being mentioned immediately before, whereas here the absolute dependence of men on Zeus is made more forcefully by the connection with the preceding lines and the general human activities described there.

Providing a wealth of information, the two editions often complement each other, but also offer information on different points and often disagree with each other in the interpretation of particular issues. I have found this stimulating, as it made me focus with more precision on the text (e.g. 107: ἤειδεν). In 128 (παπταίνοντας) K. detects a note of 'wistful sadness', quoting A.R. 1.1171 to support his claim, and adds that in Homer the feeling is often that of fear (cf. 1046). M., on the other hand, emphasizes the movement of the eyes around oneself and the searching with the eyes. In the example from A.R. there is not so much sadness as nervous apprehension present, I think. The same emotion would surely occupy the people here who have just heard the frightening prophecy from Dike and must realize the enormous implications of her departure.

In conclusion, this is a very important contribution to the study of Aratus, Hellenistic and Latin poetry, and textual criticism in general. It seems foolish to think that Aratus will regain something of the immense popularity he enjoyed in antiquity, but I sincerely hope that this fine edition will spark new research into him.

University of Durham MIRJAM PLANTINGA

ALEXANDER OF AETOLIA

E. MAGNELLI (ed.): *Alexandri Aetoli Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Pp. 304. Florence: Università degli Studi di Firenze, 1999. Paper.

This book opens modestly: 'senza pretendere che tale ricerca fosse un urgente *desideratum* della filologia . . .'. Such self-effacement is undue: this is a work of very high quality indeed. The small scope of the project (a mere seventy-two verses of Alexander of Aetolia survive, excluding a few dubious epigrams) has enabled a thorough and meticulous treatment of the subject, one which incidentally sheds light on many other topics.

It contains a new edition of the twenty-seven fragments of Alexander of Aetolia, plus testimonia; a substantial introduction, with sections on *Vita*, *oeuvre* and literary context, style and metre, *Nachleben*, and printed editions; and intensive commentary. At the end there is a translation of fragments (not of their context), including Cornarius' rendering of fr. 3; a *comparatio numerorum*; and *indices fontium*, *verborum*, subjects, and passages cited. The book is very attractively laid out and typeset. The bibliography is placed rather oddly, though, in between the Introduction and Testimonia/Fragments. It is arranged in four sections, the fourth further subdivided—something of an impediment to speedy use.

The collection of fragments is the fullest yet (nineteen authentic fragments, eight Dubia, and a collection of Spuria: Powell offered sixteen authentic fragments, five Dubia, and a collection of Falsa), though this is mostly achieved through rearrangement of material (e.g. the *Φαινόμενα*, Powell's dub. frag. 20, receives two mentions, the testimonium among the genuine fragments, and the verses of Alexander of Ephesus[?]

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.25 Published online by Cambridge University Press

among the Spuria). The only fragments not hitherto numbered in any collection are 16 (an Oxyrhyncus fragment published a couple of years after Powell) and 20 (*AP* 7.507a, ascribed to an 'Alexander' who has been variously identified). There is also an extra apparatus with overspill for certain fragments. The numeration follows Powell only as far as fr. 7; thereafter it is new.

M. often, and helpfully, gives much more of the context in the secondary source than earlier editors. He has gone to very great pains in the edition of his secondary sources. He has, in person, consulted MSS in libraries in Florence, Rome, and Leiden, microfilms of MSS in Venice, and published reproductions in other cases; and his testimonia and fragments are preceded by a most meticulous index of the relevant manuscripts and their sigla, editions, and an additional bibliography of items later than the latest published edition. His text, in general, is conservative, though moderately so (not for him Giangrandiose adherence to the paradosis at any cost). Still, he prefers minimal intervention, and, as he says, conjectures (including his own) are mostly consigned to the apparatus. He does not persuade that in fr. 3.9 *μέγαν υἱόν* is correct (the passage implies neither Achillean heroism nor excellence in statecraft, but tender and delicate beauty), and his 'il sale, compagno della mensa' (p. 164) suggests that what he wants to read in 3.15 is really *τραπέζης*, not *θαλάσσης*; in 7.3 Nauck's *ἐπεπνεύκει* is much better than the transmitted *ἐτετεύχει*, as M. notes; and in 8.2 *μακελᾶς* (for transmitted *μακέλας*) is preferred to *βακέλας* 'per la maggiore economicità dell'intervento' (p. 236): but surely the ease with which minuscule *β* can be corrupted into *μ* is an equally, or even more, economical explanation.

