio de las glosas es sistematizado después (pp. 159-66), de modo que se explica la evolución de las mismas en la transmisión. Este tema también es complejo, porque parece que las glosas fueron siendo ampliadas y seleccionadas por los copistas, aunque muchas de ellas habrían sido ya redactadas por los mismos traductores (pp. 51-2).

Efectivamente, el *Alchoran* dispone, además, de un prefacio redactado por Robert de Ketton en el que ofrece al abad de Cluny, Pedro el Venerable, su traducción (editado en las pp. 207-8, con traducción castellana en las pp. 55-8). El tema es ofrecer una traducción que ponga de manifiesto al mundo latino (referido con la palabra técnica *latinitas*) el texto fundacional del islam, naturalmente destinada a evidenciar la distancia entre sus contenidos y las doctrinas cristianas. El componente ideológico antiislámico es evidente, como lo es en la expresión de las glosas al texto, y como lo es de hecho el conjunto del *corpus islamlatinum*. Obviamente, la voluntad es ofrecer un instrumento para la refutación del islam, trabajo en el que abundará después el mismo abad de Cluny con la redacción del *Liber contra sectam Sarracenorum* y de la *Summa totius haeresis Sarracenorum*⁸.

Martínez-González también editan (pp. 559-60), traducen (pp. 53-5) y estudian un segundo prólogo, presentado como “Prólogo a la *Chronica mendosa*”, es decir, el tratado que sigue al *Alchoran* en la tradición manuscrita del *corpus islamlatinum*. En esta reseña debo manifestar que mi opinión no coincide plenamente con este criterio, puesto que el texto aquí identificado como prólogo a la CM me parece ser el prólogo que abre la serie de textos CM, GM y DM y no expresamente destinado a ser el prólogo del primero de ellos. El título que ofrece el ms. A (ciertamente el más prestigioso de todos los conservados y considerado el arquetipo) expresa *Fabulę sarracenorum*, título que se aviene con los contenidos de los tres textos. Pero, con mayor fuerza argumental, debe observarse que la primera palabra que abre el *Liber de generatione* y el *Liber de doctrina* es un lacónico *Item*⁹, palabra que agrupa necesariamente esta trilogía en el mismo

andalusíes de los comentarios que también utiliza. Explica igualmente el sistema por el que el número de suras y aleyas queda desplazado en el *Alchoran*.

⁸ Cuyas ediciones han sido citadas dentro del trabajo de Glei (1985) en la nota a pie 4.

⁹ La aparición de esta palabra *Item* al inicio del *Liber de doctrina* puede comprobarse en la ed. de Finello, dentro del volumen de Cecini, *Masā'il*, 188. Es comprensible que este *item* no esté en el inicio de la CM, al ser el primero de ellos, de modo que los dos siguientes sean presentados como *item*, es decir, como puntos de continuación del conjunto de las *Fabulae Sarracenorum*. La

corpus, a nuestro entender titulado, en su conjunto, *Fabulae Sarracenorum* (FS). Si bien, efectivamente, la expresión de la FS en primera persona *detegi Machumet detestabilem hystoriam* (lin. 8-9) alude a la traducción de la CM, sin embargo, una vez reunida con las demás obras que conforman el *corpus islamolatinum*, el título *Fabulae Sarracenorum* sirvió para presentar los tres opúsculos referidos al Profeta. Así, los contenidos de la FS se pueden leer en referencia a esta trilogía. Hay también algunas evidencias textuales y de tipo codicológico que permiten pensar que estos tres textos conformaron una unidad en tres partes, un argumento que ahora no podemos desarrollar.

El estudio de introducción continúa con la descripción codicológica de cada uno de los testimonios (pp. 61-103), y desemboca en la justificación del *stemma* (pp. 104-37), en el que nos detendremos a continuación.

Martínez-González confirman el testimonio *A* como el arquetipo conservado, pero en un estadio todavía en proceso de revisión que daría lugar a una copia en limpio y, digamos, definitiva. Esta copia es hipotética, llamada *A'* por los editores del *Alchoran*, de la que dependería el resto de la transmisión¹⁰. En la descripción de los criterios de edición (p. 175) Martínez-González confirman la decisión de haber tomado *A* como texto base de la edición, sobre el cual ha habido que subsanar correcciones con los demás testimonios. Sin embargo, creo yo, esta hipótesis, aunque razonable, no es absolutamente necesaria: nuestra razón es que, si los errores de *A* se subsanan no por conjetura de un códice “en limpio” *A'*, sino por *ope codicum*, entonces jamás se acude, en la práctica, a la necesidad de esta hipótesis. Lo que ocurre es que los editores escogen la lectura de *A* dada *post correctionem*, a cuya corrección –según entiendo– deberían llamar *A'*. Así, por ejemplo:

Alch. 31.40, (Q. 22.40) [Martínez-González 2022, 379, ll. 69-70]: *Aliter enim turres et ecclesie templeaque, quibus Deus multum inuocatur...*
Ecclesie] tantum A (sub litura) mesquide: A (supra lineam) α P³
P⁷ W K Bibl. mesquidem V¹ D T^p

Alch. 17.19 (Q. 7.19) [Martínez-González 2022, 287, ll. 24-5]:
 ...precepit ut in paradiso manentes quod si placeret comederent
 Quod] et quo (*sub litura*) *add. A*

idea es interesante, porque indica que el *corpus islamolatinum* fue “editado” de manera meditada, como hemos indicado ya, con el añadido de prólogos y paratextos –subtítulos, glosas y elementos de organización interna–, como son los *item* que hemos señalado.

¹⁰ En sus palabras (p. 105): “Esta hipotética copia en limpio del texto revisado (*A'*) sería el arquetipo de todos los demás códices”.

En consecuencia, la importancia de *A* caracteriza la edición del *Alchoran*, al ser tomado como texto base. De hecho, el número de lecturas de *A* que se imponen como correctas es muy significativo.

Siguiendo con la observación del aparato crítico (p. 137), Martínez-González derivan de *A* cuatro ramas principales: las familias α^1 y α^2 , la familia β y el manuscrito P^3 . Aunque no he sabido encontrar una explicación del importante aislamiento¹¹ de P^3 , nuestras notas sobre la *Chronica mendosa* confirman esta observación.

En cuanto a las familias α y β , se podría ver la posibilidad de distinguir una serie de subarquetipos: dentro del grupo α^1 : ε (P^{11} y V^2) η (P^4 , B y M^1); dentro del grupo α^2 : ζ (O^2 y O^3), γ (P^1 y T), δ (P^2 , P^6 y S^p); y dentro del grupo β : κ (K y W) θ (V^1 , M^a y P^8), λ (D y T^p) y ι (*Bibl.* y su *descriptus E*). Así, el subarquetipo marcado con asterisco en el *stemma* del *Alchoran* para los testimonios P^{11} y V^2 se corresponde con nuestro ε ; y el grupo, también marcado con asterisco, $M^1 P^4 B$ con nuestro η . En este sentido, la mayor diferencia consiste en sugerir el grupo δ , no interpretado como un subgrupo por Martínez-González.

Del conjunto de manuscritos que copian el *Alchoran*, los testimonios P^7 y E no transmiten ni la CM ni el GM ni el DM;¹² mientras que el ms. de Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, ms. 335 (s. XV), no transmite el *Alchoran*, aunque este último aparece –quizás por error– en la lista de *sigla codicum* con la consigna C^a . Lo más significativo es el caso de P^7 , ya que es un testimonio relacionado con la hipótesis de la identificación de *R* (el *codex ragusinus*) como el arquetipo de la familia β . Esta identificación (es decir $R = \beta$) es una de las aportaciones más innovadoras del trabajo textual de esta edición del *Alchoran*. Creo, además, que será una observación aplicable a la edición de la CM y el GM. De ese modo, es encomiable la prudencia con la que Martínez-González hablan en la p. 122 respecto a *R*: “Tampoco está completamente confirmado que [*R*] albergase la *Chronica mendosa*, el *Liber generationis* y la *Doctrina Mahumet*. Bibliander incluye estos tres escritos en su compilación, pero tal vez los tomó de alguno de los otros dos códices latinos de que dispuso”. Efectivamente, el *stemma* de la CM y del GM –no publicado– apunta a considerar el testimonio *H* (que no transmite el *Alchoran*) como el principal candidato para explicar la fuente de estos opúsculos en la edición de Bibliander.¹³

¹¹ Habría que observar que el ms. de la BnF ms. lat. 4970 (s. XIV) no transmite ni el *Alchoran* ni la CM, pero sí, en los fols. 61v-62r, el *Prologus Roberti Translatoris* (editado en las pp. 559-60). Este testimonio no ha sido tenido en cuenta por Martínez-González. Si lo mencionamos aquí es porque, en nuestra opinión, puede ser considerado un *codex descriptus* de P^3 .

¹² Puede anotarse que el manuscrito de París, BnF ms. lat. 3671 (s. XVI), transmite solo el DM; el manuscrito de París, BnF ms. lat. 3649 (s. XIV-XV) solo el *Alquindi*. Y, al contrario, los manuscritos del *corpus* París, BnF ms. lat. 6225 (s. XV) (testimonio *H*), París, BnF ms. lat. 4970 (s. XIV) y Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, ms. 335 (s. XV), no transmiten el *Alchoran*.

¹³ La mencionada ed. de Finiello confirma que también transmite el DM (fols. 236r-244v).

Finalizamos con un comentario a los índices. Los de nombres propios de persona y lugar son también una hermosa aportación, entre otras razones, porque muchas de estas referencias son difíciles de consultar en contextos latinos que provienen del árabe (nos referimos, por ejemplo, a obras de astronomía o de historiografía). El índice titulado *verba arabica* es especialmente valioso, no sólo por la misma razón y las noticias de *realia* que conllevan, sino también porque en muchos de ellos se aprecia el sistema de adaptación de la lengua árabe al latín, que mantiene con toda probabilidad rasgos andalusíes (por ejemplo, en la pronunciación que entraña *alferdeuz* para al-firdaws; *alhigere* para al-hijra; o *arruteba* para al-ruṭab).

ÓSCAR DE LA CRUZ PALMA
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
oscar.delacruz@uab.cat

FRANK T. COULSON, JUSTIN HAYNES, *The Moralized Ovid: Pierre Bersuire*, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 82, Cambridge MA-London: Harvard University Press, 2023, xviii+823 pp., \$35.00, ISBN 978-0-674-29084-6 (hb).

No modern scholar has done more than Frank T. Coulson to shine light on the medieval reception of the Roman poet Publius Ovidius Naso, better known as Ovid (43 BCE-17/18 CE). As the author of numerous studies, editions, translations, and research aids related to the imperial poet, Coulson has single-handedly made the early twenty-first century a true *aetas Ovidiana* for scholarship on the legacy of Ovid's influence on premodern Christian readers.¹ His most recent contribution is a collaboration with Justin Haynes on a Latin edition and English translation of a sprawling fourteenth-century commentary on the *Metamorphoses* known as the *Moralized Ovid* (*Ovidius moralizatus*). Composed by the Benedictine preacher Pierre Bersuire (c. 1290-1362) during his residencies at Avignon and Paris in the 1340s and 1350s, the *Moralized Ovid* offered readers elaborate Christian interpretations of the Greek and Roman myths collected in the poet's best-known poem. Bersuire had originally conceived of this commentary as part of a longer work entitled *Reductorium morale*, which aimed to sanitize pagan mythology for Christian audiences, but the *Moralized Ovid* circulated independently soon after its completion. Surviving in over ninety manuscripts and many early printed

¹ See, for example, *Ovid in the Middle Ages*, in J.G. Clark, F.T. Coulson, K.L. McKinley, eds., Cambridge 2011; *The Vulgate Commentary on Ovid's Metamorphoses, Book 1*, ed. and trans. F.T. Coulson, Kalamazoo MI 2015; and F.T. Coulson, H. Anderson, *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries, Volume XII: Ovid, Metamorphoses*, Toronto 2022.

editions, it quickly became the standard interpretation of the *Metamorphoses* in later medieval Europe.

Intended to provide useful and memorable anecdotes for preachers, the *Moralized Ovid* drew on a millennium-old tradition of Ovid interpretation dating back to the early Middle Ages to present allegorical readings of ancient myths for Christian consumption. Bersuire organized the work into fifteen chapters, one for each book of the *Metamorphoses*, and prefaced it with a gallery of descriptions of the major Greek and Roman gods and goddesses, entitled *On the Forms and Figures of the Gods*. His interpretation of Ovid's myths follows a formula. Bersuire first summarizes the story in question and then offers a Christian interpretation of it supported by quotations from the Bible, the Church fathers, and sometimes even pagan authors. For example, in the fourth chapter of Book 8, Bersuire presents the story of Theseus, Ariadne, and the Minotaur (pp. 480-5). The preacher interpreted the half-bull monster as the devil, hell, or death. Just as Minos defeated the Athenians and consigned their bodies to the Minotaur, so too did Lucifer defeat Adam and consign his descendents to death. Like the labyrinth beneath the palace of Minos, Hell is a place from which there is no return, according to Wisdom 2:1. Nonetheless, Theseus dared to enter that forbidding place and defeat the monster therein, just as Christ descended to Hell to conquer death. There are dozens upon dozens of similarly pithy and memorable interpretations of ancient myths in Bersuire's work.

There is much to admire in this handsome edition of the *Moralized Ovid*. The Latin text is based on the 1509 printing by Jodocus Badius, which derives from the earliest recension of the work produced by Bersuire around 1340 in Avignon. The translation is lucid and enjoyable to read. The introduction to the volume is informative despite being laconic, a hallmark of all volumes in the Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library Series. The editors have gone out of their way to make references to the Bible more precise. For example, a quotation from "Canticorum I" in the Latin text is rendered helpfully as "Song of Songs 1:3" in the translation (pp. 64-5). Likewise, they provide accurate citations to most of the direct borrowings to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (the absence of such a reference on p. 7 is a rare exception). While the editors use shorthand citations in their translation for biblical and Ovidian references, the sources of quotations from classical authors and Christian authorities from Aesop, Seneca, and Cicero to Augustine, Hrabanus Maurus, and Bernard of Clairvaux are found in the "Notes to the Translation" appended at the end of the volume (pp. 787-816). This volume is sure to draw attention to the text and reception of the *Moralized Ovid*, which has languished for a long time in the shadow of the equally popular contemporary French vernacular *Ovide moralisé*.

SCOTT G. BRUCE
Fordham University
sbruce3@fordham.edu

JEAN-MARIE FRITZ, CRISTINA NOACCO, *Ovidemoralisés latins: Arnould d'Orléans, Allegoriae; Jean de Garlande, Integumenta; Giovanni del Virgilio, Allegoriae*, Textes littéraires du Moyen Âge 71, Ovidiana textes 4, Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2022, 606 pp., ISBN 978-2-406-13294-3.

Le livre contient les éditions des trois commentaires médiévaux sur les *Métamorphoses* d'Ovide : des *Allegoriae* d'Arnoul d'Orléans, ainsi que de son *Accessus*, du poème de Jean de Garlande *Integumenta* et des *Allegoriae* de Giovanni del Virgilio qui comprend des parties en prose et des parties en vers. Les textes latins sont accompagnés des traductions en français moderne. En outre, le livre comprend l'Introduction de Cristina Noacco (plus bas C. N.), l'Établissement de texte par Jean-Marie Fritz (plus bas J.-M. F.), le tableau synoptique, la liste des étymologies, la bibliographie, les index.

À part les *Integumenta*¹, les commentaires en question n'ont pas été traduits en langues modernes. Tous les trois textes ont été publiés par Fausto Ghisalberti dans les années 1930² ; le poème *Integumenta* fut publié un peu plus tôt dans la thèse de L.K. Born (voir la note 1) ; Valeria Cotza consacre sa thèse à la publication des *Allegoriae* de Giovanni del Virgilio³.

L'édition des *Allegoriae* d'Arnoul d'Orléans, parue chez Garnier, est basée sur le ms. de Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 7205, f. 31^{va}-58^{vb} (fin du XII^e s.), à la différence de l'édition de F. Ghisalberti qui suit le ms. Venise, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XIV.222 (4007), f. 30^r-49^v (fin du XII^e s.) où une partie des folios est absente et d'autres sont intervertis (p. 68). Le manuscrit de base de la nouvelle édition, conserve, comme deux autres manuscrits, la forme originale du commentaire d'Arnoul qui représente la suite de l'*Accessus*, des *Glosulae* sur le texte des *Métamorphoses*, ainsi que des *Allegoriae* ; ainsi, l'œuvre d'Arnoul propose au lecteur le commentaire en chaîne qui passe du sens littéral au sens allégorique.

Pour l'édition des *Integumenta* les éditeurs se fondent sur le même manuscrit que Ghisalberti (Oxford, Bodl. Digby 104, première moitié du XIII^e s. ; ms. de base) ; en ce qui concerne Ghisalberti, il suit, à part ce manuscrit, le ms. Paris, BnF lat. 8008, XV^e s., f. 153-159⁴ ; pour l'édition de Garnier, ce dernier est un

¹ L.K. Born, *The Integumenta of the Metamorphoses of Ovid of John of Garland*, Chicago 1929; K. Gervais, *John of Garland, Integumenta Ovidii. Text Translation, and Commentary*, Kalamazoo 2022.

² F. Ghisalberti, "Arnolfo d'Orléans, un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII", *Memorie del Reale Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere, classe di lettere, scienze morali e storiche*, Volume ventiquattresimo, quindicesimo della serie terza, Milano 1932-XI, 157-234; *Integumenta Ovidii, poemetto inedito del secolo XIII*, a cura di Fausto Ghisalberti, Messina-Milano 1933; F. Ghisalberti, "Giovanni del Virgilio espositore delle *Metamorphosi*", *Il Giornale Dantesco* 34, 1931 (paru en 1933), 1-110.

³ Giovanni del Virgilio, *Allegorie super fabulas Ovidii Metamorphoseos*, edizione critica e introduzione a cura di V. Cotza, Università di Pisa 2013.

⁴ Ghisalberti, *Integumenta Ovidii*, 32.

des manuscrits de contrôle (pp. 62-3). Les éditeurs de Garnier introduisent dans le texte du poème les sous-titres, alors que Ghisalberti les place sur les marges.

L'édition des *Allegoriae* de Giovanni del Virgilio est basée sur un manuscrit de la vulgate du commentaire (Milan, Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense (Brera), AF.XIV.21, f. 51-62^r, XIV^e s.), alors que Valeria Cotza, en accord avec la pratique d'édition des textes médiévaux, fréquente en Italie, publie la rédaction « vulgate » sans choisir le manuscrit de base. Ghisalberti suit, par contre, le manuscrit qui a conservé la rédaction du commentaire distincte de la vulgate (Crémone, Biblioteca Statale, fondo governativo 129, f. 43^r-61^v ; fin du XIV^e s. [pp. 65-6]). Ainsi, la nouvelle édition permet aux médiévistes d'accéder aux textes dont les éditions précédentes ne sont pas toujours faciles à trouver et, de plus, leur découvre la partie de la tradition manuscrite qui leur était quelquefois inconnue.

Les textes latins sont accompagnés d'un choix des leçons des manuscrits de contrôle ; les textes des traductions — par les commentaires. Dans le cas d'Arnoul d'Orléans le commentaire est plus développé, en comparaison de l'édition de Ghisalberti, ce qui constitue le mérite indiscutable de la nouvelle édition. Ainsi, les éditeurs remarquent dans les *Allegoriae* d'Arnoul plusieurs coïncidences avec les *Derivationes* d'Ugguccione da Pisa ; sans aucun doute, les deux auteurs devaient utiliser la même source, perdue actuellement (p. 87 n. 7). L'édition contient de nombreuses notes intéressantes. Ainsi, les jugements d'Arnoul, dans son *Accessus*, sur le mouvement rationnel et irrationnel de l'âme, semblable au mouvement du firmament de l'Orient vers l'Occident et au mouvement des planètes, qui va dans le sens contraire, sont comparés aux *Glosae super Platonem* de Guillaume de Conches et de Bernard de Chartres (p. 91 n. 15) ; l'étymologie du nom d'Esculape, comme les éditeurs le montrent, remonte à celle qu'on trouve dans le commentaire de Remi d'Auxerre sur Martianus Capella (p. 109 n. 50), alors que, selon Ghisalberti, cette étymologie appartient à Arnoul (p. 205 n. 8), etc.

Toutefois, il est impossible de ne pas remarquer que le texte des *Allegoriae* d'Arnoul a été déjà commenté par Ghisalberti qui l'a comparé dans bien de cas aux *Mythologies* de Fulgence, aux mythographes, au commentaire de Servius sur l'*Énéide*, quelquefois au *De Civitate Dei* de saint Augustin. Certains commentaires des éditions de Garnier et de Ghisalberti coïncident, au moins partiellement. Ainsi, l'édition de Garnier explique l'affirmation d'Arnoul, selon qui les « singes » habitaient sur l'île de Lemnos et ont élevé Vulcain par une faute de lecture qui remonte à Servius (*In Buc.* 4.62) ; C. N. cite dans son Introduction le même exemple (p. 25). Pourtant Ghisalberti a déjà fait la même constatation, mais la référence à son édition est absente⁵.

