failure to produce his supposed witnesses, the *educator* and the *paedagogus*, in court; and the model offered by the following tale, and by various intertexts, for a doctor who is venal and duplicitous). This tale may very well constitute yet another example of the actor Lucius failing to understand a story which he hears.

These small objections notwithstanding, Z.'s commentary should and will be an indispensable companion for Apuleian dabblers and hardcore onomaniacs alike. In reading Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, one is always in search of an authoritative voice—and there are few voices as authoritative, learned, and sensitive as Z.'s.

Oriel College, Oxford ANTON BITEL

FISHY?

P. DRÄGER: *Ausonius:* Mosella. Pp. 160, ills. Trier: Paulinus, 2001. Cased, €15.30. ISBN: 3-87760-167-7.

It is customary for a classical commentary to begin with an introduction that does more than introduce and may even run the risk of creating fatigue or impatience by presenting its author's conclusions before the reader has had a chance to access the text; in extreme cases the text is almost an afterthought. In this respect, and others, this attractive small book of Dräger defeats our expectations. The Latin text with its facing German translation into blank verse, a translation carefully pondered and as far as I can judge sensitive to German usage as well as to Latin style, forms the first half; the *Einführung* forms the second. A list of its contents must begin with the ingenious *Fischtechnopaegnion* that D. has designed from the numbers of lines that Ausonius gave to each fish in his notorious catalogue. Then there is a tabulation of D.'s divergences from the Teubner text, chosen because it gives the *Mosella* 483 lines. This is divisible by seven, and has other attractions which even the number 490—should anyone think of arguing that as many as seven lines have been lost—cannot match (for reasons which seem to me, notwithstanding a learned-looking footnote, to work only for Arabic numerals). Then a table giving the names of Ausonius' fish (with no suggestion that the identification may be problematic), first in the Latin of Linnaeus, then in standard German, and then in Trierisch and in Luxemburgisch, with illustrations of them taken from K. Smolian's *Merkbuch der Binnenfischerei* (Berlin, 1920).

The commentary proper includes concise but helpful notes on the poem, a text and translation of Symmachus' letter about it, a short section on the life and works of Ausonius, and an elucidation of the poem's structure. D. continues to press for the importance of the *hebdomadische Kompositionsprinzip*. Many episodes in Ausonius' poem have seven, fourteen, or twenty-one lines; the name *Mosella* (at least in the nominative case) has seven letters. The proem of the *Iliad* has seven lines; Lucan mentions twice seven rivers of Italy. Pythagoras is brought in, as well as Varro, whose influence on Ausonius' catalogue of architects all acknowledge. There is a short section on the poem's 'Intention', and another one that argues for a date of publication around the time of the death of Valentinian I (November 375); at this date Ausonius could already be, as he claims, the teacher of Valentinian II, born in 371, and one could understand Ausonius' confidence that he would become consul, something that actually happened in 379, if Valentinian's death caused an honour promised for 376 to be postponed. In this section D. clearly engages with recent studies of this problem, but

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.383 Published online by Cambridge University Press

it is not his way to give references; there is, however, an extensive bibliography on Ausonius and a shorter one on translation technique.

University of Glasgow ROGER GREEN

AUSONIUS' EPIGRAMS

N. M. KAY: *Ausonius:* Epigrams. Pp. 315. London: Duckworth, 2001. Cased, £40. ISBN: 0-7156-3105-5.

When reviewing Kay's *Martial Book XI: a Commentary* (*CR* 37 [1987], 28/9) Martin Smith recalled an earlier reviewer's calculation (*CR* 32 [1982], 174) that a set of commentaries on the numbered books of Martial might eventually cost the vast sum of £275. Those who saved the requisite sum, and invested it well, and not only they, would do well to use some of their savings to acquire this edition of the complete epigrams of Ausonius. Ausonius is no Martial, in the opinion of K. (and no one is better equipped to judge), but this edition is great value—and would be even more so in paperback. K. has used his expert knowledge of Greek and Latin epigram and much else to provide a commentary which is highly scholarly and very readable.

Ausonius' place in the tradition of Greek and Latin epigram is, naturally enough, the main topic of the general introduction, and the introduction to the commentary on each piece includes judicious and illuminating assessment of the genesis and value of each of his epigrams in terms of this tradition. The manuscripts are briefly but purposefully described in the rest of the introduction. K.'s text is based on the OCT, at least in numbering and classification, but he adds two short poems at the end which in the OCT were included among the prefaces and prayers respectively (as 1.5 and 20.1). Readers who do not find epigrams where they expect them, or who come across a different numbering in works of reference, should not blame K., but look at the concordances provided on pp. 29–31, which will make everything clear. There is also a helpful list of K's divergences from the OCT, including important changes of punctuation. In many of these places K. returns to the traditional reading, but never as one clutching at a comfort blanket (this does happen). He defends (for example) *ergo* at *Epig.* 76.5 and *fons* at *Epig.* 107.3 with careful argument; on the other hand, he thoughtfully emends at *Epig*. 72.11 (but is it quite impossible to say that Salmacis saw [*vidit*] Hermaphroditus, of whom she was now part?) and at *Epig.* 77.2, though I wonder if the meaning that K. seeks ('six days and not one day more') might be provided more economically by making *sex* precede the phrase *non plus* rather than follow it. Other notes show careful attention to general editorial problems: how to decide, for example, when to make two poems of what the manuscripts present as one, or when to present in Greek script words that the manuscripts present as Latin.

A translation of each epigram is given immediately before the commentary; within it all Greek is translated. The commentary, which is clear, full, and unhurried, but never bloated, contains many good things. The bland *Epig*. 2 (2A, to be precise, for K. is inclined to split it) is illuminated with attention to the *aristeia* of that illustrious archer of Statius' *Thebaid*, Parthenopaeus; there are learned and informative notes on such various things as Roman Egypt, lion hunting, Samian ware, and the pharmacology of mercury poisoning (with a passing reference to Goethe, who evidently discussed the matter); on *ferculum* (9.3: here his textual choice is unconvincing, to my mind), on *ren* (14. 2: K. argues strongly to retain this word), on dogfish, on Nubia, on the head of Rhamnusian Nemesis now in the British Museum—and we are still less

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.383 Published online by Cambridge University Press