G.'s translation is accurate and clear, but readers should be alerted to some difficulties, among them (p. 68) *spoudē*, translated 'haste'; but *epeidē* is rarely concessive and the verb in the next sentence suggests 'seriousness'; (p. 77) a sentence is omitted; (p. 92) 'one can observe' should be 'observing that it is possible'. Misprints are few. There is a helpful glossary of plant (but not fish) names. The index is not comprehensive, omitting, for example, pistachios (p. 133), rabbits (p. 156), and tuna (p. 182): it is not, then, a reliable quick guide to foods mentioned by Galen. The introduction and notes are helpful, except for n. 20 (p. 200): G. corrects Galen's reference to Herodotus, but Galen is right and G. wrong. G.'s policy is to use Kühn for all but *On Barley Soup* and *On the Powers of Foods* (pp. 12–13), but I notice Kühn's text is translated on p. 128 of the latter. These difficulties, however, should not deflect anyone from an excellent work on a complex topic.

University of Exeter JOHN WILKINS

FRAGMENTS OF LONGINUS

M. Patillon, L. Brisson: *Longin: Fragments, Art rhétorique. Rufus, Art rhétorique* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. 390. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2001. Cased, frs. 393.57. ISBN: 2-251-00495-5.

When I first became interested in Longinus I was astonished to find that the most recent attempt at a comprehensive collection of testimonia and fragments was L. Vaucher's *Études critiques sur le Traité du Sublime et sur les Écrits de Longin* (Geneva, 1854). The subsequent appearance of two valuable papers by Brisson and Patillon, a pair of scholars admirably equipped to cope with a figure of Longinus' astonishing intellectual versatility, went a long way towards filling the gap; these papers (*ANRW* II 36.7 [1994], 5214–99, II 34.4 [1998], 3023–108) provided references, a French translation, and a detailed analysis, but not the Greek text. Now the same pair has produced an edition with text, translation, an introduction that provides an excellent introduction to Longinus, and a brief but informative commentary. In addition, the volume includes P.'s edition of the short rhetorical treatise by Rufus (probably Rufus of Peinthos), again with an excellent introduction and notes.

Those of us who have begun to use the (admittedly cumbersome) numeration of the earlier papers may be dismayed to discover that the fragments of Longinus have been renumbered. But the volume's helpful supporting aids include a concordance correlating the new numbers with the editors' old system, and with those of Vaucher and I. Männlein-Robert's massive though selective recent study, *Longin. Philologe und Philosoph* (Leipzig, 2001). The MR column must have been added at a very late stage in this volume's preparation, and unfortunately contains several inaccuracies.

The collection of fragments is not complete. I know of two substantive fragments which seem to have been overlooked. One is to be found in the extracts from John the Deacon's commentary on pseudo-Hermogenes *On Method*, which Rabe published in *Rheinisches Museum* 63 (1908), 127–51: John cites (p. 136) Longinus for a definition of παράδειγμα (παράδειγμά ἐστιν ἀπόδειξις διά τινος διηγήσεως ὁμοίας καὶ γνωρίμου τῷ ἀμφισβητουμένῳ καὶ ἀγνοουμένῳ πράγματι: Rabe includes the following illustration in the quotation, perhaps correctly); this is followed by the definition of σημεῖον already known from the miscellaneous notes at the end of

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.276 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Psellus' epitome (F49.97–9) with the addition *οἷον σημεῖον λέγομεν τοῦ νοσεῖν τὸ πυρέττειν*, and a definition of *τεκμήριον* (*τεκμήριον δέ ἐστι σημεῖον ἄλυτον, ὃ καὶ ἀναγκαῖον καλεῖται*). The Aristotelian resonances are obvious. The form of John's citation (*Λογγῖνος ἐν τῇ κατ' αὐτὸν Ῥητορικῇ*) seems to rule out P.'s suggestion (p. 211 n. 1) that these miscellaneous notes may have been excerpted from another work by Longinus. Secondly, there is an additional lexicographical fragment in the *Lexicon Sabbaiticum* s.v. *ἐμπήκτης* (*Κάσιος δὲ Λογγῖνος οὕτως ἀποδίδωσιν· ἐμπήκτης ὁ λαχὼν τῶν δικαστῶν ἐπισκέψασθαι τὴν χρείαν αὐτῶν*).