⁵ F. Ghisalberti, "Arnolfo d'Orléans, un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII", 205-6. — Cf. d'autres commentaires qui coïncident dans les éditions de J.-M. F. et C.N., d'une part, et de F. Ghisalberti, d'autre part : éd. Garnier, 99 nn. 30-1 et Ghisalberti, 202 n. 8 ; éd. Garnier, 121 n. 75 et Ghisalberti, 208 n. 2 ; éd. Garnier, 141 n. 108 et Ghisalberti, 213 n. 2 ; éd. Garnier, 157 n. 146 et Ghisalberti, 216 n. 8 ; éd. Garnier, 165 n. 164 et Ghisalberti, 218 n. 17. Cette liste n'est pas exhaustive.

On peut faire les mêmes remarques par rapport aux commentaires qui accompagnent le texte des *Integumenta* ; dans ce cas également les éditeurs de Garnier expliquent plusieurs vers du poème qui n'ont pas été suffisamment commentés dans l'édition de Ghisalberti. Ainsi, par rapport au vers 97 où Io « fugitive » est mentionnée (*Yo vaga*), les éditeurs renvoient à l'*Art poétique* d'Horace (v. 124), d'où proviennent ces mots ; ils remarquent, de plus, que les vers 123-4 ont été cités dans un manuscrit des *Integumenta* et attirent l'attention sur les odes de Jean de Garlande, écrites à l'imitation d'Horace, qui font partie de la dernière section de sa *Parisiana Poetria* (p. 234 n. 27 ; p. 235 n. 25).

Les vers 177-80 dans lesquels les sœurs Ino, Autooné, Agavé et Sémélé sont identifiées aux diverses facultés de l'homme — de la perception sensuelle jusqu'à l'intellect — reflètent l'influence, comme les éditeurs le remarquent, des jugements de Guillaume de Conche qui localise ces facultés dans les diverses parties (*cellae*) du cerveau (*De Philosophia mundi*, 3.21) ; d'une façon analogue, Jean de Garlande localise l'aptitude de l'homme au jugement logique dans une « chambre » (*cella*, v. 179) qui s'ouvre grâce à Agavé. Les éditeurs citent, de plus, la glose d'Arnoul sur Lucain (*Glosulae super Lucanum*, 1.577) qui a déjà identifié les quatre sœurs aux diverses facultés de l'homme (p. 247 n. 54).

Les éditeurs mettent en rapport l'interprétation allégorique du mythe d'Orphée et d'Eurydice (vv. 407-8 : les prés par lesquels Eurydice se promène, sont identifiés aux délices, Eurydice elle-même — à la chair) avec les jugements analogues de Bernard Silvestre dans son commentaire *Super sex libros Eneidos* ; on pourrait ajouter que le commentaire similaire fait partie du *Livre de Boece de Consolacion*, une des traductions du *De Consolatione* (commentaire du poème 3.12 m, consacré à la descente d'Orphée aux Enfers) qui, selon Glynnis M. Cropp, remonte à son tour au commentaire de Guillaume de Conches⁶. Toutefois, plusieurs commentaires dans les éditions de Garnier et de Ghisalberti coïncident ou coïncident partiellement⁷. À notre avis, il faudrait noter dans l'Introduction —, au moins, sous une forme générale — que les textes édités ont été déjà commentés par Ghisalberti.

Les textes des *Integumenta* dans les éditions de Garnier et de Ghisalberti divergent à certains endroits. Pour les vv. 399-400 les éditeurs proposent, à notre avis, le texte plus clair : « In Bacchi festis est vannus : semina vanno / [...] mundificata nitent » (p. 274 et p. 275 n. 133), alors que la leçon choisie par

⁶ « Donc par Orpheus est entendu homme saige, bien parlant ; par Euridiscs sa femme est entendue la naturelle concupiscence [...], par les prez ou elle vagoit et par le serpent qui la point sont entenduz les biens temporels qui menent en enfer » (*Le livre de Boece de Consolacion*, éd. G.M. Cropp, Genève 2006, 194 ; les pages 309-10 renvoient au commentaire de Guillaume de Conches : éd. L. Nauta dans : *L'Orphée de Boèce au Moyen Âge. Traductions françaises et commentaires latins (XII^e-XIV^e siècles)*, éd. J.K. Atkinson, A.M. Babbi, Medioevi, Testi 2, Verona 2000, 169-80.

⁷ Éd. Garnier, 225 n. 3 (v. 15) et Ghisalberti, 36 ; éd. Garnier, 229 n. 9 (v. 37) et Ghisalberti, 37 ; éd. Garnier, 229 n. 11 (vv. 45-8) et Ghisalberti, 38-9 (vv. 41-8) ; éd. Garnier, 229 n. 12 (vv. 53-4) ; 231 n. 14 (vv. 63-4) et Ghisalberti, 40 (vv. 63-6) ; éd. Garnier, 265 n. 103 (v.v 321-4) et Ghisalberti, 61 ; éd. Garnier, 273 n. 127 (vv. 383-4) et Ghisalberti, 65. Cette liste n'est pas exhaustive.

Ghisalberti (« vannus femina », p. 67), comme les éditeurs le remarquent, n'a pas de sens. Dans deux autres cas pourtant, c'est le texte de Ghisalberti qui nous semble préférable, bien qu'il choisisse des leçons minoritaires⁸.

La traduction des vv. 209-10 semble littérale, obscure et pas tout à fait correcte. Cf. « Volvitur instabilis Ixion, institor errat, / Transfuga discurrit statque caditque vagus » (pp. 250-2) ; traduction : « Ixion tourne sur sa roue sans repos : le colporteur va à l'aventure, / le déserteur court ça et là, le voyageur s'arrête et tombe à terre » (pp. 251-3). La note 63 (p. 253) explique que Jean de Garlande identifie, à la suite des autres commentateurs, la roue qu'Ixion tourne, aux marchands. Pourtant qui est ce « déserteur » dont il s'agit dans la traduction du v. 210 ?

À notre avis, le mot « transfuga » n'a pas le sens de « déserteur », mais de « transfuge », « personne qui change de pays, de lieu ». Le v. 210 caractérise le même marchand ou colporteur, qui est identifié à Ixion, ce que la traduction ne permet pas de comprendre. On pourrait traduire ce distique de la manière suivante : « L'inconstant Ixion se tourne de tout côté : le colporteur erre à l'aventure, / Se déplaçant d'un pays à l'autre, [enfin], ce voyageur s'arrête et tombe ».

À la p. 457 n. 273 (l'édition des *Allegoriae* Giovanni del Virgilio, 9.1, vv. 14-26) l'édition de Garnier renvoie aux vers 347-50 des *Integumenta* de Jean de Garlande. Giovanni évoque la vie active, contemplative et luxurieuse, ainsi que les déesses qui incarnent le choix de chaque vie. Bien que Jean mentionne Junon et la vie active, d'autres types de vie et des déesses qui y correspondent ne figurent pas dans son texte ; c'est Fulgence qui en parle (2.1) ; cela dit, Diane qui pour Giovanni incarne la vie contemplative ensemble avec Minerve, est absente chez Fulgence, et il serait souhaitable d'expliquer son apparition.

La traduction du distique (Giovanni del Virgilio, 8.1, vv. 1-15) ne semble pas tout à fait claire et réussie. Cf. : « Ne tamen huic monstro desint monimenta, poete / Aptant ad metrice proprietatis aves » (p. 442) ; traduction : « Toutefois, pour que l'on garde les traces de ce monstre, les poètes / la [Scylla] range parmi les oiseaux à caractère lyrique » (p. 443). Les éditeurs précisent : « L'alouette est avec le rossignol l'oiseau par excellence de la lyrique médiévale, latine et surtout vernaculaire » (p. 443 n. 253). Pourtant le texte latin renvoie soit à la poésie métrique, soit aux arts de versification, de sorte qu'il devienne impossible d'évoquer la poésie lyrique vernaculaire.

⁸ Cf. l'édition de Garnier, 251 n. 67, 250, vv. 207-8 : « Sisiphus est si quis honerosa negotia curat, / Pondus et imperii pondere stratus humi est », dont la traduction ne nous semble pas tout à fait compréhensible (« Sisyphe est celui qui se charge de lourdes affaires ; / et, poids, il a été renversé à terre sous le poids de sa puissance ») ; Ghisalberti, p. 53: « Sisiphus est si quis honerosa negotia curat, / Pronus et imperii pondere stratus humi est », qu'on pourrait traduire de cette façon : « Sisyphe est celui qui se soucie des lourdes affaires ; / il est courbé sous le poids du pouvoir et renversé par terre ». Cf. également le texte de l'édition Garnier pour les vv. 473-4 (282 ; 285 n. 153) et Ghisalberti, 72 : chez les éditeurs de Garnier, c'est la « mortis mulier » qui fait changer l'homme, alors que chez Ghisalberti il s'agit de « Martis mulier » (Vénus).

Certaines déclarations des éditeurs de Garnier, ainsi que leurs préférences suscitent des questions. Ainsi, en discutant les manuscrits du commentaire d'Arnoul d'Orléans, J.-M. F. note : « Nous avons donc retenu comme manuscrit de base le Clm 7205, qui présente le triple avantage d'une organisation qui était celle de l'origine, de l'ancienneté (fin du XII^e) et de sa complétude [...] ; nous l'avons également pris comme manuscrit d'appui pour les *Glosulae* du même Arnoul en grande partie inédites » (p. 60).

Pourtant l'édition de Garnier publie l'*Accessus* et les *Allegoriae* et non pas les *Glosulae* sur le texte des *Métamorphoses*. Les *Glosulae* sont partiellement citées dans les notes à l'édition des *Allegoriae* : une fois d'après l'édition de Ghisalberti⁹ ; dans certains cas d'après l'édition de Gura¹⁰ ; dans d'autres cas d'après le manuscrit¹¹. L'ensemble de ces citations ne constitue pas l'édition des gloses ; il suffit de les comparer aux éditions des gloses sur livres I et II des *Métamorphoses*, par Ghisalberti, et sur les livres III, VII-VIII, XI, par D. Gura. Notons, de plus, que les éditeurs ne mentionnent pas que les gloses à ces livres ont été publiées dans les éditions en question (les éditions figurent d'ailleurs dans la bibliographie, toutefois la référence à celle de Ghisalberti est incomplète ; nous y reviendrons). L'absence des gloses dans le texte de la publication laisse le lecteur dans l'embarras, puisque la fin de l'*Accessus* renvoie au sens littéral (« Littera sic exponatur », p. 92) ; une note (p. 93 n. 19) précise que cette phrase renvoie aux gloses, pourtant le lecteur passe directement aux allégories.

Dans l'Établissement de texte, J.-M. F. donne des renseignements sur la diffusion du commentaire d'Arnoul d'Orléans et du poème *Integumenta* de Jean de Garlande fondés sur les recherches de ses devanciers¹² —, les deux textes existant d'abord sous forme autonome, plus tard, sous forme d'alternance des commentaires en prose d'Arnoul et des vers de Jean, enfin, sous forme des gloses marginales sur le texte des *Métamorphoses*. Il n'évoque cependant pas la classification des manuscrits ou bien des renseignements sur des manuscrits

⁹ F. Ghisalberti, "Arnolfo d'Orléans, un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII", 181-9 (publication des gloses). Cf. 105 n. 45 (2.367).

¹⁰ D.T. Gura, *A critical edition and study of Arnulf of Orléan's philological commentary to Ovid's Metamorphoseos*, Ohio 2010 ; publication des gloses : pp. 167-244. Cf. la présente édition, 169 n. 171 (7.359) ; n. 173 [7.369] ; les éditeurs mentionnent également une glose publiée par D. Gura sans la citer (171 n. 175 [7.383]).

¹¹ Cf. 131 n. 93 (4.277) ; 135 n. 97 (4.562) ; 159 n. 152 (6.113) ; n. 154 (6.116) ; 161 n. 157 (6.125) ; 167 n. 170 (4.13) ; 203 n. 233 (12.531). — Les *Glosulae* d'Arnoul sur les *Métamorphoses* sont parfois citées, mais dans la plupart des cas mentionnées dans les notes à l'édition des *Integumenta* : 239 n. 32 (2.2) ; 269 n. 111 (9.67) ; 269 n. 115 (9.198) ; 275 n. 132 (9.693) ; dans les notes à l'édition des *Allegoriae* de Giovanni del Virgilio les gloses sont citées dans bien de cas d'après l'édition de Gura, *A critical edition*, 307 n. 23 (1.649) ; 309 n. 29 (10.22) ; 341 n. 82 (4.542) ; 431 n. 230 (7.361) ; 431 n. 231 (7.362) ; 431 n. 232 (7.363) ; 435 n. 238 (7.385) ; 439 n. 247 (7.625) ; 461 n. 281 (7.434) ; 9.186 ; 477 n. 312 (9.647-8).

¹² Cf. en particulier, *Integumenta Ovidii*, 10-12.

proches, ne mentionnant même pas ce qui a été dit à ce sujet par d'autres chercheurs, par exemple, par L.K. Born¹³.

Cependant Ghisalberti dans sa publication des *Integumenta* se fonde sur l'article de L.K. Born et note que, selon ce chercheur, les mss. Oxford, Bodl. Digby 104 et Paris, BnF, lat. 8008 sont proches de l'archétype, et c'est la raison pour laquelle son édition est fondée sur ces manuscrits. La thèse mentionnée de D. Gura contient, elle aussi, la classification des manuscrits pour les gloses, ainsi que le stemma des manuscrits ; les éditeurs de Garnier ne discutent pas les conclusions de Gura à ce sujet.

Les remarques sur les rédactions, les familles et les sous-familles des manuscrits sont présentes uniquement sur les pages consacrées aux *Allegoriae* Giovanni del Virgilio (p. 65) ; elles sont fondées, comme on peut le supposer, sur la thèse inédite de Valeria Cotza. La présence de ces remarques dans la section consacrée aux manuscrits de ce dernier traité contraste avec ce qui est dit par rapport aux manuscrits des *Allegoriae* d'Arnoul et des *Integumenta* de Jean de Garlande, et accentue le manque des observations de cette sorte dans les paragraphes de l'Établissement de texte qui en discutent les manuscrits.

À cet égard, la formule de J.-M. F. qui définit le but de la nouvelle édition ne semble pas tout à fait claire : « Notre but n'était pas d'établir une édition exhaustivement critique, mais d'offrir un texte satisfaisant, non reconstruit à partir des seules éditions précédentes, comme point d'appui à la traduction » (p. 79).

J.-M. F. présente la composition des manuscrits qui ont conservé les *Allegoriae* d'Arnoul d'Orléans tantôt d'une façon très détaillée, tantôt, par contre, avec une brièveté remarquable : pour le ms. de Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 7205, f. 31^{va}-58^{vb} (fin du XII^e s.) tous les opuscules grammaticaux qui en font partie sont énumérés (p. 68), alors que par rapport au ms. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 104, est précisé qu'il comporte « une soixantaine de textes techniques », « traités de Robert de Grosseteste », etc. (p. 70).

Dans son Introduction, C. N. caractérise le contexte dans lequel les traités édités ont été créés, s'arrêtant ensuite sur chacun d'entre eux —, leurs auteurs, le contenu, les sources, parfois le style et la versification (pour Jean de Garlande et Giovanni del Virgilio), l'influence et le sort postérieur ; elle suit dans une large mesure son article écrit en collaboration avec J.-M. F.¹⁴.

L'Introduction suscite plus de questions et des observations critiques que l'Établissement de texte. Il est étonnant, en particulier, que dans la caractéristique du contexte idéologique et religieux, dans lequel les commentaires ont été créés, Fulgence est assez rarement mentionné. Il fut cependant un des premiers à accorder aux mythes de l'Antiquité des sens allégoriques, et ses allégories sont

¹³ L.K. Born, "The Manuscripts of the *Integumenta* on the *Metamorphoseos* of Ovid by John of Garland", *TAPhA* 9, 1929, 179-99.

¹⁴ J.-M. Fritz, C. Noacco, "Lire Ovide au XII^e siècle : Arnoul d'Orléans, commentateur des *Métamorphoses*", *Anabases. Traditions et Réceptions de l'Antiquité* 29, 2019, 199-214.

influencées par le christianisme¹⁵. C. N. suppose, au contraire, que l'approche « qui faisait d'Ovide un philosophe et lui attribuait des intentions morales, se fonde sur l'importance que la lecture allégorique des textes littéraires — suivant le modèle de l'exégèse biblique — a connu de manière croissante dès l'Antiquité, grâce à des auteurs comme Prudence et Martianus Capella ... » (p. 8).

Cependant, l'explication allégorique des mythes y est absente de la *Psychomachia* de Prudence et du prosimètre *De Nuptiis* de Martianus Capella, même si les personnifications y agissent ; le dernier auteur fut, de plus, adepte des cultes traditionnels romains, il n'y a rien de chrétien dans son livre et il ne pouvait pas suivre « le modèle de l'exégèse biblique ». À cet égard, la constatation de l'Auteur qui suit plus bas semble également étonnante : selon elle, « l'interprétation [...] christianisante des mythes ovidiens a permis de justifier la fascination que ces histoires exerçaient chez les hommes de lettres » (p. 9), ainsi que de sauver ces histoires de l'oubli — cette constatation est inapplicable à l'ouvrage de Martianus Capella (et, d'une façon générale, à toute la littérature de l'Antiquité, y compris au Moyen Âge).

Plus bas C. N. note que les *Allegoriae* d'Arnoul s'inscrivent dans la tradition « qui remonte aux *Narrationes fabularum ovidianarum* attribuées à Lactance Placide et qui consiste à ajouter une synthèse aux manuscrits des *Métamorphoses* » (p. 17)¹⁶. Pourtant les *Mythologies* de Fulgence furent non moins importantes pour Arnoul : Fulgence propose l'interprétation allégorique des mythes, alors que Lactance Placide en donne l'építome, même si certaines de ses phrases ou des noms propres qu'il cite se rencontrent chez les commentateurs plus tardifs.

Selon C. N., le plan du commentaire d'Arnoul « conduit, d'après la célèbre tripartition d'Hugues de Saint-Victor à propos de l'exégèse biblique, de la *littera* à la *sententia*: la *littera* représente l'approche grammaticale, par l'étude de la lettre avec les *Glosulae* ... » (p. 13). Le système des sens que propose Hugues de Saint-Victor fut plus complexe, puisque le sens historique, selon lui, demande la connaissance de l'histoire (des événements du passé) et la compréhension du premier sens du récit (*Didascalicon*, lib. 6, capp. 2-3¹⁷). Nous ne croyons pas que la structure du commentaire d'Arnoul renvoie à Hugues de Saint-Victor ; d'une façon générale, les classifications des sens des Écritures furent nombreuses (cf., en particulier, saint Augustin, *De utilitate credendi*, cap. 3¹⁸) et il est possible, peut-être, de retrouver pour Arnoul un exemple plus proche parmi les théologiens.

¹⁵ É. Wolf, P. Dain, "Introduction", *Fulgence, Mythologies*, traduit, présenté et annoté par Étienne Wolf et Philippe Dain, Villeneuve-d'Ascq 2013, 7-41, ici pp. 17-20.

¹⁶ Avec renvoi à David Ansell Slater, *Towards a Text of the Metamorphosis of Ovid*, Oxford 1927, ainsi qu'à son article Cristina Noacco, "Lire Ovide au XII^e siècle : Arnoul d'Orléans, commentateur des *Métamorphoses*", *Troianalexandrina* 6, 2007, 131-47.

¹⁷ < <https://www.thelatinlibrary.com/hugo/hugo6.html> > [799B-799C; 801A-801B]; de plus: *Eruditionis didascalicae libri VII*, PL 176, col. 799 C; col. 801 A.

¹⁸ PL 42, col. 68.

C. N. remarque à la même page : « *la littera* représente l'approche grammaticale, par l'étude de la lettre avec les *Glosulae* ; le *sensus*, le sens premier, est assuré par la liste des *Mutationes*, à valeur de sommaire, tandis que la *sententia* renvoie au sens second, celui des *Allegoriae* » (p. 13). Dans ce cas il est difficile de comprendre quel système de sens l'Auteur a en vue, puisque dans les systèmes divers le sens historique ou littéral fut premier, et il fut opposé à d'autres sens (cela dit, dans la définition de ces sens les nuances furent multiples, comme, par exemple, entre saint Augustin et Hugues de Saint-Victor). De toute façon, il n'est pas clair quel est ce sens premier, appelé *sensus*, en comparaison de la *littera* (également le sens premier), et cela d'autant plus que les *Glosulae* comprennent non seulement le commentaire grammatical, mais aussi certains sujets et, de plus, les éléments de l'interprétation allégorique¹⁹.

À notre avis, les *Mutationes* (en effet, les listes des sujets auxquels les livres d'Ovide sont consacrés) n'ont aucun rapport à la structure du commentaire allégorique, mais représentent les index pour chaque livre des *Métamorphoses* ; pour s'en convaincre, il suffit de comparer les *mutationes* pour les livres des *Allegoriae* d'Arnoul et de Lanctance Placide, par exemple, pour le livre 3²⁰ —, bien qu'il n'y ait pas de coïncidences précises, il s'agit des mêmes sujets ; d'ailleurs, les éditions plus tardives des *Métamorphoses* comportent des index des sujets essentiels²¹ ; cela est vrai également pour certaines éditions de notre époque.

