ancient authors) to a see-saw battle in southern Gaul, occurring in A.D. 439, the immediate precursor to a restoration of the existing treaty between the court of Ravenna and the West Gothic chieftain Theoderic I (*TAPhS* 61.1, pp. 58–9). B. (pp. 222–93) offers a full commentary on this passage. With some hesitation she accepts the English translator's interpretation of the events behind Merobaudes' poetic flourishes, but quite properly renders this modem understanding less certain by giving most of her attention to the panegyrist's flights of fancy. The centerpiece of the passage is the siege (ll. 153–86)—a welter of eventually flame-engulfed ramparts, shields and spears, recklessly wandering arrows, hastily constructed siege towers, and night-and-day fighting. B. does a brilliant job of identifying the literary context of Merobaudes' siege, which at times reads a bit like parts of Virgil's *Aeneid*, Statius' *Thebaid*, Silius Italicus' *Punica*, and the major poems of Claudian. Yet another author may have been a direct inspiration to Merobaudes: Lucan's *Bellum civile* 3.358–508, the landward siege of Marseilles, is similar in tone to Merobaudes' disorderly battle. B.'s identification deserves credence. Lucan still attracted expert readers in the fifth century (cf. R. Bruère, *CP* 59 [1964], 223–56). Echoes of Lucan appear elsewhere in the verse panegyric (cf. B. p. 340). Merobaudes modeled one of his short poems on Statius *Silvae* 2.7, the *Genethliacon Lucani* (cf. *TAPhS* 61.1, p. 29). For the present passage, Merobaudes might well have decided to extend the Caesar–Aëtius equation with a salute to Lucan. Merobaudes' siege, then, may or may not rest upon a moment in Aëtius' military career. In its present form, the assault is a figment of the poet's imagination. The philological and linguistic analyses are the strongest part of B.'s commentary.

B. is on the verge of fashioning a complete 'Merobaudes'—edition, translation, and commentary. The present reviewer hopes that she will continue her work.

University of Wisconsin—Madison FRANK M. CLOVER

ANTHOLOGIA LATINA 485

R. M. D'ANGELO: *Carmen de figuris vel schematibus*. Pp. 178. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2001. Paper, DM 37.80. ISBN: 3-487-11345-7.

The *Carmen* of the title (AL 485 Riese, first published by Quicherat in 1839–40) is preserved in two manuscripts, the eighth-century Paris Lat. 7530 (P) and the ninth-century Casanatensis 1086 (C), both in Beneventan script. P has suffered damage in rebinding; an earlier transcript by Sirmond helps fill the gaps. The poem defines and gives examples of various rhetorical figures in sixty-one hexametrical tristichs. After a brief dedication to a certain Messius and three tristichs defining colon, comma, and period, ll. 13–150 depend principally on Rutilius Lupus (and/or a common source, such as the first-century B.C. rhetorician Gorgias), while the remainder (ll. 151–86) appear to derive from the second-century A.D. rhetorician Alexander, son of Numenius. The switch in sources coincides with certain changes in presentation, and suggested to earlier scholars that an original Rutilian core was subsequently overhauled by a second author, who may also be responsible for ll. 1–12.

D'A.'s introduction lays out these facts concisely (on the source issue see now

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.131 Published online by Cambridge University Press

U. Schindel, in S. Döpp [ed.], *Antike Rhetorik und ihre Rezeption* [Stuttgart, 1999], pp. 85–98). It offers also a survey of previous scholarship on the poem, and a discussion of its date. Lexical and stylistic features argue for the fourth century or later. The dedicatee Messius has recently been identified by Marisa Squillante with the *praefectus urbis Romae* of 470, but D'A. rightly considers the traditional identification with the grammarian Arusianus Messius (fl. *c*. 395) more likely (cf. now Schindel, though his analysis of ll. 4–12 seems to me fanciful). D'A.'s position on the dual authorship question is ambiguous. The introduction appears to argue for two authors 'appartenenti ad un medesimo ambiente retorico' (32; cf. *RFIC* 120 [1992], 98), yet both introduction and commentary refer *passim* to 'l'autore' and 'l'Anonimo,' while the commentary at one point speaks uncertainly of 'l'autore (il secondo autore?)' (p. 102).

D'A.'s volume inevitably invites comparison with Squillante's 1993 edition (reviewed by D'A. at *RFIC* 122 [1994], 486–8). Squillante provided a translation and full *index verborum* (D'A. offers neither), and her introduction does a better job of contextualizing the poem's metrical phenomena (notably shortening of final *-o*) and archaizing features (e.g. *indupetravi* at l. 66, frequent apocope of final *-s*, and some obtrusive cases of tmesis). Squillante viewed the author as an upper-class *littérateur* with archaizing tastes, out to showcase his skills in verse paraphrase. D'A. prefers to see 'un maestro di scuola' (p. 45) with primarily pedagogical goals. More discussion would have been welcome here. Is the schoolmaster theory supported or undermined by the archaisms? Was verse chosen for its mnemonic value? What generic relationship does the *Carmen* bear to Terentianus Maurus or to medieval verse grammars?

D'A. seems to me superior to Squillante in two areas. One is her treatment of the rhetorical background. Both D'A. and Squillante analyze the figures discussed and compare the *Carmen*'s rhetorical terminology to that of other sources, but D'A. makes it easier to see the wood for the trees. D'A. is also better on textual issues. She has recollated C and P (the latter with the aid of ultraviolet light) as well as Sirmond's transcript; the commentary explains editorial choices efficiently and reviews conjectures not included in the apparatus. Squillante offered only two new emendations, neither very probable. D'A. contributes eight (at l. 129 the apparatus should read simply *Schneidewin*). Four of these are entirely new: 3 *pro<r>sa* (after Apul. *Flor*. 18); 74 *signum* (appealing; certainly *regnum* is hard to swallow); 139 *coniunctio* (based on Rutilius); 168 *medio* (not an improvement). Four others are founded on previous suggestions: 48 *sed peccat* (an improvement on Frölich's *si peccat)*; 127 <*fit*> added to Sirmond's *adsimulamentum* (plausible); 178 *quom* (after Christ's *cum*; probably right); 185 *hoc* = *τὸ* (but Loewe's explanation seems preferable). Of the two proposals in the apparatus, *e<s>t hircus* at 57 is speculative, but *divos* at 161 may be on the right track. Of the other differences from Riese's second edition, most are nineteenth century emendations or cases where C (discovered in 1910) confirms or overrides earlier conjectures (though I am dubious about *passim* at 58). Some significant obscurities still remain. D'A., unlike Squillante, is willing to obelize, and at 30, 33, and 57 her despair seems amply justified. At 72 I cannot believe *uti* is sound; Shackleton Bailey's *ille* may be 'debole' but hardly on the grounds alleged by D'A. At 131 I wonder whether the archetype's *cuurites* is not based on the supposed derivation from *Cures* rather than misreading of a short-tailed q.

University of Virginia GREGORY HAYS

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.1.131 Published online by Cambridge University Press