The commentary is very helpfully presented, with an introduction, where necessary, raising wider issues before the close line-by-line philology; bibliography is most generous. The commentary on the longest fragment, fr. 3 (from the *Ἀπόλλων*, quoted by Parthenius), is particularly interesting, exemplary in its rigour, and (at almost sixty pages long) far more detailed than my own ten pages in *Parthenius* (Oxford, 1999). In keeping with Alexander's penchant for marrying recherché vocabulary with relatively simple syntax, special attention is paid to the prior and subsequent history of words and *juncturae*. Syntax, though, is also well covered (though Diels's *αἰενάουσαν* in fr. 1.4 would mean that *ὕλην* was a *second* accusative in apposition after *δόρπον*: this needed a note). If I have any criticism, it is that there is an element of overkill (consider e.g. fr. 1.2 *μακάρων νήσοισι*, pp. 114–15; fr. 3.5, the 'flower of youth' metaphor, pp. 144–5; fr. 3.9 *μέγα χάρμα*, pp. 153–4; fr. 4.5, Hellenistic neo-formations with the suffix *-ειρα*, pp. 199–200 [given this level of detail, would it have been better to arrange data by stem-type?]), albeit as a by-product of extreme conscientiousness. M.'s exhaustive analyses have been facilitated by TLG and PHI; but the data on (say) *τωθάζειν* (pp. 229–30) are easily generated thus, and tempting though it is in the interests of inclusivity to give statistics on *τωθάζειν* in Constantinus Porphyrogenetus, it elucidates Alexander little.

The general view taken of the Hellenistic literary climate is pre- or anti-Cameron: the 'coltissimo pubblico degli studiosi di Alessandria' (p. 238) is a plausible context for Alexander's works. This is reasonable enough, of course, though I would have avoided assuming (p. 13 n. 14) that Alexander's tragedies were 'libresche', 'forse più adatte alla lettura-recitazione che alla messa in scena', in the context of the 'generale declino del teatro tradizionale in età ellenistica'. But it is a pity that reviewers have to cavil, because this really is a most impressive piece of scholarship, and full of information on many topics besides Alexander. Since Alexander and Euphorion were closely

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.25 Published online by Cambridge University Press

linked, and since Euphorion badly needs a competent editor, would M. be well advised to turn his talents next in this direction?

All Souls College, Oxford J. L. LIGHTFOOT

A HELLENIST IN LATE-ANTIQUE APHRODITO

J.-L. FOURNET: *Hellénisme dans l'Égypte du VI^e siècle. La bibliothèque et l'oeuvre de Dioscore d'Aphrodité*, 2 vols. Pp. 734, 77 pls. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 2-7247-0237-9.

This lavish book, a watershed in recent revaluation of 'possibly the worst poet of antiquity', would justly have delighted its subject, Dioscorus of Aphrodito (mid-sixth century A.D.), local dignitary, official, poet, and owner of the Cairo Menander codex. Early editors of his archive (discovered in 1905 at Kum Isqaw in Upper Egypt) were overwhelmed by the poor technical quality of D.'s verses. But a broader historical perspective now acknowledges the unique riches of this material and appreciates that understanding of late-antique culture is limited indeed if confined to the literary output of an unrepresentative élite. Leslie MacCoull's *Dioscorus of Aphrodito and his World* (Berkeley, 1988) recognizes (Chapter II) that the Coptic bureaucratic documents must be studied in conjunction with D.'s Greek writings. Fournet's objective, more circumscribed yet more fundamental, is presentation of D.'s poems and other Greek literary texts, and their evaluation in the context of the whole archive.

The texts (pp. 7–237) are three new/partially edited items from D.'s library—an *Iliad*, a volume of *Scholia Minora* on the *Iliad*, and a set of verbal conjugation tables; in addition (pp. 239–665) fifty-two autograph poems are entirely re-edited. Each document is meticulously presented, with discussion of location and state of the various fragments—those in Cairo have survived much better than those released to the antique markets (e.g. *P. Strasb. gr.* inv. 2454, conjugation of ποιῶ: plate XXXIV), identification of the hands, significance and range of marginal signs, reconstruction of the original volume, relation to other exemplars, detailed technical commentary, seventy-seven monochrome full-page plates, and excellent indices. Impressive in itself, this work underpins F.'s concluding cultural profile of Dioscorus (pp. 669–90).

The *Iliad* is in a late fifth/early sixth-century hand, subsequently retouched; fragments survive from Books 2 (frequently represented in papyri), 10, and 11. F. proposes a two-volume edition (like the OCT). The text has a unique system of punctuation and accentuation, the latter added by later hands, the former designed to aid close textual study, manifest in Books 10–11, which have been collated with another edition. The codex was much used, its various students leaving their marks.

The scholia, written in documentary cursive at the turn of the fourth/fifth centuries, were used for 200 years and likewise annotated and re-inked by later hands, none certainly D.'s own. Fragments from Books 2 and 18–20 are preserved in Cairo, and from 4–5 (Diomedes' *aristeia* was much studied, as often) in Strasburg, a rich haul among papyri of this text, of which fifty-seven exemplars are known, but only eight postdate the fourth/fifth centuries. D.'s copy has unique abridgements and contamination between the glossographical tradition of the *Scholia Minora* and the

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.25 Published online by Cambridge University Press