C. N. explique (p. 11 n. 23) que le *Florilegium gallicum* comporte « des extraits d'Ovide, de Tibulle, de Pétrone et de Valérius Flaccus ». Elle ne fait aucune référence aux études qui lui sont consacrées et, en particulier, à l'article très détaillé de B. Munk Olsen, « Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIII^e siècle », *RHT* 9, 1979, 47-121 (pour le *Florilegium gallicum*, pp. 75-83). Il s'ensuit que la liste des auteurs, dont ce *Florilegium* comportait des extraits, était bien plus longue : à part ceux qui ont été mentionnés, on y trouvait des extraits de Virgile, de Stace, de Lucain, d'Horace, de Juvénal, de Perse, de Martial, de Térence, de Cicéron, de Salluste, etc.

¹⁹ Cf. l'édition des gloses par Ghisalberti : « I, v. 671 : *virgam caduceum i. rethoricam orationem* », par rapport à Mercure (Fausto Ghisalberti, "Arnolfo d'Orléans, un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII", 184) ; « II, v. 11 : *Fabula est quod Doris uxor Nerei vel Oceani fuit que habebat VII filias quarum inferiores partes erant pisceae, superiores humanae* », 184).

²⁰ *Lactancii Placidi qui dicitur narrationes fabularum ovidianarum*, H. Magnus, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon Libri XV*, Berolini 1914, 642. Cf. l'édition de Garnier, p. 116.

²¹ Cf. en particulier l'édition préparée par Raphael Regius : *Ovidii Metamorphosis cum integris ac emendatissimis Raphaelis Regii enarrationibus...*, Venetiis, Augustino Barbadico, 1497 <<https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k60834q>> [non paginé] qui contient l'index détaillé, distinct de celui de Lactance Placide. L'édition Publii Ovidii Nasonis *Metamorphoseos*, Venetiis, per Christophorum de Pensis, 1492 <<https://catalogue.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cb372815704>> [non paginé] publie les index de Lactance Placide pour tous les livres qui précèdent le texte des *Métamorphoses* ; ensuite, ses arguments au début des « fables ».

On lit dans l'Introduction que « dans le traitement de Mercure, le poète [Jean de Garlande] décline les attributs et leur respective portée, comme le fait Raoul de Houdenc dans son *Roman des Ailes*, contemporain des *Integumenta* » (pp. 35-6). La comparaison avec ce roman ne semble pas nécessaire, puisque Fulgence, lui aussi, découvre le sens des attributs de Mercure (I, xviii : *Fabula Mercurii*²²), même si on n'y trouve pas de coïncidences précises avec le texte des *Integumenta*. De plus, il ne faut pas oublier que plusieurs œuvres en ancien français découvrent des sens allégoriques des attributs des personnages, comme, par exemple *Espurgatoire seint Patriz* traduit par Marie de France, la première partie du *Roman de la Rose* (le sens des flèches d'Amour)²³, etc.

L'auteur cite l'interprétation allégorique du mythe d'Orphée des *Integumenta* (« Pratum delicie, coniunx caro, vipera virus, / Vir ratio, Styx est terra, loquela lira » ; vv. 407-8), en y ajoutant une remarque suivante : « Ce style ésotérique, qui mêle et condense à la fois le texte d'origine latin et le premier commentaire d'Arnoul, fait songer au *trobar clus* des premiers poètes occitans, voire aux compositions poétiques minimalistes japonaises, les haïkus, où la juxtaposition de substantifs aboutit à des formules très condensés, voire hermétiques qui sont autant de défis à la sagacité des lecteurs » (pp. 36-7)²⁴.

Avouons que ces parallèles nous semblent bien éloignés du poème de Jean de Garlande et nous ne comprenons pas lequel des troubadours l'Auteur a en vue. Les vers cités des *Integumenta* utilisent une figure rhétorique fréquente dans la poésie latine médiévale — le zeugma, dont les espèces cite, par exemple, Matthieu de Vendôme, en en illustrant les définitions par de nombreuses exemples, semblables aux vers de Jean ; on trouve des définitions analogues et des exemples qui les illustrent chez Évrard l'Allemand²⁵.

L'Auteur note que l'utilisation du distique élégiaque lie Jean de Garlande « à la tradition des épigrammes et des sentences morales de l'Antiquité : la forme appuie le programme qu'il a donné à son texte » (p. 37). Le choix du distique élégiaque, croyons-nous, lie Jean de Garlande, en premier lieu, à Ovide qui l'utilise dans toutes ses œuvres, à l'exception des *Métamorphoses* ; les vers du début des *Integumenta* (vv. 3-4, p. 222) qui associent la plume légère de Jean au service des « poètes » et le choix des pentamètres font écho, semble-t-il, au début des *Amores* (1.1.1-4) où Ovide donne une définition ironique du pentamètre et l'oppose aux vers épiques.

²² Fulgence, *Mythologies*, 70.

²³ T.A. Jenkins, *Marie de France, Espurgatoire seint Patriz : an Old French Poem of the Twelfth Century*, Genève 1974, vv. 799-805, pp. 83-4 ; Armand Strubel, *Guillaume de Lorris et Jean de Meun, Le Roman de la Rose*, Paris 1992, vv. 2050-763.

²⁴ Avec le renvoi, dans la note 117, à l'article de J.-M. Fritz, "Moralisation et *brevitas*. Les Ovides moralisés latins d'Arnoul d'Orléans et de Jean de Garlande", S. Cerrito, M. Possamaï-Pérez, eds., *Ovide en France du Moyen Âge à nos jours*, Paris 2021, 32 et 35.

²⁵ E. Faral, *Les arts poétiques du XII^e et du XIII^e siècle. Recherches et documents sur la technique littéraire du Moyen Âge*, Genève 1982 [Paris 1924], 111-12 ; 346, vv. 273-86.

Selon C. N., les prosimètres du XII^e s. ne correspondent pas à la définition moderne du prosimètre comme texte alternant des parties en prose et des parties en vers, mais qu'à cette époque il n'y avait que la forme de « *dictamen metricum* », mélange des vers métriques et des vers rythmiques (pp. 47-8). Comment classer alors des œuvres illustres des écrivains de l'*École de Chartres* — *De Planctu Naturae* d'Alain de Lille, la *Cosmographia* de Bernard Silvestre ?

L'Auteur constate, en particulier, par rapport aux parties en vers des *Allegoriae* de Giovanni del Virgilio, que « la rime interne entre les deux vers du distique (ou bien entre l'hémistiche et la fin de l'hexamètre, ainsi qu'entre l'hémistiche et la fin du pentamètre) est à cette époque la caractéristique la plus fréquente du prosimètre (pp. 49-50, avec le renvoi à Valeria Cotza). Évrard l'Allemand cite des exemples nombreux des rimes liant les parties diverses du distique élégiaque, en dehors de la forme du prosimètre²⁶.

C. N. renvoie aux écrivains et théologiens médiévaux par rapport à l'image du monde comme livre ouvert, en mentionnant uniquement les noms des auteurs (Alain de Lille et Hugues de Saint-Victor) et en citant l'article qui en parle ; pourtant ni les titres des ouvrages, ni les numéros des livres et des vers ne sont mentionnés (p. 8 et n. 9). L'édition des commentaires médiévaux sur les Métamorphoses est par définition destinée au public universitaire et aux chercheurs, et les références plus précises nous semblent nécessaires.

J.-M. F. (Établissement de texte, p. 66) et C. N. (Introduction, pp. 41-2) caractérisent différemment les parties rimées du commentaire de Giovanni del Virgilio qui n'était pas toujours considéré comme leur auteur. Ainsi, J.-M. F. écrit : « nous pensons, sans preuve définitive, que ces parties métriques sont pour l'essentiel l'œuvre de Virgilio, ce qui n'empêche pas ici ou là les emprunts à Garlande ou à la riche tradition parémiologique » (p. 66).

Quant à C. N., elle discute également cette question, mais se prononce d'une façon beaucoup plus décisive en faveur de Giovanni del Virgilio, auteur des vers : « l'on reconnaît désormais la volonté, de la part du poète-exégète, de fournir une clé de lecture à double entrée — à double tour, pourrait-on dire du recueil ovidien : à la compréhension de l'interprétation allégorique du texte latin [...] s'ajoute sa mémorisation ... » (p. 42). Nous croyons que les éditeurs devraient coordonner un peu plus leurs vues sur cette question.

Il existe d'autres répétitions dans l'Introduction et dans l'Établissement de texte. C. N. donne des renseignements sur les traductions du commentaire de Giovanni del Virgilio en langue vernaculaire (pp. 52-3). J.-M. F. en parle à son tour (p. 65 et n. 16). C. N. précise que les vers de Giovanni avaient des fonctions mnémotechniques (p. 42) ; J.-M. F. le confirme également (p. 67).

Pour l'édition des *Allegoriae* d'Arnoul d'Orléans de Ghisalberti les dates différentes sont indiquées : p. 14 n. 36 (1932) ; p. 60 (1932) ; p. 17 (1933).

²⁶ Edmond Faral, *Les arts poétiques du XII^e et du XIII^e siècle*, 362, vv. 705-33; des exemples analogues pour l'hexamètre : 364, vv. 755-801.

Les co-auteurs écrivent souvent, dans la tradition italienne, au lieu de « Jean de Garlande » ou « Jean », « Garlande », au lieu de « Giovanni del Virgilio » — « Virgilio », ce qui ne nous semblent pas réussi, puisqu'il ne s'agit pas des noms de famille.

L'édition comporte des erreurs de frappe, y compris celles qui peuvent mettre le lecteur dans l'embarras. C. N. mentionne des poèmes français *Pyramus et Tisbé*, *Narcisse et Philomela* (sic) (p. 30), renvoyant ensuite dans la note 93 à l'édition *Pyrame et Thisbe, Narcisse, Philomela*. Trois contes du XII^e siècle, éd. et trad. Emmanuèle Baumgartner, Paris 2000, d'où il s'ensuit qu'il s'agit, entre autre, du *Lai de Narcisse*. À la p. 60 la cote du manuscrit est incorrecte : ms. BnF fr. 8001 (sic) au lieu de ms. BnF lat. 8001.

La bibliographie du volume nécessite des compléments et des corrections. On est impressionné de ne pas trouver dans la bibliographie les éditions des *Allegoriae* d'Arnoul d'Orléans, des *Integumenta* de Jean de Garlande et des *Allegoriae* de Giovanni del Virgilio préparées par F. Ghisalberti :

F. Ghisalberti, “Arnolfo d'Orléans, un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII”, *Memorie del Reale Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere, classe di lettere, scienze morali e storiche*. Volume ventiquattresimo, quindicesimo della serie terza, Milano 1932-XI, 157-234 ;

Integumenta Ovidii, poemetto inedito del secolo XIII, a cura di F. Ghisalberti, Messina-Milano 1933, 79 p. ;

F. Ghisalberti, “Giovanni del Virgilio espositore delle *Metamorphosi*”, *Il Giornale Dantesco* 34, 1931 (paru en 1933), 1-110.

Pourtant, à l'exception des thèses, ce sont des éditions imprimées rarissimes, sinon uniques (pour Arnoul et Giovanni del Virgilio) des traités auxquels la présente édition est consacrée.

À la p. 579 de la bibliographie, on trouve le titre suivant de l'édition des *Glosulae* d'Arnoul : Arnoul d'Orléans, *Glosulae Metamorphoseos*, éd. des livres 1 et 2 par F. Ghisalberti, *Arnolfo d'Orléans. Un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII...*, pp. 181-9. Le titre de la publication est incomplet ; comme il ne figure pas dans la bibliographie, il n'est pas facile de comprendre où on peut trouver l'édition des gloses.

Les éditeurs citent souvent dans les notes le livre d'Hygin, *Astronomica* (cf., en particulier, p. 173 n. 181 ; p. 319 n. 45 ; p. 485 n. 325 ; le titre est donné sous forme abrégée), pourtant aucune édition de ce texte ne figure dans la bibliographie.

À la p. 543 (n. 430) les éditeurs font référence à Orose, *Hist. adv. Paganos* (sic, sous forme abrégée), dont l'édition est absente de la bibliographie.

Le titres de l'article de Jean-Marie Fritz, auquel les éditeurs font souvent référence, sont différents dans le texte du volume et dans la bibliographie : p. 13 n. 32 : Jean-Marie Fritz, “Moralisation et *brevitas*. Les Ovides moralisés latins d'Arnoul d'Orléans et de Jean de Garlande”, *Ovide en France du Moyen Âge à nos jours*, éd. S. Cerrito et M. Possamaï-Pérez, Paris, Classiques Garnier, 2021,

pp. 25-42 ; p. 27 n. 82 : Jean-Marie Fritz, « Moralisation... » ; même titre abrégé aux p. 34 n. 109 ; p. 37 n. 117.

Cependant dans la bibliographie le titre de l'article est suivant : Fritz, Jean-Marie, « Moralité [sic] et brevités. Les Ovides moralisés latins d'Arnoul d'Orléans et de Jean de Garlande », *Ovide en France du Moyen Âge à nos jours. Études pour célébrer le bimillénaire de sa mort* (d'autres données coïncident) ; par conséquent, le lecteur reste perplexe.

Il faudrait mentionner dans la bibliographie les thèses inédites auxquelles les co-auteurs font référence dans les articles qui servent d'introduction au volume :

Giovanni del Virgilio, "Allegorie super fabulas Ovidii *Metamorphoseos*, edizione critica e introduzione a cura di Valeria Cotza" (Université de Pise 2013) ;

Matteo Ferretti, "Per Giovanni del Virgilio e la lectura delle *Metamorphosi* a Bologna nel Trecento. Con l'edizione di un volgarizzamento inedito" (Tesi di laurea in Filologia romanza, Università di Bologna 2006).

À la p. 261 (n. 94) les éditeurs font référence à la traduction de la *Poétique* d'Aristote par Guillaume de Moerbeke ; l'édition de la traduction (Aristotelis latinus, 33, *De arte poetica : translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeka ...*, ed. Laurentio Minio-Paluello, Bruxelles : Desclée de Brower, 1968) ne figure pas dans la bibliographie.

Il serait souhaitable d'ajouter à la bibliographie l'article de B. Munk Olsen, "Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIII^e siècle", *RHT* 9, 1979, 47-121, consacré aux florilèges, ainsi que l'introduction de R. Parr à son édition de l'*Ars Versificatoria* de Matthieu de Vendôme où il accorde une attention à sa polémique avec Arnoul, ainsi qu'à ses commentaires : Matthew of Vendôme, *Ars Versificatoria* (The Art of the Versemaker), trans. from the Latin with an Introduction by Roger P. Parr, Milwaukee, Wisconsin : Marquette University Press, 1981, pp. 9-14).

Malgré ces quelques remarques critiques, on ne peut que saluer la nouvelle édition des trois traités qui sera, sans aucun doute, bien utile aux médiévistes et à tous ceux qui ont un intérêt pour la réception des auteurs de l'Antiquité au Moyen Âge.

LUDMILLA EVDOKIMOVA

Institut de littérature mondiale, Université orthodoxe Saint-Tikhon (Moscou)

ludmila.evdokimova@gmail.com

JESÚS LÓPEZ ZAMORA, “Cum adulescens litteris Graecis operam darem”. *El manuscrito latino de Giovanni Bartolomeo Marliano de Hesíodo, Opera et Dies. Edición crítica del ms. Ang. lat. 240 (Roma, Biblioteca Angelica), Collection Latomus 367, Textes médio- et néo-Latins 2, Bruxelles: Latomus, 2023, iv+150 pp., 8 tavv., ISBN 978-90-429-4910-2.*

Quella di Giovanni Bartolomeo Marliani (o Marliano) è una singolare e significativa figura di umanista “minore” (ma senza volere attribuire al termine una sfumatura negativa) quattro-cinquecentesco, che certo meriterebbe (e merita) un’attenzione maggiore di quanto finora non sia stato fatto, per la varietà e la molteplicità dei suoi interessi (storici, antiquari, artistici, epigrafici, filologici, letterari) e per l’importanza da lui rivestita nell’ambito delle versioni latine di testi greci classici.

Nato nel 1488 a Robbio, nel Vercellese, il suo nome compare, nei frontespizi delle sue opere, sia come Giovanni Bartolomeo sia, semplicemente, come Bartolomeo e, talvolta, è accompagnato dal titolo di *patritius Mediolanensis* (benché tale origine nobiliare non risulti confermata né dal testamento né da altri documenti che su di lui possediamo). Dopo aver studiato lingua e letteratura greca a Milano, presso Stefano Negri (a sua volta allievo di Demetrio Calcondila), il Marliani frequentò l’Università di Padova, dove conobbe il futuro cardinale Giovanni Morone, che vi studiava diritto (e che diverrà uno dei suoi principali protettori e benefattori, durante il lungo periodo da lui trascorso a Roma). Nel 1525 – quindi a 37 anni – lo ritroviamo, quindi, a Roma (benché il suo definitivo trasferimento nella città papale sia avvenuto alcuni anni più tardi), dove entrò in contatto con gli ambienti della curia pontificia e dallo stesso papa, Paolo III Farnese, ricevette il titolo di cavaliere di San Pietro. Nel maggio 1534 diede alle stampe la sua opera più famosa, la *Antiquae Romae Topographia, libri septem* (Romae, A. Blado, 1534), una notevole e documentata guida alle antichità di Roma dedicata al cardinale Gian Domenico De Cupis, corredata di illustrazioni e fondata, soprattutto, su fonti classiche letterarie ed epigrafiche, nonché sui risultati dovuti ai più recenti ritrovamenti archeologici. La *Topographia*, alla cui redazione aveva contribuito Annibal Caro, godette di un immediato e durevole successo, tanto che, negli anni successivi alla sua prima pubblicazione, essa fu fatta oggetto di traduzioni e di epitomi in varie lingue (per l’importanza di colui che la allestì, vale la pena di menzionarne almeno l’edizione stampata a Lione da S. Gryphe e curata da François Rabelais, che la dedicò al poeta Jean Du Bellay: cfr. R. COOPER, “Rabelais and the *Topographia antiquae Romae* of Marliani”, *Études Rabelaisiennes* 14, 1977, 71-87). Quattro anni più tardi, nel 1538, a Basilea, Thomas Platter pubblicò un’epitome della *Topographia* insieme con il *De antiquitatibus Romae* di Giulio Pomponio Leto e il *De regionibus Urbis Romae* di Publio Aurelio Vittore. Ancora, nel settembre 1544 l’opera venne riedita con il titolo *Urbis Romae Topographia* e una nuova dedica a Francesco I di Valois, re di Francia (ed è questo il testo a suo modo definitivo della *Topographia*, secondo il quale essa verrà poi sempre ristampata). Nonostante il successo editoriale dell’opera, gli

studiosi contemporanei di antiquaria si dimostrarono assai critici nei confronti di essa (si ricordano, soprattutto, le accuse di Benedetto Egio e di Pirro Ligorio), e biasimarono il Marliani, insinuando che egli non sapesse scrivere correttamente in latino, che avesse commesso vistosi errori nella trascrizione delle iscrizioni, nella citazione delle fonti classiche e nell'individuazione della corretta ubicazione di alcuni antichi monumenti e, soprattutto, che avesse apertamente plagiato autori ben di lui più preparati e attendibili, come Biondo Flavio e Andrea Fulvio. A tali critiche il Marliani reagì con decisione, replicando al Ligorio e all'Egio coi *Topographiae Urbis Romae haec nuper adiecta*, aggiunti in un'edizione della *Topographia* data alle stampe a Roma nel 1553, nei quali egli si sforzò di dimostrare l'assoluta infondatezza delle tesi dei suoi detrattori (sulla vicenda, cfr. il saggio di M. Laureys, A. Schreurs, "Egio, Marliano, Ligorio and the *Forum Romanum* in the 16th Century", *HumLov* 14, 1996, 385-405).

Intanto, in una data presumibilmente di poco posteriore al 1544, egli aveva già preso i voti di frate agostiniano e si era ritirato in una casa a Tor Sanguigna, presso la chiesa romana di Sant'Agostino. Di questo periodo è la *Consulum, dictatorum censorumque Romanorum series una cum ipsorum triumphis, quae marmoribus sculpta in Foro reperta est, atque in Capitolium translata* (Romae, A. Blado, 1549, poi ampliata e ristampata nel 1560, col nuovo titolo *Annales consulum, dictatorum, censorumque Romanorum a condita Urbe usque ad Titum Caesarem. Eiusdem in eosdem ac triumphos Commentarius*, con dedica a papa Pio IV Medici), nella quale vengono descritti il contenuto e l'originaria collocazione dei Fasti consolari e trionfali, sulla base di iscrizioni marmoree scoperte nel Foro Romano nell'estate del 1546 e poco dopo trasferite in Campidoglio.

