recognized as the opposite of evil, so that the Stoics define virtue as the knowledge of good and evil. Against this, Plutarch says that the good could be recognized by contrast with what is merely indifferent, in which case the existence of evil would not after all be necessary for virtue (and the Stoic god could not so easily be excused for its introduction into the world). B. argues that Plutarch has deliberately abbreviated the Stoic definition of virtue to score an easy point (n. 214): the Stoics in fact defined virtue as the 'knowledge of what is good, evil and indifferent'. This is not only unfair to Plutarch (the Stoics needed to justify the existence of evil, so that the existence of indifferents is irrelevant in this context); it also reduces the Stoics' argument to a matter of semantics (e.g. the view that virtue cannot be defined without reference to evil). In fact, the Stoic argument presumably involved the fact that virtue is the only good, and that virtue requires deliberate choice. But the choice cannot be between indifferent and good, since the Stoics believe that no action is morally indifferent. Evil, in other words, must be a live option if there is to be virtue; and so it must exist. (For all this, cf. Seneca, *Epistle* 90.) Plutarch's argument represents the serious objection of someone who does believe that some actions are morally indifferent to a Stoic position more serious in its turn than B. suggests.

My methodological reservations (in which B. will no doubt recognize the clatter of a hobby-horse) should not be taken in any way to suggest that I underrate B.'s achievement in this work. I could write as much, and more, on virtues of the work which will, however, be readily apparent to those who use it. If I disagree with aspects of the commentary, that is not because it lacks care, detail, and a powerful scholarship which is witness to B.'s long reflection on Plutarch's engagement with the Stoics. The work is beautifully presented, and includes a bibliography, and indexes of passages, names, and Greek words.

University of Durham GEORGE BOYS-STONES

PAUSANIAS ON ELIS

M. Casevitz, J. Pouilloux, A. Jacquemin (edd.): *Pausanias:* Description de la Grèce. *Tome VI. Livre VI. L'Élide (II)*. (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé.) Pp. xxxix + 337, map, plan. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002. Paper, €50. ISBN: 2-251-00501-3.

Olympia lies at the centre of Pausanias' description of the sacred landscape of Greece, occupying nearly one-fifth of the whole text and dominating his account of Elis in Books 5 and 6 (out of 10). That positioning is no accident. For Pausanias, as no doubt for many of his contemporaries, the sanctuary of Olympia is a space imbued to an unparalleled degree with the traces of the Hellenic past. It is also a site which confronts him with the enormous difficulties involved in any attempt to access that past and to see beneath the sacred monuments and statues of Greece to the 'realities' which lie behind them. That is a tension which runs, albeit often in less conspicuous form, through the whole of Pausanias' work. His account of Olympia acts as an exemplary centrepiece for his exposition of the alluring but barely graspable richness of the Hellenic heritage.

Book 6, the second of Pausanias' two Olympic books, takes us on a tour of the statues and monuments of the Altis (the Olympic sanctuary). Pausanias lists nearly

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

200 statues of famous athletes, in most cases together with the names of their sculptors, and often with detailed accounts of their backgrounds or circumstances of victory (including, amongst many other bizarre details, a pair of athletes who were famed for breaking their opponents' fingers, in 6.4). One of the book's most fascinating features is Pausanias' unusually heavy dependence on epigraphical evidence, which means that many of his claims can be compared with inscriptions and statues which have been uncovered in the excavations of the last 150 years. The Altis has for that reason been a central starting-point for debates about the 'accuracy' of Pausanias' representation of the sites he takes us to; and it continues to be one of the sites which holds out most tantalizingly, and sometimes frustratingly, the promise of seeing for ourselves 'what Pausanias saw', much as it was an iconic space for Pausanias' own project of looking into the past.

This Budé commentary—one of a series of ten Pausanias volumes, of which five are now published—offers wonderfully clear access to the details of Pausanias' account. The work's economically displayed bibliographical command in a range of areas—especially over recent archaeological and epigraphical work—is particularly impressive. Anne Jacquemin's brief introduction guides us elegantly through some of Pausanias' main preoccupations, and is particularly good on the centrality of Olympia for Greek history and for Elean identity as Pausanias presents it. That sense of centrality is enhanced, she suggests, by the ring composition which binds together the beginning of Book 5 and the end of Book 6, taking us back to the very edges of Elean territory as we leave the central space of Olympia behind us. There are also indexes, on people, authors, artists, athletes, places, and monuments. The geographical index gives a compelling at-a-glance view of the topographical range of the places Pausanias mentions—nearly 200 communities and regions squeezed into the condensed Panhellenic space of the Altis, inscribed side-by-side with each other on the statue bases he describes.

Commenting on Pausanias is necessarily an exercise which involves navigating through a long tradition, not least the powerful presence of James Frazer's 1898 commentary, along with a number of more recent versions. This volume carves out its own space effectively, distinguished by its efficiency, breadth of reference, ease of use, and its ability to show, through its bibliographical thoroughness, just how far our understanding of Pausanias' material has been enhanced within the last twenty years, from which so many of the noted publications date. The tone is business-like and clean-cut, as if the editors are acutely aware of having a wide body of twentieth-century scholarship to impose order on, much as Pausanias himself must impose order on the body of mythical and historical material which confronts him. There are only occasional flashes of the highly visual, autoptic detail which Frazer values so highly (and which is of course equally Pausanian in its way). Yet the Budé too conjures up a remarkable impression of vividness despite, or perhaps even because of the brevity of its notes, which draw our attention in powerfully compressed form to the many widely dispersed articles and texts which between them offer us such promising gateways to understanding of the Olympic sanctuary and its place within Pausanias' world.

Those resemblances between author and commentators should come as no surprise, given that the exercise of writing commentary is itself an inherently Pausanian one. One of the things this volume shows, in fact, is how often the exercise of commenting on Pausanias or even reading Pausanias involves one in repeating his most distinctive moves. For one thing, as I have suggested, the detailed exegesis the volume offers us is constantly reminiscent of Pausanias' own. What the volume lacks, many will find, is a

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/54.2.340 Published online by Cambridge University Press