big picture of what Pausanias' text achieves, and of the way in which it fits into its broader cultural and literary contexts (although there is much up-to-date comment on very recent publication which can push us in that direction). Ultimately we are left to put that big picture together for ourselves, waiting for the clues to emerge as we read. Yet in a sense, that too is a Pausanian effect, in line with the way Pausanias himself stops short of offering syntheses and summaries, yet always hints that there is some coherent Panhellenic vision lying behind the mass of details he confronts us with, which we may catch glimpses of if only we have the patience to fit those details together piece-by-piece.

University of St Andrews JASON KÖNIG

BABRIUS

J. VAIO: *The* Mythiambi *of Babrius. Notes on the Constitution of the Text.* (Spudasmata 83.) Pp. liv + 176. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2001. Paper, DM 68. ISBN: 3-487-11438-0.

Vaio discusses textual problems in Prologue I and eighty-seven of the 143 extant fables of Babrius. Since the *Mythiambi* belong to that class of literature valued more for its contents than its language, establishing the text written by Babrius has special difficulties. Four ancient witnesses on papyri and wax tablets document early corruption through use as a school text—glossing of words, omission of verses, composition of additional verses, and addition of prose summaries. According to the *Suda*, Babrius published his fables in ten books, but there survive only selections, rearranged alphabetically in two Byzantine traditions. The four manuscripts are so corrupted by omissions and additions that the paraphrastic tradition of prose versions becomes a valuable source for reconstructing the text. Even fables composed by imitators of Babrius are mined for readings. For the most part, Vaio succeeds admirably in his goal of improving the text of recent editions, even if at times his confidence in his ability to reason through the variants to find Babrius' exact phrasing does not do justice to the difficulty of the tradition.

V.'s examination by autopsy of the papyri, wax tablets, and manuscripts (he had access to most of the paraphrastic manuscripts only on microfilm) has produced corrections to the *apparatus criticus* in the Teubner edition by La Penna and Luzzatto (1986), and added refinements to their improvements of earlier editors. Some of V.'s corrections affect textual readings, but others concern only minor inaccuracies in earlier reports of manuscript readings or attributions for emendations. A main focus of his study is the epimythia, or concluding prose summaries. Since the ancient witnesses preserve examples of such epimythia, V. argues convincingly that some descend from Babrius, while in other instances meter, vocabulary, or grammar betray Byzantine composition. As a result, each editor must decide which epimythia are genuine and which are not. By my count, V. brackets twenty-eight in whole or in part, and his decisions are sensible, if often subjective. Future editors will no doubt continue to vary in their judgement, since the choice often turns on the sole criterion of exact applicability to the meaning of the fable. Another complex problem is presented by fables that have significant variants of more than one line. After careful examination of objective criteria of grammar, vocabulary, style, and metrical practice, V. still finds a number of such passages in which it is difficult to choose between the variants, because neither version is clearly late. Consequently, a second edition by Babrius (first

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.342 Published online by Cambridge University Press

suggested by Dübner) remains a possibility, although V. also suggests reworking by an early imitator. He advocates the texts of such variants be printed in parallel, to avoid the possibility of consigning a genuine text by Babrius to the apparatus.

Although V. commends the Teubner edition by La Penna and Luzzatto as the standard text which he only supplements, the main focus of his criticism is in fact the work of Luzzatto, who edited Prologue I and fables 1–80, but was also responsible for the entire apparatus. As V. acknowledges, her apparatus is 'full and complete' and 'on the whole accurate' (p. vii), but he often criticizes her overreliance on the Athoan Codex (A), her judgement about transmitted readings, and her emendations. In addition, La Penna–Luzzatto worked from photographic images, and V.'s autopsy sometimes leads to a truer report, often confirming Crusius. For instance, in *Fab.* 70.3 he reports the reading *μόνην* under erasure in A, as reported by Crusius but omitted from the Teubner apparatus, and he shows that in *Fab.* 115.12 Luzzatto's alternate *ἀστέρων* is based on a misreading of the erasure in A so that *πτερῶν* should be retained. Only in a few instances did it seem to me that Luzzatto's text deserves more consideration than V. gives it. Her conjecture at *Fab.* 12.10, on Procne and Philomela, to read *αἳ παρθένοι γ' οὐ χωρὶς ἦμεν ἀλλήλων* (involving more minor changes than V. suggests) adds an appropriate emotional element and makes sense of the line; I would prefer it to V.'s brackets indicating interpolation. Nor does it seem likely that he is right to retain the transmitted reading *αὐτόν* as the subject of the infinitive *βοηθεῖν* in *Fab.* 20.3 against Fix's conjecture *αὐτός*, an intensive pronoun with another verb accepted by Crusius, Perry, and La Penna–Luzzatto, since *βοηθεῖν* implies help from another rather than self-help. But these are mere quibbles, and overall V.'s work provides a valuable check on the readings in earlier editions and convincing suggestions for improvements.

Despite the complexity of the topic, V.'s discussion is remarkably clear and readable. He helpfully summarizes each fable and quotes enough of the text in question that the reader does not need constant reference to a full edition. Obviously based on years of careful work, his study is in the nature of a prolegomenon to a new edition, and we can only hope that he will provide us with such. In the meantime, scholars will have to supplement the apparatus in La Penna–Luzzatto with his corrections, and read their text against his arguments for change, plausible variant traditions, and deletions.

University of Cincinnati KATHRYN GUTZWILLER

DE DEA SYRIA

J. L. LIGHTFOOT: *Lucian:* On the Syrian Goddess. *Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary.* Pp. xx + 606, maps, ills. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Cased, £80. ISBN: 0-19-925138-X.

Among the numerous writings transmitted under Lucian's name, *De Dea Syria* is something special. It is written not in the classicizing Attic that Lucian commands so brilliantly, but in a would-be Ionian which sounds charming and quaint at the same time; nor does it handle its theme in the witty and often caustic style which is Lucian's hallmark, but in a more detached mode, in which narrative naivety, seemingly earnest reasoning, and subtle irony peculiarly mingle in ever-changing degrees. With the appearance of Lightfoot's book, the work can claim one more distinction: it has

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.342 Published online by Cambridge University Press