Al Marliani – che, come si è detto, aveva studiato da giovane col Negri, allievo del Calcondila – si devono poi (ed è questo l'elemento che maggiormente interessa, in relazione al vol. oggetto di questa nota) versioni dal greco in latino di numerosi testi classici greci, che confermano i suoi vari e molteplici interessi filologici: egli allestì l'edizione e la traduzione latina delle *sententiae* tratte dalle tragedie di Sofocle (*Hoc libello haec continetur Sophoclis [...] vita*, Romae, A. Blado, 1545), e nel 1565, forse sentendo prossima la fine (aveva ormai, a quell'epoca, ben 77 anni), lasciò alla Biblioteca del Convento di Sant'Agostino di Roma (l'attuale Biblioteca Angelica) alcuni manoscritti autografi contenenti le sue versioni (talvolta corredate da prefazioni, commenti, glossari) di Omero (*Iliade* e *Odissea*), Esiodo (*Le opere e i giorni*), Aristofane, Sofocle, Euripide (*l'Ecuba*), Pindaro, Demostene, Isocrate, Ermogene, Apollonio Rodio, Teocrito, Strabone di Amasea, Luciano di Samosata e, fra i moderni, gli umanisti Demetrio Calcondila, Emanuele Moscopulo e Teodoro Gaza. Si tratta di lavori che, nell'intenzione dell'autore, non erano destinati alle stampe: la maggior parte di essi, infatti, giace ancora manoscritta ed è auspicabile che su tali scritti si eserciti, prima o poi, l'acribia di studiosi giovani e valenti; essi, piuttosto, si configurano come testi scolastici, probabilmente rivolti agli allievi di greco che seguivano le lezioni tenute privatamente a Roma dal Marliani.

Il Marliani morì a Roma, nella sua casa di Tor Sanguigna, il 26 luglio 1566 (a 78 anni di età, quindi), e fu sepolto nella chiesa di Sant'Agostino (avverto, per correttezza, che nella delineazione di questo schizzo biografico dello scrittore mi sono ampiamente fondato su M. Albanese, "Marliani, Bartolomeo", in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 70, Roma 2008, 597-600; per un più ampio profilo – benché oggi un po' datato – si vd. poi A. Bertolotti, "Bartolomeo Marliano, archeologo nel secolo XVI", in *Atti e Memorie delle Regie Deputazioni di Storia Patria per le Province dell'Emilia*, n.s., 4, 1880, 107-38; e, più di recente, M. Laureys, "Bartolomeo Marliano (1488-1566): ein Antiquar des 16. Jahrhunderts", in K. Corsepius [et alii], eds., *Antiquarische Gelehrsamkeit und bildende Kunst: die Gegenwart der Antike in der Renaissance*, Köln 1996, 151-67).

Alla figura e all'attività filologica, esegetica e traduttiva del Marliani, in rapporto alla sua versione de *Le opere e i giorni* (*Opera et Dies*) di Esiodo, rivolge ora la sua attenzione Jesús López Zamora, giovane studioso particolarmente interessato alla trasmissione, alla ricezione e alle versioni latine dell'opera esiodea: già autore di molteplici, apprezzabili contributi in tal direzione, López Zamora ha, soprattutto, pubblicato qualche anno fa un'eccellente edizione critica della versione latina de *Le opere e i giorni* esiodei approntata nel 1462 dall'appena diciottenne Niccolò della Valle (Nicolaus de Valle, *Hesiodi Ascraei Opera et dies*, edición crítica por J. López Zamora, Genève 2020, su cui cfr. la mia recens., in *BstudLat* 51, 2021, 325-32) e, adesso, propone un'altrettanto ottima edizione della traduzione latina dello stesso poemetto didascalico esiodeo, attestata unicamente nel ms. Roma, Biblioteca Angelica, Ang. lat. 240 (ai ff. 66^r-83^v).

Il vol., dopo un breve *Preámbulo* (pp. 3-4) che funge da prefazione, è aperto da un'ampia e impegnata *Introducción* (pp. 7-40) che costituisce il miglior viatico per accostarsi nella maniera più corretta e filologicamente consapevole allo studio della versione del poemetto ascreo predisposta dal Marliani, e la cui lettura risulta assolutamente indispensabile per una retta e fattiva conoscenza e comprensione dell'autore, della sua opera e della sua attività didattica e traduttiva. Dopo aver stilato un puntuale e perspicuo quadro biografico e bibliografico dell'autore (1.1. *Giovanni Bartolomeo Marliano*, pp. 7-10), lo studioso spagnolo rivolge la propria attenzione nei confronti della fortuna che i poemetti esiodei godettero fra la seconda metà del Quattrocento e tutto il Cinquecento (1.2. *La traducción de Hesíodo en los siglos XV-XVI*, pp. 10-16). López Zamora, innanzitutto, tende giustamente a ribadire l'importanza e la fortuna che il poeta ascreo ebbe già a partire dal Quattrocento, e soprattutto nella seconda metà del secolo, quella in cui i classici greci, pur ben noti nei decenni precedenti, cominciarono a circolare, a essere letti, studiati e, come nel caso in questione, tradotti con maggiore frequenza e ricorsività; e ciò, soprattutto, per merito del già ricordato Niccolò della Valle, la cui versione de *Le opere e i giorni* esiodei si situava proprio all'origine, dal punto di vista cronologico e culturale, della diffusione del secondo dei due poemetti di Esiodo all'interno della cerchia dei colti umanisti quattrocenteschi. Una traduzione, quella condotta dal giovanissimo umanista romano, alla cui notevole diffusione e fortuna contribuirono non solo una

ricchissima tradizione ms. ma anche l'invenzione e lo sviluppo, in Europa e poi in Italia, della stampa. Il prospetto delle principali versioni esiodee approntate fra il 1453 circa e il 1592 comprende, oltre ad alcune traduzioni latine anonime, quelle dovute all'attività di Pier Vettori (1453 circa), del già ricordato Niccolò della Valle (1462), del bolognese Antonio Codro Urceo (sec. XV ex.), di Girolamo Aleandro (sec. XVI in.), di Ottomar Luscinius (1515), di Iohannes Ulpus e Franekerensis Frisius (1539), di Carolus Figulus Coloniensis (1540), di Georgius Rotallerus (1546), di Iohannes Brixius (1550), di Mathias Garbitus Illyricus (1559), di Iohannes Frisius Tigurinus (1562), di Georgius Henischius Barthfeldensis (1574), di Stephanus Riccius Calensis (1580) e di Iohannes Spondanus (1592). Si tratta, nella stragrande maggioranza dei casi, di *translationes* latine dotate di un preciso e precipuo scopo didattico e, quindi, condotte secondo il criterio *ad verbum* (o, se si preferisce, *verbum de verbo*), sulla scia degli insegnamenti svolti, a tale oggetto, da Manuele Crisolora e, soprattutto, da Leonardo Bruni nell'opuscolo *De recta interpretatione*; versioni nelle quali, peraltro, vengono perfettamente rispettate anche la forma metrica (esametri dattilici *katà stichon*) e l'identità del numero complessivo dei versi (827 esametri, sia nel testo greco originale che nella versione latina corrispondente): «La *translatio ad verbum* – scrive López Zamora a tal proposito – se antoja como el instrumento más eficaz para este primer contacto con el poema del cantor de Ascras. Y la versión que dejó manuscrita Bartolomeo Marliano no es una excepción» (p. 15).

Nei due paragrafi successivi lo studioso, rispettivamente, indaga sulla possibile autografia del ms. Ang. lat. 240 (*olim* C.4.7, *olim* ms. 240, latore *unicus*, come si è detto, della versione esiodea), riccamente provvisto di glosse interlineari e marginali (1.3. *Sobre la autoría del ms. Ang. lat. 240*, pp. 16-21), e offre un'attenta descrizione codicologica dello stesso (1.4. *El ms. Ang. lat. 240*, pp. 21-39). Il ms. in questione, esemplato a Milano probabilmente intorno al 1540, è un cartaceo di 66 *folia* (ff. 1^r-115^v), vergato in una umanistica corsiva molto nitida e con numerosi segni di abbreviazione. Esso comprende versioni, glosse e commenti ad Apollonio Rodio (gli *Argonautica* ai ff. 1^r-65^v), appunto a Esiodo (gli *Opera et dies* ai ff. 66^r-83^v, la *Theogonia* ai ff. 84^r-90^r) e a Demostene (l'*Oratio de Chersoneso* ai ff. 97^r-106^v, l'*Oratio III contra Philippum* ai ff. 106^v-115^v). Quanto alle caratteristiche della traduzione del Marliani degli *Opera et dies* esiodei, essa è fatta oggetto di un'ampia e puntuale disamina da parte di López Zamora che, alla luce di innumerevoli esempi e passi paralleli, la mette a confronto con le versioni latine del medesimo poemetto esiodeo in precedenza condotte da Pier Vettori, Niccolò della Valle e Codro Urceo. Si tratta, a detta dello studioso spagnolo, di una «versión latina [...] impecable del poema de Hesíodo» (p. 27), quasi del tutto scevra di veri e propri errori e contrassegnata, invece, da numerose e intelligenti innovazioni lessicali (che vengono accuratamente passate in rassegna e largamente esemplificate dallo studioso). Passando al commento al testo (glosse marginali e interlineari), dallo studio di esso emergono nettamente la profonda conoscenza della lingua greca e la sicura preparazione filologica del Marliani (già posta in risalto, riguardo alla sua versione di Isocrate testimoniata nel ms. Ang. lat. 146, da L. Gualdo Rosa,

La fede nella «paideia». Aspetti della fortuna europea di Isocrate nei secoli XV e XVI, Roma 1984, pp. 65-73). Per la redazione delle sue glosse, infatti, Marliani ha fatto ricorso a una notevole quantità di *auctores* greci (Omero, Pindaro, Platone, Aristotele, Teofrasto, Senofonte, Teocrito, Pausania, Arato, Tolomeo, Plutarco, Dioscoride, Cornuto, Ateneo, Polluce, Ammonio, Luciano, Teone, Eustazio) e latini (Catone, Terenzio, Cicerone, Lucrezio, Virgilio, Orazio, Ovidio, Igino, Columella, Plinio, Macrobio). Un'altra questione abbastanza importante concerne la precisa e sicura individuazione del modello greco del poemetto esiodeo al quale il Marliani ha fatto ricorso per condurre la propria traduzione. Alla luce dell'attenta ricognizione effettuata da López Zamora sui mss. e sulle antiche stampe cui, verosimilmente, l'umanista poteva avere accesso, si può concludere che tale modello poté essere rappresentato, assai probabilmente, da un esemplare dell'*editio princeps* degli *Opera et dies* pubblicata da Bono Accursio oppure, in alternativa, dalla prima edizione aldina – o anche da un ms. da essa dipendente – arricchita dagli *scholia ad Hesiodum*; in ogni modo, però, López Zamora conclude affermando che «la génesis mediolanense de la traducción hesiódica invita a ver en la edición de Accursius el modelo más verosímil» (p. 39).

Il testo degli *Hesiodi Opera et dies* del Marliani (pp. 41-120), trasmessoci da un *codex unicus*, è pubblicato da López Zamora nella maniera più fededegna possibile e più vicina e aderente al ms., limitando l'*emendatio* alla correzione degli evidenti errori ortografici e alla normalizzazione della punteggiatura. Suddiviso, come d'altra parte all'interno del codice, in 31 sezioni tematiche, il testo della versione esiodea del Marliani è accompagnato da una tripla fascia di apparato: la prima fascia comprende l'apparato critico propriamente detto; la seconda presenta le copiose glosse interlineari e marginali; la terza registra i *loci similes* greci e latini. Il vol. include anche una ricca *Bibliografia* (pp. 125-36) “all'americana”, forte di ben 185 titoli (fra studi generali, edizioni delle opere del Marliani, traduzioni latine degli *Opera et dies* nei secoli XV e XVI, sia manoscritte che a stampa); e un utilissimo apparato di *Indices* (*Index verborum*, *Index locorum*, *Index nominum*, *Index codicum*, pp. 137-50).

Concludendo questa segnalazione, posso senz'altro affermare che il vol. curato da Jesús López Zamora sul quale mi sono qui intrattenuto (come, d'altronde, la sua precedente edizione critica della versione esiodea di Niccolò della Valle) ricopre un'indubbia importanza per la complessiva presentazione e rivalutazione della figura e dell'opera di Giovanni Bartolomeo Marliani, per la disamina puntuale e acribica della sua versione de *Le opere e i giorni* testimoniata nel ms. Ang. lat. 240, nonché per il tentativo, che ritengo pienamente riuscito, di delineare con approfondimento e con ampiezza di documentazione il successo goduto dal testo esiodeo nell'Umanesimo italiano, fra i secoli XV e XVI.

ARMANDO BISANTI

Università degli Studi di Palermo
armando.bisanti@unipa.it

CHRISTOS TSAGALIS, *Early Greek Epic: Language, Interpretation, Performance*, Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes 138, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2023, xxix+637pp., €144.95, ISBN 978-3-11-099372-1.

This collection of twenty papers published between 2005 and 2020 cannot be taken separately from the books by Professor Tsagalis (henceforth, T.) which appeared in print during the same period: *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics* (Washington, DC 2008), *From Listeners to Viewers: Space in the Iliad* (Washington, DC 2012), and *Early Greek Epic Fragments* (Berlin-Boston 2017-). Taken together with the collection under review, these publications constitute a remarkable body of scholarship, all of it dedicated to Greek epic tradition.

The author's Introduction starts with an account of the developments that took place in the study of early Greek epic in recent decades, among them the new assessment of the relationship between the two leading trends in the twentieth-century Homeric scholarship, Neoanalysis and Oral Theory; the more systematic approach to the Epic Cycle; the fruitful use of the methods of narratology and cognitive theory; the deeper understanding of performance as the main medium through which epic poetry was communicated to the public. All these developments are not only discussed in the present collection but are also productively applied and taken further. This modern turn, however, is far from replacing the traditional methods of philological analysis: rather, they exist side-by-side, helping to create a more nuanced picture of the field. Such combination of the old and the new is a signal characteristic of the 21st-century Homeric scholarship, of which the author of the book under review is one of the most authentic representatives.

The collection is divided into four thematic sections: Homer (chapters 1-9), Hesiod (chapters 10-11), The Epic Cycle (chapters 12-16), The Performance of Epic (chapters 17-20). Needless to say, rather more often than not the division proves somewhat conventional, for the topics of different sections are often intertwined to create a rich and variegated picture of early Greek epic as a whole. Still, each section has a leitmotif of its own that reflects both the scholarly trends with which its topic is mainly associated in the contemporary scholarship and the author's own research interests. In the case of Homer, such a leitmotif is unquestionably the issue of intertextuality.

"Allusion is not a side-effect or secondary feature of Homeric storytelling," T. writes in the Introduction (p. XXII). "It lies at the heart of Homeric compositional technique and defines it pervasively. It is the trademark of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*." Four of the nine papers constituting the Homer section are dedicated to this topic, which is justly considered by T. as instrumental in superseding the division between Neoanalysis and Oral Theory. Side-by-side with the programmatic "Towards an Oral, Intertextual Neoanalysis" (2012), which opens the collection, I find "De-Authorizing the Epic Cycle: Odysseus' False Tale to Eumaeus (*Od.* 14.199-359)" (2012), especially representative of this approach. The question that T. addresses

in this study is whether the false tales that Odysseus relates in the second half of the poem could be considered as constituting “an extensive epic *Zitat*, pointing to a group of epic versions of Odysseus’ return, which we may designate by the term *alternative Odyssey*” (p. 163). He meticulously examines both the typical, context-free features (“motifs”) of the tales in question and their context-bound elements, and arrives at the conclusion that the Homeric *Odyssey* transcends the real-world boundaries of space and time characteristic of the earlier tradition, thus creating “a Panhellenic master myth for Odysseus’ return” (p. 206).

Closely associated with intertextuality is T.’s systematic application of the models of spatial analysis. It is best represented in “Epic Space Revisited: Narrative and Intertext in the Episode between Diomedes and Glaucus (*Il* 6.119-236)” (2010). By combining cognitive theory and narratology, the author draws a distinction between “story space”, “embedded story space”, and “intertextual space”. The latter is reconstructed “through the possible interconnections between the story and/or embedded story space of a given song-tradition with other song-traditions” (p. 84). Similar “hypertextual links between various oral traditions” (p. 50) are also created by the catalogues which, as is shown in “The Dynamic Hypertext: Lists and Catalogues in the Homeric Epics” (2010), generate a multilayer inter-traditional framework in the minds of the audience.

In approaching Hesiod, T. focuses on the generic identity of the poems of the Hesiodic Corpus as expressed not only in their poetological apparatus but even in their sonic texture. The former comes to the fore in “Poetry and Poetics in the Hesiodic Corpus” (2009). Reading the *Theogony* and *Works and Days* in poetological terms, T. makes the argument for Hesiod’s acute generic awareness. In the second paper of this section, “Soundplay in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*” (2017), he exhibits the poem’s extraordinary richness in sophisticated soundplay, attributing it to the fact that, being a generic fusion of *ehoie*-poetry and catalogue-poetry, the *Catalogue of Women* seeks to find its own style (p. 279).

The section dedicated to the Epic Cycle bring us back to the issue of intertextuality. In “γυναιῶν ἕνεκα δῶρων: Interformularity and Intertraditionality in Theban and Homeric Epic” (2014), T. reinstates his main methodological stance that “meaningful allusion of an intertextual nature is possible within the universe of oral poetry” (p. 313), making a case for a quotation from the lost Theban Cycle being made twice in the Homeric *Odyssey*. The next chapter, “*Cypria* fr. 19 (*PEG, GEF*): A Reconsideration’ (2012) deals with the much more uncontentious issue of motif transference. By analysing the extant evidence concerning the episode of Achilles’ hiding at Scyros on the eve of the Trojan War and its reflections in the *Iliad*, T. expertly navigates between the variants of the oral *Cypria* and the way they are exploited in the Homeric *Iliad*. Finally, the two papers that conclude this section, “*Telegony*” (2015) and “Verses attributed to the *Telegony*” (2014), offer a comprehensive reassessment of the evidence relating to this Cyclic poem.

The series of four chapters forming the last section (all of them published in 2018), is dedicated to the performance of epic. The section is nothing less

than a tour de force. Closely monitoring the performance context of epic recitals from Homer's *aoidoi* to the rhapsodes of the Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, and Imperial periods all over the Greek world, it forms a self-contained study of high scholarly value which will certainly serve as an indispensable source to be consulted by everyone interested in Greek epic poetry and its performance.

MARGALIT FINKELBERG
Tel Aviv University
finkelbe@tauex.tau.ac.il

RAFAEL J. GALLÉ CEJUDO, *Elegíacos helenísticos*, Introducción, edición y traducción, Alma Mater, Colección de autores Griegos y Latinos, Madrid: CSIC, 2021, xc+838 pp., ISBN 978-84-00-10890-8.

La presente edición, debida a Rafael J. Gallé Cejudo, catedrático de Filología Griega de la Universidad de Cádiz (España), es el fruto de más de quince años de trabajo dedicados al estudio de la elegía helenística (cf. las referencias a sus trabajos previos recogidas en las pp. L y LXVI-LXVII). Esta aquilatada experiencia se traduce en las diversas virtudes que adornan la obra: una voz autorizada, que domina la bibliografía sobre la elegía helenística y sabe seleccionar la información precisa para que el lector pueda comprender cada testimonio y fragmento; un texto establecido con un criterio editorial coherente, y una traducción precisa.

En la introducción general (pp. XV-XC), el autor ofrece una panorámica clara del género elegíaco en la época helenística. Comienza (pp. XV-XXII) con un rápido repaso de los estudios sobre el tema, prestando la atención debida a los de la tradición hispánica. A continuación resume la diversidad temática y los contextos de presentación de la elegía arcaica, con el fin de ayudar a la adecuada comprensión de la recuperación y adaptación del género en la época helenística. Al respecto, Gallé cuestiona ideas asentadas, como la supuesta ausencia de compromiso de la nueva poesía, que según muchos habría estado alejada de los intereses comunitarios, o aquella otra que defiende que donde hay experimentación literaria y metaliterariedad no existe subjetividad, lo cual ha permitido durante mucho tiempo enfrentar la elegía helenística, pretendidamente objetiva, a la latina, subjetiva. Aborda después (pp. XXII-XXX) el funcionamiento de los mitos en el género, cuyo análisis se ve dificultado por la fragmentariedad del material conservado y los problemas de su interpretación; por ejemplo, un título de tema mitológico no siempre comporta contenidos mitológicos (como pasa con *Musas*, de Alejandro de Etolia), mientras que, como contrapartida, estos contenidos pueden aparecer en obras cuyo título no hace sospechar su presencia, como *Leoncion*, de Hermesianacte. En general, se constata en la elegía de la época un gusto por la versión mítica más novedosa y alejada de la tradición, que cumple una función paradigmática y ejemplarizante,

sobre todo etiológica, toda vez que los *aitia* suman preciosismo literario, prurito erudito y actividad racional y crítica del poeta. El autor presta atención luego (pp. XX-XXXVII) al empleo frecuente de los catálogos asociados a la temática amorosa (a partir del *Catálogo de las mujeres* atribuido a Hesíodo y con la mediación del fr. 1 de Critias y de la *Lide* de Antímaco de Colofón), y, asimismo, a la selección de temas de la periferia homérica, es decir, de aquellos ausentes de los poemas homéricos pero vinculados a sus contenidos. Describe después (pp. XXXVII-XL) los “microgéneros” que, como contenido central o secundario, se encuentran en las elegías helenísticas: “los *patria*, las *ktiseis*, las *haloseis*, las genealogías, los meses, la temática pastoril, las *arai* o maldiciones, las metamorfosis, la astrología, las etimologías, etc.” (p. XXXVII). Tras unas palabras sobre las razones que pueden haber motivado la pérdida casi completa de la literatura helenística y, en concreto, de la elegía (p. XI-XLI), Gallé cierra la introducción con observaciones sobre las ediciones de referencia y de apoyo que ha empleado para la elaboración de la suya y, asimismo, sobre la traducción, que cuenta con el meritorio antecedente de la que preparó José Antonio Martín García para la Biblioteca Clásica Gredos, titulada *Poesía helenística menor (Poesía fragmentaria)* (Madrid 1994). La bibliografía (pp. XLV-XC), que, como indica el editor, es necesariamente menor que la relativa a otros géneros mejor conservados, es muy completa, y se emplea con precisión y detalle en las introducciones y las notas a los fragmentos.

La edición en sí está dividida en tres secciones. La primera está dedicada a los autores principales: Filitas, Hermesianacte, Alejandro de Etolia, Fanocles y Partenio (pp. 91-453); la segunda, titulada “Retazos elegíacos” (pp. 455-643), agrupa otros diecisiete autores sobre cuyas elegías se conserva poca información, mientras que la tercera contiene los *adespota* (pp. 645-809). Cada autor de las dos primeras secciones y cada fragmento de la tercera va precedido de una detallada introducción, la cual, sumada a las documentadas notas a pie de página, crea la justa impresión de que la edición contiene toda la información necesaria para la correcta intelección e interpretación de los textos recogidos en ella. El autor ha dejado fuera de la edición los siguientes autores y obras: los *Orígenes* (Αἰτίαι) de Calímaco, cuya inclusión hubiera supuesto un considerable aumento de las dimensiones de una edición ya de por sí extensa; las elegías del cínico Crates de Tebas (*SH* 359-61), si bien estas se presentan como reescrituras de elegías arcaicas y tienen poco que ver con la renovación del género en la época helenística; los fragmentos de las *Apariencias* o *Imágenes* (Ἰνδαλμοί) de Timón de Fliunte (*SH* 841-843 + 844; cf. la reseña del presente volumen a cargo de F. García Romero en *CFC:egi* 33, 2023, 399-401, <https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/cfcg.86766>, en p. 399); finalmente, “los autores y fragmentos elegíacos de disciplinas específicas de carácter astronómico o del ámbito de las ciencias exactas” (p. XLIV). A pesar de estas exclusiones, la presente edición es la más completa hasta la fecha: si los autores y fragmentos de la primera sección se pueden consultar reunidos en la edición de Jane L. Lightfoot (*Hellenistic collection*, LCL, Cambridge, MA-London 2009), no ocurre lo mismo con los de las otras dos secciones, de modo que el avance editorial es notable. Tras

la edición, acompañada de la traducción correspondiente, la obra se cierra con un índice de nombres propios (pp. 811-38).

En lo que respecta al establecimiento del texto, la edición de Gallé supone una revisión concienzuda de aquellas ediciones acreditadas que ha escogido como base por su mayor solvencia y prestigio; ello, claro está, no excluye la consulta de las restantes (cf. pp. XLI-XLIII). Como José Guillermo Montes Cala, su maestro y colega durante muchos años en la Universidad de Cádiz, el autor defiende un sano conservadurismo en las elecciones textuales: siempre que el texto transmitido permite una interpretación razonable, no estima necesario sanarlo mediante conjeturas; si no, por supuesto, estas hacen falta. Cuando el establecimiento de los textos resulta especialmente complejo –lo que ocurre en el caso de los frs. 3 de Hermesianacte y 3 de Alejandro de Etolia–, expone con detalle todas las informaciones en sendos apéndices críticos textuales (cf. pp. 227-50 y 339-43, respectivamente). La edición presenta la comodidad de incluir, junto al número de cada testimonio y fragmento, las equivalencias con la numeración de las ediciones anteriores.

Las elecciones del autor son, por norma general, muy razonables y se pueden compartir sin reparos. Tan solo querría hacer aquí dos observaciones acerca de tres testimonios. La primera atañe a los testimonios 11a-b de Filitas de Cos (p. 118). En el primero de ellos (= *Vita Theocriti* 1,9 Wendel), a propósito del período del florecimiento del poeta, Gallé acepta, con buen criterio, el suplemento de Wendel ἤκμασε δὲ κατὰ Πτολεμαῖον τὸν ἐπικληθέντα <Φιλάδελφον τὸν Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λάγου>; de este modo, el *floruit* se sitúa en tiempos de Ptolomeo Filadelfo, hijo de aquel otro Ptolomeo conocido como “el hijo de Lago”, y no en los de este último. En cambio, en el testimonio siguiente (11b), conservado en un escolio a Teócrito (*Anecdoton Estense* 3.9.10 ἤκμασε δὲ ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις Πτολεμαίου τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Λαγωῦ), Gallé estima, como Lightfoot, que no hace falta un suplemento semejante para aclarar el período del florecimiento, pero por razones distintas. La editora británica (p. 16) lo traduce como “He flourished in the time of Ptolemy surnamed Lagous”, aceptando aquí que, según la fuente, el *floruit* de Filitas tuvo lugar en tiempos del hijo de Lago. En cambio, Gallé interpreta τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Λαγωῦ como un genitivo de parentesco referido al padre de Ptolomeo, de modo que Filitas habría florecido en la época del Ptolomeo hijo del hijo de Lago (sobre el sentido de Λαγωῦ, cf. la tardía *Cronografía* anónima del *Cod. Coislin*. 193.l.25, donde, entre Alejandro Magno y Ptolomeo Filadelfo, figura Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Λαγωῦ). Por coherencia con la intervención textual que ambos editores aceptan en el testimonio previo, quizá también aquí convenga un suplemento semejante al de Wendel: ἤκμασε δὲ ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις Πτολεμαίου τοῦ <Φιλαδέλφου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ> ἐπικληθέντος Λαγωῦ, “Floreció en tiempos de Ptolomeo (Filadelfo, hijo de Ptolomeo, el) llamado «hijo de Lago»”, lo que supondría un salto textual de lo mismo a lo mismo.

La segunda observación tiene que ver con el testimonio 11 de Partenio. Gallé, como Lightfoot, edita y traduce la versión latina del tratado de Galeno

Sobre las propias doctrinas (Περὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ δοκούντων), elaborada a partir del árabe o del siríaco. En realidad, ambos podrían haber empleado directamente la versión original en griego (§ 1.1-2), que se lee en un manuscrito del siglo xv (*Thessalonicensis Vlatadon* 14) hallado en 2005 en el Monasterio Vlatadon de Tesalónica; cf. e.g. la edición de Alessandro Lami en I. Garofalo y A. Lami, eds., *Galeno, L'anima e il dolore (De indolentia – De propriis placitis)*, Milano 2012, pp. 58-61. En cualquier caso, la versión latina se corresponde bien con el original; las únicas divergencias destacables son, primero, que *cum transiret per terram illorum* traduce διερχόμενος πόλιν y, segundo, que *istos familiares meos*, en griego τουτωνὶ τῶν ἐμῶν οἰκετῶν, son sus “esclavos”, como confirma una posterior referencia a estos mismos personajes en § 1.4 como τῶν δούλων.

En lo que respecta a la traducción, merece destacarse la acribia “alejandrina” de Gallé, que busca siempre la palabra precisa y, a menudo, desacostumbrada; sus traducciones, nada literales, son valientes. Me permito recoger los siguientes ejemplos: p. 129: “Pero no soy de los que se dejan camelar” (ἐγὼ δέ τις οὐ ταχυπειθής); p. 139: “los vientos enfardelados” (τοὺς ἀνέμους ἐγκεκλεισμένους); p. 143: “Ahora siempre a fuego lento medito” (νῦν δ’ αἰεὶ πέσσω); p. 201: “Illegó a los alcores de Colofón” (ἦλθεν ... ἄκρην ἐς Κολοφῶνα); p. 291: “Pero aquella, cuando el preclaro Anteo rechace la miserable coyunda, / pergeñará entonces contra él un meticuloso engaño / confundiéndolo con sus patrañas” (ἡ δ’ ὅταν ἀρνηῖται μέλεον γάμον ἀγλαὸς Ἀνθεύς, / δὴ τότε οἱ τεύξει μητιόεντα δόλον, / μύθοις ἐξαπαφοῦσα); p. 487: “toro pletórico” (ἀφειδῆ / ταῦρον); p. 535: “y los zamarrea hasta hacer perder por completo el sentido a los hombres” (ἐκ δ’ ἀνδρῶν πάντ’ ἐτίναξε νόον); p. 547 “sin lograr ganarse su confianza” (δύσπιστος); p. 569: “ese injusto escamoteo” (ἀδίκου στερήσεως). En ocasiones sus traducciones se vuelven hacia lo coloquial: cf. p. 199: “un permanente tostón” (τὸν αἰεὶ βαρύν); p. 201: “cuántas parrandas soportó” (πόσους ἀνεδέξατο κόμους).

Por último, en lo que respecta a los aspectos ortotipográficos, la presentación de la obra facilita tanto la lectura como la consulta puntual. Si hubiera que ponerle un reparo, sería el uso sistemático de la letra redonda para el texto y de la cursiva para la traducción; habría sido de agradecer que se hubiera cambiado el tipo de letra –o bien añadido comillas– para distinguir el texto y la traducción de los fragmentos citados del que en ocasiones los precede y los sigue (cf. e.g. pp. 190s.).

En resumen, la presente obra supone un considerable avance editorial, que facilita la lectura y la comprensión de unos textos que, por su condición fragmentaria y por la falta de información suficiente, requieren de una edición tan fiable, una traducción tan precisa y una ayuda exegética tan detallada como las que nos ofrece el autor.

JUAN LUIS LÓPEZ CRUCES
Universidad de Almería
juanluis@ual.es

HUNTER H. GARDNER, *The Latin Love Elegists*, Brill Research Perspectives in Classical Poetry, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2023, vii+98 pp., €70.00, ISBN 978-90-04-68814-8.

“Lo bueno, si breve, dos veces bueno” is a famous dictum by Baltasar Gracián, a prominent writer of the Spanish Siglo de Oro. This maxim aptly applies to Hunter Gardner’s book, *The Latin Love Elegists*, which provides an excellent overview of the unique genre of Latin love elegy in just over 80 pages. Still, one might ask: was another book on Latin love elegy really necessary, given the abundance of high-quality contributions in recent decades? Scholars such as Paul Veyne, with his semiotic approach in *L’Élégie Érotique Romaine. L’Amour, la Poésie et L’Occident*, Paris 1983 and Duncan F. Kennedy (*The arts of love: five studies in the discourse of Roman love elegy*, Cambridge 1993), with his eclectic-sociological analysis, have significantly enriched the field, along with contributions from Maria Wyke, Sharon James, Paul Allen Miller, and more recently, Sara H. Lindheim¹. Additionally, several recent companions or collective volumes, such as those edited by Genevieve Liveley and Patricia Salzman-Mitchell², Karen Weisman³, Barbara Gold⁴ or Thea Thorsen⁵ provide comprehensive coverage. Gardner herself has already made a significant contribution with her book *Gendering Time in Augustan Love Elegy*, Oxford 2013, which informs some of the theoretical considerations in this new work, particularly regarding temporality in elegy.

Given this wealth of scholarship, one might argue that another book on Latin love elegy was perhaps unnecessary. However, after reading Gardner’s concise volume, it becomes evident that its value lies not so much in filling a gap but in offering a fresh and insightful perspective on the genre. The book offers a well-balanced overview that is accessible to a broad audience while maintaining the scholarly rigor expected by specialists. Gardner’s erudition is evident, yet it does not overwhelm the reader. Instead, the thoughtfully restrained footnotes allow more interested readers to delve deeper into specific discussions and explore further bibliographical references.

Gardner’s book is a nuanced and innovative contribution to the study of Latin love poetry. It stands out for its careful analysis of the Latin love elegists—Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid, and Sulpicia—through a relatively brief selection of passages and for its focus on the gendered dynamics that shape the relationship between

¹ M. Wyke, *The Roman Mistress, Ancient and Modern Representations*, Oxford 2002; S.L. James, *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion, Gender and reading in Roman love elegy*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2003; P.A. Miller, *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*, Princeton 2004; S. Lindheim, *Latin Elegy and the Space of Empire*, Oxford 2021.

² G. Liveley, P. Salzman-Mitchell, eds., *Latin Elegy and Narratology: Fragments of Story*, Columbus 2008.

³ K. Weisman, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of the Elegy*, Oxford-New York 2010.

⁴ B. Gold, ed., *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy*, Malden-Oxford 2012.

⁵ T. Thorsen, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*, Cambridge 2013.

the *amator* and the *puella*. This approach not only enhances our understanding of the elegists' work but also recontextualizes their contributions within the broader literary and cultural traditions of ancient Rome and the Greek precursors of the genre. At the same time, it offers a fresh perspective on the complex fact that any reading of elegy is inevitably influenced by the historical contingencies of its readership.

The volume is divided into five sections, preceded by an "Introduction" and followed by a "Bibliography". The bibliography includes some of the most relevant contributions (mainly written in English) to the study of Latin love elegy. One issue to note is that some authors are listed with their full names, while others are cited with only their first names abbreviated. A useful "Index" concludes the book.

In the short introduction, Gardner situates the emergence of the genre in its historical context, specifically within the framework of the "cultural shift (...) that accompanied the end of Republican governance" (p. 2), and anticipates the contents of the five sections that follow.

The first section ("Antecedents, Origins, Innovations") analyzes the backgrounds of the genre, specifically Greek elegy of the Hellenistic period on the one hand, and Catullus, on the other. Gardner subscribes to the thesis that Hellenism introduced a new kind of authorial self-consciousness, which, in its turn, was developed by Catullus, whose merit consists in "bridg[ing] the gap between the artistic principles of Hellenistic poetry and the Augustan elegists" (p. 2). As Gardner argues, Greek epigrammatic tradition crucially paved the way for the particular power dynamics of Latin love elegy, whereas the New Comedies of Plautus and Terentius foreshadowed some of the *dramatis personae* and themes that are typical of erotic elegy. Yet, as Gardner cogently notes, there are some critical points of divergence between Roman New Comedy and Latin elegy, specifically in regard to one of the defining features of elegy, which, in contrast with comedy, is "the lover's repeated capitulation to erotic indecision" (p. 12).

Pages 12 to 28 provide an insightful explanation of the role of Catullan poetry as a pivotal influence on the subsequent development of elegiac discourse. This influence is particularly evident in the way Catullus merges "erotic experience with a political and moral lexicon that effectively championed extra-marital relationships as an alternative (...) to traditional politics and morals in Rome" (pp. 19-20). Although the compact format of Gardner's book limits the depth of textual analysis she can provide, it still offers some excellent readings, such as her analysis of Catullus 68 on pages 21-2. As Gardner notes (p. 22), "C. 68 thus establishes not only a constantly shifting position of the speaking subject, but also an inversion of and reversion to the norms defining gendered identity in Rome as significant contributions to the Augustan elegists." At this juncture, Gardner could have strengthened her argument by engaging with interpretations of Carmen 68(b) that highlight the poem's foreshadowing of elegiac power dynamics. Specifically, the analogies between myth and personal experience, as well as the blurring of

boundaries between center and margin, anticipate the treatment of the *puella* as subject-matter, that is, as literary *materia* in Latin love elegy⁶.

Gardner's exploration of Catullus's slippery subjectivity underscores her extraordinary ability—rare among scholars—to make complex ideas accessible. This skill makes the book especially valuable for readers who may not be familiar with some of the more specific (and at times rather hermetic) scholarship, such as the work of Paul Allen Miller on the emergence of 'lyric consciousness' in Catullus⁷. For instance, on pages 22-3, Gardner concisely yet clearly explains the intricate split experienced by the speaking subjects of elegy during the transition from Republic to Empire through the lens of Lacanian psychoanalysis.

Sub-section 1.2 (pp. 28-32) is devoted to Gallus and, within the constraints of the scant fragments of his poetry, examines the significant role he played in the development of elegy. Gardner infers from the remnants "certain constitutive ingredients of Augustan elegy: in particular, the reference to a beloved's transgressive behavior (*nequitia*) from the perspective of a first-person *amator* and the combination of political panegyric (...) with self-conscious poetic posturing and reference to less lofty affairs" (p. 30).

In the second section ("Playing the Gender Card: Augustan Love Elegy"), Gardner examines how the Augustan elegists build upon themes of political unorthodoxy and gender role-playing, first anticipated by Catullus, and skillfully integrate them into their exploration of power dynamics. Focusing on Propertius's *Monobiblos*, Gardner concludes that although the *puella* is granted power over the *amator* and is thereby cast in a role that challenges normative gender dynamics in Rome, "power is of advantage only to those who wish to use it, and we are given very little to evaluate the *puella*'s attitude toward her own dominant status" (p. 35).

Particularly intriguing is Gardner's argument on pages 41-2, where she questions the view of the *puella* as a completely subdued poetic subject. Drawing on Erika Zimmermann Damer's application of Irigaray's concept of *mimétisme*, Gardner suggests that while the Propertian *puella* is indeed shaped by the *amator*'s discourse, she also actively challenges it. So, Gardner concludes that "the elegists occasionally cede control of their sign systems in ways that challenge the *amator*'s discursive mastery over his *puella*" (p. 43).

In subsection 2.1, titled "*He Said, She Said: A Puella's Perspective*", Gardner primarily examines the *Heroides* and the poetry of Sulpicia, both of which she considers "natural extensions of the elegiac corpus" (p. 46). Particularly noteworthy is the comparatively extensive attention given to Sulpicia, whose elegies are often overlooked in scholarly discussions of elegy. Gardner contrasts

⁶ This issue is discussed, among others, in J.M. Blanco Mayor, *Power Play in Latin Love Elegy and its Multiple Forms of Continuity in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Berlin-Boston 2017 (esp. in pp. 75-91).

⁷ See P.A. Miller, *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness: The Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome*, London 1994.

the typical male perspective in elegy with Sulpicia's unique approach. Whereas in male-authored elegy the poet often uses illness as a metaphor to showcase his own creative power, emphasizing how he, the *amator*, can "overcome" or transcend physical and emotional challenges through his art (overshadowing, thus, the *puella*'s actual experience and reducing her to a mere object within the poet's narrative), Sulpicia shifts the focus to the *puella*'s perspective, highlighting that her experience of illness is not just a backdrop for the poet's self-expression. Instead, Sulpicia emphasizes the *puella*'s own physical and emotional suffering, suggesting that recovery is not just the poet's triumph but a shared process that involves the *puella* as an active participant. This approach brings a more nuanced and empathetic view of the *puella*'s experience, acknowledging her agency and the reality of her suffering.

Gardner's conclusions on the relationship between gender—i.e., who plays the role of man or woman within love elegy—and sexual identity (biological male vs. biological female) are also noteworthy. As she states at the end of subsection 2.1, "in permitting only biological males (*amator* and *puer*) to develop into adult men whose narratives, life courses, and identities can be envisioned as exceeding the boundaries of the genre, gaining rather than losing powers and prerogatives, the genre allows only them to 'play the man'" (p. 51).

Section three ("(De)construction the *puella*") examines what Gardner calls "the vulnerabilities of elegy's key players" (p. 3), particularly the *puella*. Gardner explains how Propertian and Tibullan elegy subtly reveal the *puella* as a sexual construct, while Ovidian poetry further develops this idea, challenging the artist's control over his subject-matter. In this context, Gardner discusses Ovid's evolution beyond the *Amores* and convincingly argues that it "does not entail a clean break from the viscous trap that ensnares elegy's *amatores*" (p. 55). Drawing on Sharrock's insights into the elegiac nature of desire in the *Metamorphoses*—particularly illustrated by Pygmalion's "womanufacture"—Gardner supports the idea that the *Metamorphoses* evoke the gendered power dynamics central to elegy. However, Gardner could have expanded on this topic, as the erotic world of the *Metamorphoses* is more complex. It not only reflects elegy but also explores its transformation, making possible the elegiac *adynaton* of *mutuus amor*—thereby signaling the definitive end of erotic elegy. In this regard, Blanco Mayor's study⁸, which is not listed in the bibliography, could have provided valuable insight.

The most noteworthy aspect of subsection 3.1 ("*Time's Up? Elegiac Violence and Twent-First Century Readers*") is Gardner's ethical approach to the genre—another strong reason, in my opinion, to recommend this book. Shifting from a strictly meta-poetic interpretation of the genre, Gardner aligns with the increasingly common approaches to elegy that focus on "uncomfortable questions about the flesh and blood of those women who have, however tenuously, inspired the *puella*'s creation" (p. 57). Within this framework, she advocates for

⁸ See footnote 6 above.

recognizing the “pedagogical value of teaching elegy in the post-#MeToo era in classrooms where the students are more sensitive to the (perhaps) predatory intent that defines, e.g., the Propertian lover’s near advances upon sleeping Cynthia” (p. 3). Although there are some valuable contributions that explore the darker, abject, or violent aspects of the genre, Gardner rightly argues that these ethical considerations warrant further investigation, as they have been largely overlooked in the study of Latin elegy.

Section four (“Elegiac Vulnerabilities: Scripting Desire in Augustan Rome”) explores the challenges faced by both the *puella* and the poet in relation to the civic and moral duties imposed upon them by the Augustan context. Gardner contends that “[w]hatever the status of the *puella*, whether didactic addressee of *Ars* 3 or the beloved in the elegiac poetry of Ovid and his predecessors, there is an unavoidably political aspect of reading, frequently a public, shared activity in the ancient world, and especially of reading poems about sexual behavior in Augustan Rome” (p. 69).

In section five (“Receptions and New Directions”), Gardner concludes her overview of Latin love elegy by exploring the genre’s afterlife in Imperial Rome and its presence in contemporary culture, particularly in cinema. This perspective adds considerable appeal to the book, not only by engaging with popular culture but also by demonstrating that the ‘limping pace’ of Latin love elegy—despite its brief period of prominence between the late Roman Republic and the Augustan era—persists.

JOSÉ MANUEL BLANCO MAYOR
Universität Rostock
jose.mayor@uni-rostock.de

GREGSON DAVIS, SERGIO YONA, eds., *Afterlives of the Garden. Receptions of Epicurean Thought in the Early Empire and Late Antiquity*, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2024, viii+182 pp., € 79,95, ISBN 978-3-11-102192-8.

This collection of essays complements the editors’ 2022 *Epicurus in Rome*. Gregson Davis and Sergio Yona are clear on the different aims of the present volume. It is specifically addressed to Epicurean themes in the literature of the late Roman republic and the Empire. Although the modes of reception range, as the editors comment, from “wholesale rejection” to “total acceptance” (4), the particular interest of the volume lies in the examples of positive uptake of, or at least strong engagement with some of the most appealing features of Epicureanism’s original and later Lucretian presentations. Approximately equal attention is given to poetry and to philosophy. The three topics treated most comprehensively are

the Epicurean attitude to romantic love, Epicurean epistemology and scientific explanation, and morality and divinity.

The individual chapters are well supplied with quotations and translations, so that claims for the imprint of specifically Epicurean ideas in a range of literary texts can largely be assessed on their merits. In a few cases, the inference to Epicurean influence requires a bit of stretch. As Enrico Piergiacomini warns, “Scholars who advocate the author’s commitment to a particular philosophical school are... obliged to demonstrate that a specific passage of [a text] conforms more closely to the basic principles of one sect than to those of another” (98).

Epicureanism is typically found on its back foot in philosophical commentary as allegedly amoral, insufficiently respectful of the animal- human divide, politically irresponsible, vulgarly hedonistic, and dismissive of such uplifting articles as providence and the immortality of the soul. Lucretius’s *De rerum natura*, assumed to be based on Epicurus’s partially recovered Greek text, *On Nature*, brought to the fore very different themes, including, as the volume’s title indicates, the beauty of nature, the value of peaceful co-existence, and the irrepressibility of the “*naturae extrema vestigia*” (3.308, 3.20), the deeply rooted tendencies that philosophy cannot altogether extirpate from our characters.

Two chapters, by Davis and by Erin Hanses deal directly with the Epicurean-Lucretian position on romantic love and sex at the end of Book IV. Should Lucretius be read as mocking the former and disgusted by the latter,¹ or rather as a somewhat mournful yet amused celebrant of the Venusian principle that renews nature generation by generation? Lucretius’s claim that women enjoy and seek sexual pleasure has remained a difficulty not only for philosophers but also for educators and legislators. At the same time, female choosiness, dramatically described in Lucretius 4.1133-40, is a misery-inducing feature of human life, and poets, lyricists, and dramatists have relished this source of material. Sex without emotional entanglement is generally good, according to Epicurus, and the philosopher is advised to restrict himself to friends with benefits, presumably the system of the Garden, to escape the predicament. Romantic fixation on the one cannot fail to bring suffering through uncertainty of possession and outright rejection. Davis discusses the presentation of the *amator miser*, in the *Carmina* (1.5., 1.33, and 2.9) of the satirist Horace. The experienced elder poet, who has escaped from the “sea of Aphrodite” and hung up his soaking clothes, addresses the naïve, smitten youth desperate for the attention of the lovely but indifferent courtesan. In a related essay, Erin Hanses examines the poetry of Sulpicia in the *Corpus Tibullianum* Book III, describing her as “the only extant female love elegist” (57). Here the shoe is on the other foot. Sulpicia depicts a lovelorn woman lamenting her inability to monopolise the attention of a preferred man. Perhaps encouraged by some of Philodemus’s own verse, Sulpicia, Hanses argues, presents a different solution to

¹ A position forcefully argued by P. Gordon, “Some unseen monster: rereading Lucretius on sex”, in D. Fredrick, ed., *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, Baltimore 2002, 86-109.

the Epicurean predicament, namely commitment and mutual enjoyment between equal partners, in place of constant turbulence, hierarchy, or causal promiscuity. The poet however “burns”—and apparently with enjoyment (Poem 3.11.5). As George Ainslie argues, uncertainty is wealth, and disappointment keeps appetite sharp.² With regard to our losses through death or defection, as Davis notes (33), the Epicureans, as reported by Plutarch, valued mourning. “It is better to be moved somewhat and to grieve and melt into tears.”

Emotionality is also the subject of chapter 2, dealing with the much-discussed question of Aeneas’s revenge killing of Turnus at the end of the *Aeneid*. Anger, deemed ethically permissible by Aristotle (EN 1149) when justified by the offense, but mostly rejected by the Stoics, notably Seneca in *De ira*, as unseemly loss of self-control, was the subject of another *De ira* by Philodemus, which favoured the former position. In the epic, Turnus is a thoroughly bad actor, cruel, cowardly, boastful, and treacherous, who has slain Aeneas’s protégé Pallas, but he is helpless in pleading for mercy. Aeneas hesitates in noble fashion, but apparently gives way to uncontrolled rage triggered by the sight of Pallas’s baldric conspicuously displayed by Turnus. Taking the side of Erler and Galinsky in the voluminous debate on Vergil’s intentions and their positioning in contemporary Roman ethics,³ Robert Hedrick argues that Aeneas has a “sure cognitive foundation for knowledge, judgement, and punishment” (54). The vividly depicted final scene is to be understood in terms of Epicurean epistemology, in which sense experience reveals unquestionable truths. Turnus’s belt is not an emotional trigger but visual evidence of an unforgivable crime. The hypothesis is thought provoking, though not all readers will be persuaded this was exactly what Vergil had in mind.

In Chapter 4, Nicholas Winters argues that the anonymous poem *Ciris* is written from an “explicitly Epicurean stance” (79). *Ciris* is about the other Scylla—not the Homeric sea monster, but the daughter of King Nisus of Megara who conceives a passion for King Minos, who is besieging their city. Winters argues that, despite the author’s *recusatio* in the form of an apology for the apparent absence of much Epicurean content after the opening lines and the conspicuous presence of myth, magical transformation, and divine interventions, the poem is an Epicurean project. Its themes include the dangers of *amor insanus*, the proper offices of friendship, the inevitability of change, and the folly of fear of death. The unhappy young woman refuses friendly advice, brings about her father’s death and the destruction of her city by ill-advisedly slicing off his protective lock of purple hair. She is not only spurned by the object of her desire but tied and dragged behind his ship until she is turned by the merciful goddess Amphitrite into a beautiful bird, with, however, her

² “Positive emotion is then limited by premature satiation of the appetite for it, a relentless process motivated by the impatience that is described by hyperbolic discount curves. This satiation can be restrained only by using adequately rare and unpredictable occasions as cues for the emotion.” G. Ainslie, “Uncertainty as wealth,” *Behavioural Processes* 64, 2003, 369-85.

³ Against commentators who find intentional moral ambiguity or even moral unacceptability in these passages; v. P. Burnell, “The death of Turnus and Roman morality”, *G&R* 34, 1987, 186-200.

father magically restored as her avian foe, the sea eagle. Was this punishment or reward? It is better to be free and alive than to be tortured, but it is punishment to leave human life so young and unsatisfied, and terrible to be eternally and fiercely pursued by one's metamorphosed father. Not all of this is textbook Epicureanism, but Winters remarks convincingly on the compatibility of poetry with philosophy. Poetry, as Philodemus found, can be more than Lucretius's honey that sweetens the bitter message of indifferent gods and death as final (4.10-14). It is "more than a mere ornament to attract the uninitiated to philosophy. It is an exercise of the Epicurean ideal of mental clarity, by which a wise man sees the physical world as it truly is: beautiful" (81).

Chapter 5 makes a sound case for the Epicurean background of the pseudo-Vergilian "Aetna" poem, while noting some fusion of Stoic and Epicurean elements. This attribution is not controversial, given the length and detail of the physicalist explanation for volcanic activity, involving heated air in subterranean wind tunnels, which follows Lucretius's account closely. Enrico Piergiacomini proceeds to deepen the analysis, reminding the reader of the Epicurean doctrine that the explanation of imposing natural phenomena not only removes fear of the anger of the gods but is a source of pleasure. "Scientific research represents the true wealth of human beings" (105). One form of "wonder" is scorned by the Epicureans as evincing untutored superstition and manipulability, but this does not rule out a commendable form of wonder, understood as admiration for the variety and unpredictable power of nature.

While Marcus Aurelius is known to have established chairs in philosophy in Athens for each of the prominent sects, including Epicureanism, in CE 176, and while the editors point out that there was considerable intellectual traffic between Athens, Rome, and Naples, information on the persistence of an Epicurean school or community in the imperial age is incomplete. Chapter 6 by Francesco Verde offers four brief case studies, above and beyond the familiar discussions of Epicureanism found in Cicero, Diogenes Laertius, and Plutarch, that testify to continuing engagement. The Peripatetic Aristocles presumably writing towards the end of the last century BCE or the first century CE in Messene insists that pleasure and pain are not principles of choice and avoidance; the correct principle is reason. The Platonist Atticus in Athens around 176 CE appreciates Epicurus's piety and his appreciation of the role of divine simulacra, which he considers preferable to Aristotle's impersonal theology. But Epicurus has no sense of providence, the goodness of the world, or the role of the gods in securing absolute justice. Dionysus of Alexandria in the 3rd century CE attacks atomism as inadequate to explain the order and beauty of the world; how can an irrational mass of atoms form two bodies as different as sun and moon? Epicurus's acknowledged piety is seen as subterfuge to save his life. Plotinus, who wrote his *Enneads* in the second half of the third century CE in Rome and Sicily, regards the Epicureans as better philosophers than the Gnostics with their dismal cosmology of evil, but their ontology and ethics are regrettable: they do not value the intellect and recommend an amoral life in a

universe of blind chance. Verde mentions in passing Trajan's widow and Hadrian's stepmother, the Epicurean sympathizer Pompeia Plotina. More information on this figure, who, consistently, one might argue, with Epicurean values, is "viewed as having provided Romans with fairer taxation, improved education, assisted the poor, and created tolerance in Roman society"⁴ would have been welcome.

An enjoyable and penetrating final chapter by Michael Erler points to St. Augustine's early Epicurean phase and its later traces as described in his *Confessions* 6.14.24. In his youth, not only was Augustine addicted to physical pleasure, he contemplated joining in the formation of a commune of like-minded young men, attracted by the idea of living apart and sharing goods. As the commune was not envisioned as admitting women in the fashion of the Garden, and as both wives and those hopeful of acquiring wives objected, the project failed to launch. Although the reaction of most of the Church Fathers to Epicureanism was strongly negative, Christian doctrine, Erler points out, overlapped with Epicurean to a significant extent. Both sects agreed in rejecting false prophets, oracles, and sacrifices, and denied the intervention of members of any pantheon in human affairs. Erler notes that Augustine appears to have accepted as well the doctrine that human society is not based on moral ideals or natural sociability but on convenience (144). To these points might be added the common Epicurean and early Christian aversion to military heroics and civic distinctions. And women's active role in early Christian communities is widely recognised, though the ideals of celibacy, virginity, and maternal nurturance do not belong to Epicurean doctrine.

While this short volume can offer only a taste of the "complexity, subtlety, and extent of Epicurean influence" in the period (1), it offers an excellent jumping in point for the nonspecialist as well as the specialist. Where the former are concerned, although individual chapters mention in passing the roles of Cicero, Plutarch, Seneca, Diogenes Laertius, Philodemus, Herculaneum, and the Naples circle of poets, including Vergil and Horace, a short initial chapter on the transmission and dissemination of Epicurean doctrine from the late Republic onwards and the imperial context would have been welcome. The information is available elsewhere, however, and the volume is supplied with a comprehensive bibliography to that end.⁵ By way of a final comment, I note that the work is licensed under the Creative Commons Act, a gratifying development for readers everywhere.

CATHERINE WILSON

University of York

Catherine.wilson@york.ac.uk

⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pompeia_Plotina. The only monograph I was able to identify is by S. Salomoni, "Pompeia Plotina, l'imperatrice filosofa", in *Filosofo, maestre, imperatrici: per un nuovo canone della storia della filosofia antica*. Studi di storia della filosofia antica 10, Roma 2020, 131-61.

⁵ For an overview, T. Dorandi, "Epicurus and the Epicurean School", *Oxford Handbook of Epicurus and Epicureanism*, Oxford 2020, 13-42.

T.H.M. GELLAR-GOAD, CHRISTOPHER B. POLT, eds., *Didactic Literature in the Roman World*, Routledge monographs in classical studies, London-New York: Routledge, 2024, xii+202 pp., £130.00, ISBN 978-1-032-45650-8.

This is a rather interesting collective book on the didactic literature of antiquity. The volume is in fact varied for topics considered, as well as characterized by a good level of contributions, which support views if not always completely shareable, however generally exposed with clarity and care.

Chapter one, by Michael Paschalis, is inspired by a famous article of R.D. Brown ("Lucretius and Callimachus", *ICS* 7, 1982, 77-97). The arguments put forward by Paschalis in this paper appear really thin but not very compulsory. I refer in particular to the alleged reminiscence of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* (2 ἀεὶ μέγαν) in Lucretius' *De rer. nat.* 1.931 (where *magnus* means 'difficult' with reference to the novelty of the poem and it doesn't look like a revival of the great Hellenistic poet, of which Lucretius echoes instead in this context, as it is well known and as Paschalis also says, the prologue of *Aitia*).

Chapter two, by Alison Keith, contains a new and well-grounded focus on the still debated philosophical interests of Vergil and therefore on his supposed adherence to the Epicurean creed, already highlighted in the ancient biographies of the Augustan poet (e.g. in the *Vita Vergili Probiana*, quoted and highlighted at the beginning of the article). Vergil's *Georgics* are the work at the heart of this study, but in the light of the research perspective here adopted by Alison Keith, here is also analyzed the famous first eclogue. A significant part of the discussion concerns the Noric cattle plague and the comparison with the well-known Lucretian model.

Following on from Alison Keith's article, in the third chapter Peter Heslin proposes an acute and in-depth analysis of Vergil's, so to say, not fanatical Epicureanism. In fact, Heslin focuses on what Vergil affirms in famous contexts of the second book of the *Georgics* on the ideal condition of the Epicurean philosopher (2.490 *felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*) and on that of the farmers of the Golden Age (2.458-9: cf. 2.493). According to the author, Vergil's alleged less intransigent Epicureanism would distinguish the Augustan poet from the zealous Lucretius, as poetry, in Vergil's opinion, would be rather different from philosophy.

Chapter 4, by Leah Kronenberg, which concerns Hesiod and Vergil and their description of cold winter in *Works and Days* (493-563) and in *Georgics* (1.291-310), is in our opinion the one that elaborates the arguments less shareable among those contained in this useful volume. I think that one cannot see irony and double (erotic) meanings everywhere. Friedrich Nietzsche warned against the exercise of an «insolent familiarity» with the ancient world. Scenes and details described by the two poets are only evidence of realism and should not be overinterpreted. For example, the Hesiodic passage can be easily explained by considering that the lazy man's ἐλπίς ('expectation') of the arrival of a more favorable season, without

doing anything else, is deemed by the Greek poet neither ethical nor practical (but certainly not a symbol of masturbation), as well as for Hesiod, as we know, there was a good and a bad contest.

Chapter five, by Steven J. Green, firstly studies instructions given by Vergil in the *Georgics* on how to manage the animal mating process. Green also focuses on the influence by Vergil on Grattius' *Cynegetica* or on the second book of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and his description of *adulterium*. A rather different analysis regards Germanicus' adaptation of Aratus' *Phaenomena* and marital infidelity in the cosmos, about Jupiter's love intrigues, which are of course other examples of *adulteria*, while nothing comparable – as the author often emphasizes – is found in Aratus or Cicero.

Chapter six, by Melanie Racette-Campbell is an excellent study on erotodidaxis in Roman elegy. The essay compares Lucretius, Vergil's *Georgics* and Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* with the elegiac Augustan poetry. Two main verbs are at the ground of the study: *docere* et *discere* (and one time also *accipere*). This very interesting linguistic analysis allows us to consider whether the elegiac poet (Propertius, Tibullus or Cornelius Gallus) learns or teaches love (the second case is that of *praeceptor amoris*). As regards Propertius, as Racette-Campbell writes, we can say that his poem as a whole can be considered a real lesson about the elegiac love.

Chapter seven, by Joseph McAlhany, focuses on Marcus Varro's lost Menippean Satires' fr. 375 Astbury. At this purpose, rather convincingly McAlhany rejects all the previous amendments, starting with the very well-known and drastic by Scaliger. Therefore, he only replaces *nigellis pupuli* by *nigelli pupuli* (the error appears to be caused by the previous words, where you can find two endings in -s: *oculis suppaetulis*).

Chapter 8, by Sarah Culpepper Stroup, is another article regarding Marcus Terentius Varro and in particular his work *De re rustica*. The author does not agree with all the previous considerations on the nature of this Varro's work composed in 37 B.C. Stroup carefully analyzes the well-known relationships between Varro and Cicero, especially in relation to the Cicero's "dialogic project", to the common friendship with Atticus, who is an interlocutor of the second book of *De re rustica* and also of several Cicero's works. The author's conclusion, mainly grounded on a linguistic basis, but that I don't believe very persuasive, is that Varro's *De re rustica* is to be understood as a posthumous homage to Cicero.

Chapter 9, by Del A. Maticic, is a brief note on the *Constitutio Limitum* of Hyginus Gromaticus, a treatise of the Flavian age contained in the *Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum* (on p. 167 you can find the rather egregious oversight *Romanarum*). The study analyzes the presence of three sources quoted by Hyginus: Archimedes's *Sand Reckoner*, Vergil's *Georgics* and Lucan's *Pharsalia*. Not very convincingly, as I suppose, the author argues that the inclusion of these learned references in this technical treatise would produce a kind of "anxious"

intertextuality, alluding to the Roman wars that were the background to the activity of the surveyors of that time.

The ten and last chapter, by James J. O'Hara, tries to propose a new interpretation of a particularly studied work, namely the *Ars poetica* of Horace. This article is linked to an announced author's book aptly entitled *Teaching, Pretending to Teach, and the Authority of the Speaker in Greek and Roman Didactic and Satire*. In fact, O'Hara claims here that Horace's poem is not, as some believe (e.g. B. Frischer), a completely parodic text, but that the Augustan poet sometimes truly teaches the literary subject sometimes ironically pretends to teach (a sophisticated but not improbable hypothesis).

GIUSEPPE SOLARO
Università di Foggia
giuseppe.solaro@unifg.it

FRANCESCO CANNIZZARO, *Sulle orme dell'Iliade. Riflessi dell'eroismo omerico nell'epica d'età flavia*, Firenze: Società Editrice Fiorentina, 2023, 409 pp., ISBN 978-88-6032-689-8.

Francesco Cannizzaro, giovane studioso che ha pubblicato diversi contributi sull'epica flavia, ha dato alle stampe questa rielaborazione della sua tesi di dottorato "Sulle orme dell'*Iliade*: Imitazione omerica e strategie emulative in *Argonautiche*, *Tebaide* e *Punica*", discussa nel 2020 presso l'Università di Pisa. In essa, C. esamina le complesse riscritture di quattro episodi omerici nelle *Argonautiche*, nella *Tebaide* e nei *Punica* tramite minuziose comparazioni da cui sono tratte acute e giuste conclusioni sulla tecnica imitativa e poetica di Valerio Flacco, Stazio e Silio Italico.¹ C. tenta, inoltre, di apportare nuovi elementi sulla cronologia relativa dei tre poemi, particolarmente problematica per quanto concerne gli ultimi due.

Il volume è scritto in una prosa scorrevole e con uno stile molto chiaro, ben curato e pressoché privo di refusi.² Inoltre, oltre a essere stato pubblicato in

¹ In realtà, C. va oltre, non solo studiando gli episodi omerici nella letteratura grecolatina fino agli epici flavi (ad es., egli dedica alcune pagine alla ricezione della *Dolonia* in Ovidio e Lucano e a quella della *Dios apate* in Apollonio Rodio e Virgilio) e notando i possibili influssi di questi modelli "mediatori" su di essi, ma anche chiedendosi come mai essi manchino in alcuni autori in cui ci si aspetterebbe che ci fossero. Ringrazio Sergio Casali per i preziosi suggerimenti offerti.

² Ho riscontrato soltanto: p. 103 n. 88 "le imprese Tideo e Capaneo" invece di "le imprese di Tideo e Capaneo"; p. 156 "a lungo del suo poema" invece di "a lungo nel suo poema"; p. 166 "da parte dalla cavalleria di Volcente" invece di "da parte della cavalleria di Volcente"; p. 223 n. 212 "oltre, che ovviamente" invece di "oltre che, ovviamente"; p. 243 "sul commento di Gervais cfr. *supra*, p. 8" invece di "sul commento di Bernstein cfr. *supra*, p. 8"; p. 294 n. 66 "Un accenno

versione cartacea, a beneficio di tutti gli studiosi ce ne è anche una digitale in pdf ad accesso aperto con licenza Creative Commons.³

Inizialmente abbiamo un indice, una prefazione e una nota editoriale;⁴ successivamente, un'introduzione generale seguita dal cuore del volume, ossia quattro capitoli su altrettanti episodi omerici e la loro ricezione nei tre epici flavi. Abbiamo infine un epilogo, i riferimenti bibliografici e un elenco dei passi citati. Ogni capitolo è a sé stante e si può leggere in maniera indipendente, e ho anche apprezzato il fatto che C. riassume con efficacia quanto detto in ogni capitolo alla fine di ognuno di essi.

Nell'introduzione generale, C. tratta tutte le questioni preliminari utili a comprendere le dimensioni del lavoro e a seguirlo fluidamente. C. dimostra la necessità di leggere la *Tebaide*, le *Argonautiche* e i *Punica* non solo alla luce di Virgilio ed Ennio, ma anche di Omero, delimita per bene gli orizzonti dello studio, e fornisce lo *status quaestionis*, le principali metodologie con cui verranno affrontati i quattro esempi scelti (intertestualità e narratologia) e alcuni spunti sulla cronologia delle tre opere. Infine, C. discute il rapporto di Valerio Flacco, Stazio e Silio Italico con la figura di Omero nel trattamento della virtù eroica.

Il cap. I verte sulla ricezione della scena omerica del combattimento sul cadavere (*Leichenkampf*) in Valerio Flacco e Stazio. C. prende le mosse dal principale *Leichenkampf* omerico, ossia la lotta sul corpo di Patroclo in *Iliade* 17 e 18, e dalla mancanza di esso nell'*Eneide* (ce n'è soltanto un'allusione nell'arrivo di Enea sul luogo della morte di Pallante in 10.510-15). Valerio Flacco riprende il *Leichenkampf* nella breve scena di 6.342-70, in cui Telamone difende con successo il cadavere di Canto morto in battaglia. Stazio, invece, lo rielabora in *Tebaide* 9.86-195, in cui Ippomedonte lotta invano sul corpo di Tideo. C. conclude il capitolo dimostrando persuasivamente che “è plausibile che nell'episodio del *Leichenkampf* Stazio, da *poeta doctus* quale è, abbia attinto a Omero tramite la mediazione testuale di Valerio Flacco” (p. 68).

all'ingresso in scena di Zeus libro XV dell'*Iliade*” invece di “Un accenno all'ingresso in scena di Zeus nel libro XV dell'*Iliade*”.

³ Il download è possibile dal sito della Società Editrice Fiorentina <https://edu.sefeditrice.it/>.

⁴ Colpisce un po' la scelta di Cannizzaro dell'edizione di Hill (Leiden 1996²) per il testo di Stazio, e tanto più la sua osservazione su quella di Hall et al. (Cambridge 2007-2008): “all'approfondito studio della tradizione manoscritta non corrisponde, però, adeguato rigore stemmatico, con la conseguenza che le lezioni dell'autorevole codice P si ‘perdono’ nella messe di codici citati in apparato (e nella corposa appendice al testo) e il testo stampato risulta purtroppo poco soddisfacente”. Infatti, Hall et al. (Cambridge 2007-2008) hanno convincentemente dimostrato che la tradizione del poema è aperta e che non si può quindi stabilire uno stemma. Per la supposta autorevolezza di P, già contestata da Hall et al. (Cambridge 2007-2008), rimando a quanto ho scritto al riguardo in *Mnemosyne* 76, 2023, 632-3 n. 8. È vero che Hall et al. (Cambridge 2007-2008) presentano un numero eccessivo di congetture promosse a testo, ma, a livello di collazione, la loro edizione è molto più affidabile, in quanto essi hanno collazionato quasi tutti i manoscritti che hanno impiegato in maniera autopistica, riportando anche le letture in un modo molto più preciso, rispetto a quella di Hill (Leiden 1996²) che, per molti codici, ha attinto a collazioni di seconda mano che sono sbagliate.

La ricezione della *machē parapotamios* omerica in Stazio e Silio Italico è trattata nel cap. II. L'obiettivo principale di C. è quello di confrontare i protagonisti delle scene: “[n]el corso delle prossime pagine [...] ci si concentrerà non tanto sulla ripresa del tema della *teomachia*, già ampiamente esplorato dalla critica, quanto sulla caratterizzazione degli eroi protagonisti (Ippomedonte e Scipione padre a confronto con Achille) e dei fiumi loro antagonisti (l’Ismeno e il Trebbia a confronto con lo Scamandro)” (p. 75). C. comincia analizzando la *machē parapotamios* omerica, vale a dire lo scontro tra Achille e il dio-fiume Scamandro (o Xanto) in *Iliade* 21.1-382, e i brevi accenni a essa nell’*Eneide* (nel discorso di Enea durante la tempesta in 1.92-101, nel discorso di Nettuno a Venere in 5.803-11 e soprattutto nell’*aristia* di Enea dopo la morte di Pallante in 10.510-605). Stazio sviluppa la *machē parapotamios* in *Tebaide* 9.225-569, in cui Ippomedonte lotta contro l’Ismeno. Silio Italico, invece, la riscrive nel libro 4.573-703, in cui Scipione si scontra con il Trebbia. C. chiude il capitolo sintetizzando il rapporto non solo tra Omero e Stazio e Silio Italico nelle loro fini rielaborazioni, ma anche tra i due poeti flavii, e discutendo, di conseguenza, la possibile cronologia relativa di esse, senza però arrivare a conclusioni certe.

La ricezione della *Dolonia* omerica in Stazio e Silio Italico è affrontata nel cap. III, il più consistente del lavoro. C. incomincia prendendo in esame la *Dolonia* omerica, cioè la sortita notturna di Diomede e Odisseo da una parte e di Dolone dall’altra in *Iliade* 10, e quella non riuscita di Niso ed Eurialo in *Eneide* 10.176-449. Stazio ripropone la *Dolonia* nella *monomachia* di Tideo contro i cinquanta Tebani mandati da Eteocle per tendergli un’imboscata in 2.482-743 e 3.1-217; nella doppia spedizione organizzata dal vate argivo Tiodamante e quella seguente fallita di Opleo e Dimante per andare a recuperare le salme di Tideo e Partenopeo in *Tebaide* 10.156-346 e 347-448 rispettivamente; e nell’*aristia* di Argia e in seguito anche di Antigone in 12.105-463. Silio Italico, invece, la riprende nello stratagemma di Annibale per forzare il blocco romano presso il monte Callicula attraverso l’espedito dei buoi infuocati in 7.282-380; nell’incendio notturno ordinato da Scipione agli accampamenti del traditore Siface in 17.85-108; nella narrazione della drammatica vicenda di Satrico e Solimo, padre e figlio, in 9.66-177; e nella morte del comandante Marcello in 15.334-80. Infine, C. affronta la questione sulla cronologia relativa tra *Tebaide* e *Punica* negli episodi riprendenti la *Dolonia* concludendo in maniera molto convincente: “[...] allo stato attuale della ricerca e alla luce di quanto è emerso in queste pagine, sembra più economico pensare che le pericopi siliane considerate in questo capitolo – incluso l’episodio di Sagunto ed esclusa la morte di Marcello (su cui, quanto ai rapporti con la *Tebaide*, non sono stati trovati indizi utili) – siano state influenzate dagli episodi staziani esaminati piuttosto che il contrario” (p. 267). In questo capitolo ho molto apprezzato le pagine sul ruolo della luna/Luna in alcune delle scene prese in esame (pp. 214-25).

L’ultimo capitolo (IV) è dedicato alla ricezione del celebre episodio omerico noto come *Dios apate* nei tre epici flavii. C. parte da una disamina della *Dios apate*

omerica in *Iliade* 14, quando Era chiede e ottiene da Afrodite il *kestos himas* al fine di sedurre Zeus e distrarlo, con l'aiuto del Sonno, dalla battaglia tra Greci e Troiani. C. considera quindi la ricezione dell'inganno a Zeus in Apollonio Rodio 3.6-153, dove Era e Atena chiedono ad Afrodite di far innamorare Medea di Giasone tramite il figlio Eros, e in tre passi dell'*Eneide*: la richiesta di Giunone a Eolo di scatenare una tempesta contro la flotta di Enea in 1.50-80; il dialogo tra Giunone a Venere in 4.90-128; e la seduzione di Vulcano ad opera di Venere in 8.370-415). Valerio Flacco riprende la *Dios apate* nei libri 3 e 4, in cui Giunone, con l'aiuto di Driope, orchestra il ratto di Ila, che porta al conseguente abbandono del giovane e di Ercole da parte dei compagni Argonauti in Misia; e nel libro 6, in cui, come in Apollonio, Giunone chiede a Venere il *cingulum (kestos himas)* per farlo toccare a Medea in modo che lei si innamori di Giasone. Stazio riprende l'inganno a Zeus nel libro 10, quando Giunone invia Iride dal Sonno a fare addormentare la guarnigione a guardia del vallo di Tebe affinché il peplo donatole dalle donne argive non vada perduto. Inoltre, in 2.269-305, l'*ekphrasis* del monile di Armonia, Stazio allude al *kestos himas* iliadico tramite il *cingulum Veneris* valeriano (la cosiddetta "window reference"). Silio Italico, invece, evoca la *Dios apate* in 10.326-86, in cui Giunone chiede al Sonno di addormentare Annibale e suscitare sogni orrendi per dissuaderlo dal suo proposito di incendiare Roma; il dio obbedisce alla dea e il comandante quindi rimanda l'assalto. C. conclude in maniera molto persuasiva circa la fortuna della *Dios apate* negli epici flavi: "[...] Valerio Flacco ne esplora pienamente le possibilità metanarrative, riprendendone persino il suo oggetto più caratteristico, e il suo esempio può aver indotto Stazio e Silio Italico [...] a confrontarsi con alcuni episodi connessi alla *Dios apate*" (pp. 332-3).

Nel brevissimo epilogo, C. prende in esame la comparsa di Omero nel canto IV 85-96 dell'*Inferno* della *Divina commedia* di Dante, la cui rappresentazione come un re ed un sovrano sarebbe stata condivisa da Valerio Flacco, Stazio e Silio Italico.

Abbiamo, infine, la bibliografia, molto aggiornata, e l'elenco dei passi citati che rende il volume molto fruibile.⁵

In definitiva, C., dimostrando un'ampia padronanza tanto delle letterature greca e latina come della bibliografia scientifica, illustra con acutezza e precisione la ricezione nell'epica flavia delle quattro scene omeriche da lui individuate e analizza in modo convincente i fini processi di rielaborazione non solo degli epici flavi ma anche di altri poeti. Si tratta di una lettura d'obbligo sia per gli studiosi di letteratura flavia sia di epica omerica sia in genere per tutti i filologi classici. Senz'altro, C. ha

⁵ Si possono aggiungere i lavori mancanti segnalati nella recensione di E. Pyy (<https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2024/2024.08.15/>); inoltre, F. Econimo, "Illusione e morte: effetti del Sonno nella Tebaide", in F. Bessone (a c. di), *Dalla 'Tebaide' alla 'Commedia' (e oltre). Nuovi studi su Stazio e la sua ricezione*, Pisa-Roma 2022, recensito da me in questo stesso volume, per la discussione sulla *Dios apate* in *Tebaide* 10 (pp. 312-21), S.L. Mohler, "The cestus", PhD. diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 1926, per il *kestos himas* (cap. IV), e L. Scolari, *Doni funesti Miti di scambi pericolosi nella letteratura latina*, Pisa 2018 (spec. 19-78), per quella sul monile di Armonia (pp. 321-5).

raggiunto il suo obiettivo, ovverosia “[...] aver gettato più luce su come la poesia epica d’età flavia abbia recepito il suo [di Omero] *altissimo canto*”⁶ (p. 336), nonché “[...] aggiungere qualche tassello sulla cronologia relativa fra i tre poemi in esame (ancora incerta specialmente tra *Tebaide* e *Punica*)” (p. 14).

BARUCH MARTÍNEZ ZEPEDA

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

baruch.martinez@hotmail.com

GIANLUIGI TOMASSI, *Luciano di Samosata, La nave o Le preghiere*, Introduzione, traduzione e commento, Texte und Kommentare 61, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020, 366 pp., €129,95, ISBN 978-3-11-065314-4

The book to be reviewed here is a new commentary on one of the most lively pieces of Lucian of Samosata, his dialogue “The Ship or The Wishes”.¹ The author, a younger Italian scholar, who has already published a number of important items on Lucian,² has produced a substantial volume: 366 pages for 15 pages of Greek text – but one may say that Lucian’s witty dialogue really deserves them.

The extensive introduction (pp. 1–70) starts with a section on “content and structure” (p. 1–5³), followed by a discussion on when to date this dialogue (p. 5–7). According to Tomassi, “la datazione del dialogo è abbastanza sicura [...] intorno alla metà degli anni ’60 del II secolo” (p. 7), but this may be too confident;⁴ in my opinion there is no evidence to exclude that *Navigium* may have been written also later, e.g. in the 170s. The quite ample third section (p. 8–19) is a kind of excursus, devoted to “Il *Bis accusatus* e la poetica di Luciano”. Following some intriguing statements by “the Syrian”, Lucian’s mouthpiece in *Bis Accusatus* (“The Double Indictment”, ch. 32), Tomassi somewhat misleadingly asserts (p. 9) that until the age of forty Lucian had exercised the profession of an “itinerant sophist”, but then distanced himself from the world of rhetorical declamation and switched to writing serio-comic dialogues – again, this may be too credulously taking “the Syrian” at his word,⁵ because Lucian never really stopped being a rhetorical

⁶ La citazione di C. è di Dante, *Inf.*, IV 95.

¹ The last substantial commentary on this text was published half a century ago by Geneviève Husson: *Lucien, Le Navire ou les Souhaits*, 2 vols., Paris 1970.

² The most important of them is his 2011 commentary on Lucian’s “Timon”.

³ In note 3 (p. 2), Tomassi rightly rejects Anderson’s (Some notes on Lucian’s *Navigium*, *Mnemosyne* 30, 1977, [363–8] 363–4) attempt to find structural analogies between Lucian’s dialogue and books 7–9 of Plato’s “Republic”.

⁴ Too confidently dated seem also the various stages of Lucian’s life, as they are described on p. 6.

⁵ For contradictory statements of Lucianic mouthpieces concerning their relationship to philosophy and rhetoric at a certain age see e.g. Nesselrath, *ANRW II* 36.5 (1992), 3456–7”.

performer within the cultural parameters of the Second Sophistic (as Tomassi himself acknowledges on p. 10), but combined rhetoric and (both philosophical and comical) dialogue to produce some of his best work.⁶ In the fourth section,⁷ Tomassi returns to *Navigium* and considers its place within the literary tradition (p. 20–30), surveying its relationship to a number of literary genres: he starts with comedy (p. 20–1),⁸ continues with satire (p. 21–4) – a section in which he tries to show that there are “*numerosi ... paralleli*” between Lucian’s *Navigium* and the *Satyrical* (especially the *Cena Trimalchionis*) of Petronius⁹ –, Plato (p. 24–5), popular philosophy and diatribe (p. 25–8),¹⁰ the *Characters* of Theophrastus,¹¹ as well as epic, tragedy and historiography (p. 29–30).¹²

The next section discusses “*La nave e la realtà contemporanea*” (p. 31–40). It begins with a look at Athens’ harbour Piraeus, which is the setting of the first part of Lucian’s dialogue. Why Tomassi here refers to the mighty fortifications of the harbour in classical times, is not clear;¹³ moreover his mention of their destruction by the Spartans “*nel 403 a.C.*” and their reconstruction “*alla fine della guerra del Peloponneso*” (p. 31) is inexact: the destruction of the walls took place immediately after Athens had capitulated to Lysander in 404 BCE (see Xen. Hell. 2.2.23), and their reconstruction was undertaken about ten years after the end of the Peloponnesian War (see Xen. Hell. 4.8.9–10). Tomassi then discusses the mighty Egyptian grain ship (named “*Isis*”) in Piraeus that at the dialogue’s beginning arouses the admiration of Lycinus and his companions, and its voyage from Egypt to Athens (p. 33–9). Again, however, he commits an error by mentioning “*il doppiaggio del capo Malea*” by the ship: had the “*Isis*” really passed Malea, she would never have gotten to Piraeus.¹⁴ As for the ship itself, Tomassi leaves it open

⁶ On p. 18, Tomassi correctly states that Lucian never experienced a “*conversione alla filosofia*”, as some earlier scholars mistakenly believed (enumerated in n. 58).

⁷ At the beginning of this section, he somewhat contradictorily asserts that Lucian, on the one hand, “*non è un innovatore*”, but that, on the other, he produced “*creazioni originali*” (p. 20).

⁸ I am not sure whether Tomassi’s characterization of Timolaus as “*il tipico senex libidinosus della commedia*” (p. 21) really hits the spot, because to be sexually attractive to both younger men and women is only one of Timolaus’ many desires; on the other hand, Tomassi rightly rejects Graham Anderson’s thesis that the opening sequence of *Navigium* is indebted to a lost comic model (ibid.).

⁹ I have to confess that the “*parallels*” Tomassi adduces for this (p. 23–4) do not convince me.

¹⁰ In this section, Tomassi provides a long list “*dei principali temi diatribici sfruttati da Luciano*” (p. 26), but the quotes he adduces from *Navigium* do not always match the description of these themes.

¹¹ Though Tomassi himself is rightly sceptical about detecting “*un’ influenza diretta*” of the *Characters* on Lucian, he nevertheless enumerates some instances of possible (but to my mind, not always convincing) parallels between the *Characters* and *Navigium*.

¹² Interesting here are the parallels he enumerates between *Navigium* and Arrian’s *Anabasis* (though we can probably not exclude that Lucian might also have read earlier histories of Alexander the Great).

¹³ Lucian’s dialogue does not mention them, and the dialogue takes place in Lucian’s own time, as do all the Lycinus dialogues.

¹⁴ In ch. 9 it is quite clearly stated that the ship would have had to pass Malea, but did not do so, having instead been blown off its original course and been driven to Piraeus.

whether such an impressive ship could really have existed, calling its description “una delle migliori e più affascinanti *ekphraseis* lucianee” (p. 39).

After a shorter section discussing some further “riferimenti alla realtà contemporanea” (p. 39) in the dialogue, Tomassi concentrates on “I protagonisti del dialogo” (p. 40–58). His discovery of “una certa dose di cinismo” (p. 41) in Lycinus’ three companions Adimantus, Samippus and Timolaus is not very convincing: Adimantus wants to shut out rich people from his estates (ch. 22), but this is no mark of Cynicism but of simple vindictiveness; and a similar vindictiveness is exhibited by Samippus and Timolaus when they fantasize about decapitating the vanquished enemy king (ch. 37) or about splitting the skulls of one’s adversaries (ch. 44), respectively. Interestingly, Tomassi also discovers traits of contemporary historical figures in three of the four dialogue speakers (p. 42): according to this assumption, Adimantus is supposed to resemble the super-rich Herodes Atticus, the would-be conqueror Samippus the emperor Lucius Verus, and Lycinus of course Lucian himself (no contemporary match is presented for Timolaus). Now it is fairly clear that Lycinus is meant to be a persona for the author himself;¹⁵ but the other identifications might be more questionable: Adimantus may have some traits resembling “al tipico benefattore e filantropo di una città dell’Impero romano del II secolo” (p. 43), of which Herodes Atticus was one of the most prominent examples; on the other hand, Herodes was not a “nouveau riche” in the way that Adimantus in some respects seems to be (for this see p. 22). Tomassi detects some vague external signs of a philosopher in him (he walks barefoot, ch. 1, and his hair is close-cropped, ch. 10, which is a Stoic kind of hairstyle), but rightly recognizes that this is not enough to make a philosopher out of Adimantus. Still, Tomassi believes that Lycinus’ companions in this dialogue harbour certain philosophical pretensions, and even thinks that in this respect Lucian might have wanted to characterize them as a kind of would-be philosophers in the way he may have regarded Dio of Prusa and Favorinus (p. 44), but this, in my opinion, is rather too speculative. As for Lycinus, Tomassi thinks that he does not have “a posizione privilegiata che ricopre in altri dialoghi” (p. 46), but this is contestable: after the introductory section of the dialogue, Lycinus wins every argument against his companions, destroying each of their fantasies with a ruthless analysis of their weaknesses. Tomassi himself regards Lycinus as the main spokesman of Lucianic satire, which “non prevede controfferte alle illusioni umane, non propone soluzioni [...] Luciano [...] non ha nulla da offrire agli uomini, se non una filosofia del buon senso” (p. 48) – but isn’t that already something? The Lycinus of *Navigium* is quite comparable to the Lycinus of *Hermotimus* (of which dialogue Tomassi makes no mention here); there Lycinus, too, liberates a fellow human being from false illusions (and, unlike Lycinus’ companions in *Navigium*, Hermotimus gratefully acknowledges this

¹⁵ See now also H.-G. Nesselrath, *Lukian von Samosata. Der Weg eines Syrerers ins Römische Reich und in die europäische Geisteswelt*, Baden-Baden 2024, 60–2.

in the end). Tomassi's subsequent portrait of Samippus (p. 48–54) may be too positive: he regards Samippus' desired exploits as “fondati non sulla fortuna, ma sulla sua virtù” (p. 49) – but Samippus actually wants to begin his career as a chief of bandits (ch. 28), and for his following ascent to the position of king and conqueror he will in fact need lots of good fortune! Tomassi rightly stresses the numerous parallels of Samippus' imperial dream with the career of Alexander the Great – but to regard Samippus' dream as “un divertito omaggio” (p. 51) vis-à-vis the *Anabasis* of Arrian may go too far; in Lucian's time Alexander's tale was surely well-known and even a stock feature of rhetorical education, so that it might be too hazardous to pin down Lucian's Alexander-like Samippus on just one literary model. Besides Alexander, however, Tomassi wants to see yet another historical figure represented (in a distorted way) by Samippus, namely Lucius Verus (see above), and he even goes so far as to correlate certain events of Verus' Parthian War with the dating of Lucian's *Navigium*. Here, however, we get perilously close to creating a vicious circle, postulating that certain events of that Parthian War *must* have *closely* preceded Lucian's writing down of *Navigium* (p. 53), but this argument is far from compelling – some of these events may indeed have found their way into Lucian's fictional (re)construction, but why not many more years afterwards than Tomassi cares to consider? Finally, in the portrait of Timolaus, Tomassi stresses two traits that may seem questionable: Timolaus the old man and Timolaus the negative foil of Menippus (as depicted in Lucian's *Icaromenippus*). It is true that Lycinus calls Timolaus a γέρων ἀνὴρ (ch. 45), but the main reason for that may be to stress the contrast to his “childish” fantasies; otherwise there is not much that suggests that Timolaus is someone of advanced age. And as common traits connecting Menippus and Timolaus Tomassi stresses their desire for “l'esplorazione del cielo e la soddisfazione delle curiosità scientifiche della terra” and that both “hanno il desiderio di apparire come dèi” (p. 57); but this can hardly be claimed for Menippus, and Timolaus' manifold curiosities can hardly be characterized as “scientific”.

The next extended section concerns the literary aspects of the dialogue (“Esecuzione, stilo e lingua del dialogo”, p. 58–67). A first subsection discusses “La tecnica drammatica di Luciano” (p. 58–61) and here mainly the problem how an oral rendering of the dialogue by just one speaker could sufficiently clearly convey the development of talk and action to an audience. The next subsection concerns the style of the dialogue (p. 61–6) and the means by which Lucian achieves liveliness and spontaneity, covering also the range of “espedienti umoristici” (p. 63) Lucian employs and describing (quite interestingly) how the syntax seems to be adapted to convey a certain image of the various interlocutors (p. 64–6). A shorter subsection on Lucian's language mainly reproduces the numbers of Chabert's monograph of 1897, “L'atticisme de Lucien”. There seems, however, to be a certain measure of confusion here: according to Chabert (as cited by Tomassi), 1230 words of Lucian's overall vocabulary of 10400 words are non-classical and more than half of them (i.e. something like 650) are hapax

legomena. But then Tomassi goes on to say that there is a third section of Lucian's own words that he calls "i termini 'propri' del vocabolario di Luciano" (p. 66) – but should we not count the aforementioned hapax legomena among them, as they are obviously used by none other than Lucian and thus are "termini 'propri'" of him? The subsection ends with the enumeration of such hapax legomena and of words used by Lucian with an unusual meaning in *Navigium*.¹⁶

The introduction concludes with a „Nota testuale“ (p. 67–70) which presents a list of 26 passages in which Tomassi's Greek text of *Navigium* differs from that of Macleod. The majority of Tomassi's choices can be accepted; in some cases, however, questions remain. In ch. 11, he opts for the reading κενή τις ἔννοια (Kilburn: "an empty notion"; Tomassi himself translates "un'idea sciocca") of the codices recentiores, while the veteres offer καινή instead, which sounds more positive and can indeed be defended: it is Adimantus himself who is speaking here, and why should he devalue his own fanciful idea as "empty" or "sciocca"?¹⁷ In ch. 14, Tomassi follows Dindorf's deletion of καί after καθεδούμεθα, judging it "ridondante" (p. 165), but this is not the case, if we assume that Lycinus' sentence remains uncompleted because Adimantus interrupts him (as already Macleod observed, the deletion of καί "non opus est si loquens interpellatur"). In ch. 15, Tomassi opts for the form ἐδύνατο, claiming that Lucian prefers it to ἡδύνατο (p. 173); but if we look at the whole of Lucian's known works, we see ἐδυν- in 35 passages and ἡδυν- in eight. While this latter number is clearly smaller, it is not small enough to justify the opinion that Lucian only used ἐδυν-; he probably used both (and did not care very much for absolute consistency). Here in Nav. 15, our most important manuscript (Γ) has ἡδύνατο (ipse legi), so we should keep this form.¹⁸ In ch. 16, Tomassi follows Fritzsche's conjecture ἐκάστω (which, it seems, was anticipated by Γa), but ἑκάστος (to be found in Γ originally and in other manuscripts) is clearly the lectio difficilior here and should therefore be retained.¹⁹ In ch. 19, Tomassi prefers to read εἰ θέλεις with the codices recentiores, but again there is no compelling reason why we should not keep the εἰ θέλοις of the veteres. Tomassi again prefers the recentiores' ὑπῆρξεν to the veteres' ὑπῆρχεν in ch. 24, claiming that shortly afterwards Lucian also uses the aorist ἐκέλευσα (p. 210); he does not consider that in the first case Adimantus speaks of repetitive gifts (for which the imperfect tense is better suited than the aorist), which he does not in the second. In ch. 31, Tomassi opts (once again) for the recentiores' συμπαρῶσι, but

¹⁶ It might still be debated, however, whether ἀρχή in ch. 34 also belongs to these words. Here and in his comment on ch. 34, Tomassi states that ἀρχή is used in the meaning of "capital city", but he cites no parallels for this use.

¹⁷ In his following words, Adimantus concedes that his sudden fancy might seem "childish" to the others (μειρακιῶδες ὑμῖν δόξει τὸ φρόντισμα), but that does not necessarily mean that he thinks so himself.

¹⁸ On p. 173 Tomassi wrongly claims that ἡδύνατο in this passage is found only in the recentiores.

¹⁹ On p. 174, Tomassi quotes this sentence with ἑκάστος, which he also translates (p. 81): "ciascuno di noi [...] chieda pure [...]".

the veteres indicate a lacuna of at least eight or nine letters after συμπαρ – it would therefore be more prudent to keep the lacuna in the text and cite some proposals that have been made (e.g. Macleod's συμπαρατάσσονται or συμπαριπτεύωσι) in the apparatus or commentary. In ch. 38, Tomassi wants to read αἰ (connected with πόλεις), but the older manuscripts have οἱ, which is clearly a lectio difficilior (with οἱ meaning – as Tomassi himself correctly acknowledges on p. 257 – the inhabitants of the πόλεις). One additional passage (in ch. 39), in which Tomassi differs from Macleod (reading ἐκστάδιος of a more recent manuscript instead of Γ's ἐκστάδιος, for which see Macleod, Glotta 1980, 259) has been omitted from the list (and, judging from his comment on p. 258, Tomassi does not even seem to be aware that he is differing from Macleod's text here).

On p. 72–101, the Greek text of *Navigium* and Tomassi's Italian translation follow on facing pages. In some places, corrections of the translation should be considered. In ch. 9 Tomassi translates τοῦ Νηρέως ἡλικιώτην with “compagno di Nereo”, but ἡλικιώτης means “contemporary of” or “as old as” (as Kilburn translates) which jokingly exaggerates the age of the helmsman of the “Isis” (who had already in ch. 6 been called γέρων). In the next chapter, speaker assignments in the translation differ markedly from those in the Greek text: in the Greek text Lycinus only raises the question ἀλλὰ τί τοῦτο; οὐκ Ἀδείμαντος ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν; and Timolaus answers in the affirmative (Πάνυ μὲν οὖν, Ἀδείμαντος αὐτός) and then raises his voice calling Adimantus (ἐκβοήσωμεν οὖν. Ἀδείμαντε, σέ φημι [...] τὸν Στρομβίχου), after which Lycinus resumes, stating that Adimantus must either be wroth with his friends or gone deaf; in the translation, Lycinus answers his own question (Πάνυ μὲν οὖν, Ἀδείμαντος αὐτός), and Timolaus exhorts his companions to call him, does so himself and then also states the two possible reasons (cited above), why Adimantus doesn't seem to hear. Tomassi nowhere gives a reason why he altered the speakers' assignments, nor seems there to be any reason for it. In ch. 15, Adimantus' words ἀποπλευσοῦμαι πάλιν ἐπὶ τῆς νεώς are rendered too inexactly by “tornerò a bordo della mia nave” (cf. Kilburn: “I'll [...] sail away again on my ship”), and in Lycinus' answer Tomassi omits καὶ (καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπιστάντες: “noi resteremmo”, while Kilburn translates “We'll stay too”). In ch. 16, the words παρ' αὐτῷ γὰρ ἐκάστω τὸ μέτρον τῆς εὐχῆς are rendered much too freely with “Che ognuno sviluppi la sua preghiera a suo piacimento” (cf. Kilburn: “each one may decide the measure of his wish”). In ch. 21, Tomassi has overlooked the δέ in εἰ δέ μὴ σιωπήσῃ and connected this conditional clause with the preceding words (“e i letti d'oro, se non starai zitto”), while in fact it belongs to the following phrase (καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτούς), cf. Kilburn: “and, if you don't keep quiet, my servants as well”. In ch. 24, Tomassi has confused τοσοῦτος and τοιοῦτος, translating ἀργύρῳ τοσοῦτῳ with “un' argenteria simile” (cf. Kilburn: “so much silver”). And why translate, in ch. 27, εὖ οἶδα with “sai bene” (Kilburn: “I'm sure”)? Quite inexact is the rendering (in ch. 38) of the phrase αἱ ἂν ὑβρίσωσι τι ἐς τὴν ἀρχήν with “se proveranno a fare offesa alla mia autorità” (cf. Kilburn: “(how many cities) that have been insolent to my empire”); just as inexact is the

translation of ὁ θαυμασιώτατε βασιλέων (ch. 39) with “mio re dei re” (Kilburn: “most glorious majesty”) or τινες τῶν ἔξω τῆς ἀρχῆς (ibid.) with “una nazione straniera”. In ch. 42, Tomassi translates μυρίοι with “diecimila” (repeated in his commentary on p. 271), but for this the word would need to be accentuated μύριοι (Kilburn translates “thousands”). Quite inexact is also the rendering of δεήσει καὶ τὴν δεξιὰν συνεπιλαβεῖν in ch. 45 with “servirà anche l’aiuto della mano destra” (a bit less inexact Kilburn: “your right hand must take its share”; Fowler and Fowler: “the right hand must be forced into the service”); and finally, in ch. 46 the words ὁ συκοφαντῶν τοὺς ἄλλους are rendered much too innocuously by “che critichi chiunque altro” (Kilburn: “you who cavil against everybody else”).

There follows the most substantial part of the book, the commentary itself (p. 103-298). It contains a treasure-trove of valuable information, but here, too, I may be permitted to point out some omissions or corrections. On p. 124, one would have liked to read a bit more about the rare verb ἀποβουκολέω (used by Lucian not only here, but also Bis acc. 13). On p. 142, Tomassi mentions “l’ardito viaggio di Scintaro e dei suoi compagni oltre le Colonne d’Ercole” in “True Stories I” ch. 9, but there Scintharus meets (and soon after joins) the crew of the first-person narrator only in ch. 33. For his thesis that “Hermes e Zeus sono gli dèi ‘favoriti’ da Luciano” (p. 179), Tomassi might have cited F. Berdozzo, “Götter, Mythen, Philosophen: Lukian und die paganen Göttervorstellungen seiner Zeit”, Berlin 2011, 34–48 (for the prominence of Zeus in Lucian’s “Dialogues of the Gods”) and H.-G. Nesselrath, *Vom kleinen Meisterdieb zum vielgeplagten Götterboten: Hermes in den Göttergesprächen Lukians*, in: Chr. Schmitz (ed.), *Mythos im Alltag – Alltag im Mythos. Die Banalität des Alltags in unterschiedlichen literarischen Verwendungskontexten*, München 2010, 147–159. On p. 186, the correct name for the sea god into which the young Melicertes was transformed, would be (in Italian) “Palemone” (i.e. Palaemon), not “Polemone”. On p. 200, Tomassi claims “Il portiere è una presenza tipica delle case dei ricchi Romani”, but he can also be found already in Plato’s dialogue *Protagoras* (314c–e). On p. 206, a Euripides fragment (905 Kannicht) is still cited from the superseded edition of Nauck. While on p. 212 Tomassi sides with “la critica moderna” in rejecting a too close association of the dialogue figure of Lycinus with Lucian himself, he seems to have no problems (on p. 214) with accepting Jacques Schwartz’ highly questionable procedure of dating Lucian’s dialogues by means of the absence or presence of certain proverbs in their text. In his comment on the beginning of ch. 28, Tomassi apparently misunderstands what Samippus classifies as ἀδύνατον here (“L’iniziale critica al sogno di Adimanto, il cui possesso di una straordinaria imbarcazione è [...] bollato come ‘impossibile’”, p. 223): it is not Adimantus’ ship as such, but that an Arcadian landlubber like Samippus cannot show it to his compatriots (ἦν γε τοῖς πολίταις ἐπιδείξασθαι ἀδύνατον)! One should perhaps not classify Samippus’ first (rather criminal) exploits as “pirateria” (p. 225), because as a landlocked Arcadian he will have started with raids on land. On p. 226–228, Tomassi cites the famous dialogue (within the “Dialogues of the Dead”) between

Alexander the Great, Hannibal, Minos and Scipio four times as “12 [25]”, but these numbers should be reversed, as “25” is the number within the most recent editions (like that of Macleod) and “12” that of older editions. On p. 235, Tomassi claims that Kenchreae (one of the two ports of Corinth) was “situata a 7 km a sud-ovest di Corinto” – in reality it lay to the south-east of Corinth, because it was also “affacciata sul golfo Saronico”. On p. 247, a Greek noun, ἀποδειλία, meaning „vigliaccheria“ is presented that does not exist; the correct form would be ἀποδειλιάσις (attested in Polybius and Plutarch). On p. 249, Tomassi wrongly asserts that Athena gave the olive tree to the Athenians “dopo la vittoria su Poseidone”, while according to the mythical story as reported in Apollodorus’ *Bibliothēke* (3.178-9 = 3.14.1; also cited by Tomassi!) Athena made the gift of this tree already *before* her competition with Poseidon for Athens was decided. On p. 255, Tomassi incorrectly claims that Lycinus “ironicamente dichiara che [...] Samippo sarà irrimediabilmente ferito” in his single combat against the enemy king (ch. 37) – but Lycinus says nothing about “irrimediabilmente”, and Samippus immediately afterwards declares that his τραῦμα is only ἐπιόλαιον. On p. 256, Tomassi correctly renders the title εἰς στρατηγὸς (ch. 38) as “stratega unico” – one wonders why he did not also do so in his translation (where we find only “stratega”). In ch. 39, Tomassi notes that once more “Samippo si ispira alla biografia di Alessandro Magno” concerning “la cura straordinari<a> nell’allestire un banchetto” (p. 258) – but it is actually Lycinus (not Samippus) who talks of this banquet here! When talking about the representation of India and its inhabitants in Lucian’s works (on p. 277), it is rather strange that Tomassi makes no mention at all of the prolatia *Bacchus*, the setting of which is wholly located in India. Commenting on the ἀντίποδες people mentioned in ch. 44, Tomassi compares the end of “True Stories” book 2, where the first-person narrator suffers shipwreck “sul continente degli Antipodi” (p. 280) – but does he? One might rather think that with ἡπειρον [...] τὴν ἀντιπέραν τῇ ὑφ’ ἡμῶν οἰκουμένη κειμένην (VH 2.47) Lucian means the continent on the opposite side of what we now call the Atlantic Ocean, because this continent was also his aim when he set out in VH 1.5 (there he wants μαθεῖν, τί τὸ τέλος ἐστὶν τοῦ ὠκεανοῦ καὶ τίνες οἱ πέραν κατοικοῦντες ἄνθρωποι), but this is not the region of the Antipodes. On p. 289–90, Tomassi wavers in his comment on the second but last sentence of ch. 45 between Cobet’s conjecture ἀπομύξας (which he also has in his text on p. 98) and the manuscripts’ reading ἀποξύσας, without making clear which he would prefer. Similarly, in ch. 46 he prints the second μετ’ ὀλίγον within square brackets as if deleted (as Bekker proposed), but translates it nevertheless, and also in his commentary on p. 292 he treats it as genuine text.

After the commentary we get a section with antique (and non-antique) illustrations of ships and seafaring (p. 299–318), an ample bibliography (p. 319–347), and “Indici”: of “nomi e [...] cose notevoli” (p. 349–355), of “termini greci” (p. 356–8) and of the principal quoted (and discussed) passages from ancient texts (p. 359–366).

Finally, let me note a few more mistakes that might impede a reader's understanding (I will not mention some further misprints, as they do not impair reading comprehension): on p. 6 n. 16, Tomassi calls Macleod's OCT text an "edizione critica con trad.", but there is no translation in OCT texts; on p. 12 n. 32, read "Ledergerber" instead of "-berger" (in the bibliography, the name is correctly spelled); p. 22 n. 67: "Meyer 1913" (= Ernst Meyer, *Der Emporkömmling: ein Beitrag zur antiken Ethologie*, Giessen 1913) is not in the bibliography. On p. 69, Tomassi attributes a conjecture (in ch. 29) to me, which was actually made by Rudolf Kassel (as I have made quite clear in *Gnomon* 62, 1990, 508). On p. 69 (and 236), Tomassi ascribes the conjecture of διαβάλωμεν (instead of the codices' διαλάβωμεν) to Fritzsche, but Fritzsche himself ascribes it to the French philologist François Guyet (of the 17th century). On p. 127, "Ippogigi" seems to be an error for "Ippogipi" (for Greek Ἰππόγυποι in Lucian's "True Stories" book 1, ch. 11). On p. 141, read σχιζόμενος instead of σχιμενος; on p. 156, ἐπεβίωσα (repeated on p. 162) should be changed into ἐβίωσα, on p. 158 "Dypilon" into "Dipylon". On p. 165-6 the passages in which a laughing Anacharsis is depicted by Lucian are wrongly given as "Scyth. 1, 9 e 39" – they are all to be found in the homonymous dialogue (*Anacharsis* 1, 9 and 39). In the sentence "Caronte non fa che 'versare con abbondante flusso' [...] versi omerici e indispone Caronte" (p. 174), the second "Caronte" must be changed to "Hermes" (Charon's interlocutor in the homonymous dialogue). On p. 180, the word δώτορ either has a wrong accent (if the vocative is meant – as in a number of Homeric passages –, it should be δῶτορ), or it should be changed into δώτορ (nominative). On p. 183 "cura" in the quote from Varro's Menippean satires must be corrected to "curas". On p. 193, read "sollecitare" for "solleticare". On p. 196, read (as a reference to Oltramare's "Origines de la diatribe romaine") "p. 51, no. 34 [the number as fallen out] 'il faut fuir le luxe ...'". On p. 268 read "Tosi 1992" instead of "T. 1922". On p. 282, "Tomassi 2014" must be corrected to "Tomassi 2015".

Despite such corrigenda, Tomassi's commentary is a valuable tool for better understanding – and enjoying – one of Lucian's liveliest dialogues.

HEINZ-GÜNTHER NESSELRATH
Georg-August-Universität Göttingen
hnessel@gwdg.de