Among the fragments of Longinus' commentary on Hephaestion (F42–7) I would have expected to find 109.9 and 212.21–5 Consbruch. In F55, from Lachares, 292.3–6 Graeven should have been printed (not just mentioned on p. 117). *RG* 6.211.12–15 (F23 V = F67 MR) should have been included along with the other evidence from John of Sicily (F53, 56, 59). John of Lydia *de mensibus* 4.1 should have been cited as the source for the multiply attested F64, and not just a *Suda* entry that derives from it (Männlein-Robert includes a number of other parallels, but misses pseudo-Zonaras s.v. *Αἰωνάριος*).

Some other material is not printed in the main collection, but mentioned in passing in the introduction or notes. Porphyry *ap.* Eusebius *HE* 6.19.8 (T16 V = F12 MR) is deliberately omitted, on grounds that do not seem entirely convincing (p. 8 n. 2). For the testimonium to a work on ethnics in Par. Coislin. 387 fol. 153^{v}–154^{v} (T11 V = F3 MR) we are referred (p. 188 n. 11) to a note in the earlier paper, which judged it 'difficilement utilisable'—all the more reason, surely, to place the evidence before the reader. The possibility that Longinus compiled a chronographic work is mentioned vaguely (p. 4), without even a reference to the discussion in the earlier paper which found the evidence 'particulierement problématique'; the testimonium itself (*FGrH* 259 T1 = F2 MR) is not printed. (To the references at *PCPS* 45 [1999], 51 n. 46 add now the sceptical observations in R. W. Burgess, *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography* [Stuttgart, 1999], p. 33 n. 12.) An extract on metre from Par. 2677 fol. 83^{v} that has been attributed to Longinus on very tenuous grounds (F14 V) is firmly rejected here (p. 52 n. 1, p. 188 n. 11), but could still have been printed (cf. Männlein-Robert, p. 551 n. 79). These exclusions do not represent a consistent editorial policy, for elsewhere the editors are more hospitable to *dubia* and *spuria.* Psellus *Opuscula theologica* 56.6–9 Gautier (derived inaccurately from Proclus) is included as F37b, although the reference to Longinus is certainly wrong; and the essay on memory and the fragment on heads of purposes are printed as appendices, although the editors deny them to Longinus (but *On Memory* warrants a more agnostic stance: from the obvious fact that the essay is not part of the *Rhetoric* (pp. 61–2), the inference (p. 125) that it is not by Longinus does not follow, and internal evidence is hardly conclusive either way). Methodological rectitude lies with the more inclusive policy. Since a collection of fragments is a tool, its construction must be determined by consideration of its prospective users' needs, and what users need above all is to have full and ready access to the evidence. As it is, readers will have to work through the whole volume with the most careful attention to be sure of coming across the scattered indications that there is potentially relevant evidence that the editors have chosen to withhold, and that they will therefore need to hunt down elsewhere.

A number of other testimonia, though they add nothing of substance, might have merited mention for the sake of completeness: the apparatus to *Prolegomenon Sylloge* 317.12 Rabe; the titles of the rhetorical *συναγωγαί* discussed by I. Hadot in *Simplicius: sa vie, son oeuvre, sa survie* (Berlin, 1987), pp. 31–4 (~ R. Sorabji [ed.],

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.276 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Aristotle Transformed [London, 1990], pp. 297–301); and Michael Italicus 137.8–10 and 165.14–15 Gautier.

I conclude with a few miscellaneous observations. I have argued that the excerpts *ἐκ τῶν Λογγίνου* (F50) may help us recover more Longinian material from Photius: see *GRBS* 39 (1998), 271–92. In that paper (p. 275) I cite parallels in Sopater's commentary on Hermogenes to the sixth of the excerpts, here mistranslated: *ὅτι τὸ παραγράφεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν λαμπρῶν προσώπων ἄτοπόν φησι* does not mean 'il est absurde . . . d'accuser faussement des personnages illustres', but that in the case of illustrious figures it is absurd to use procedural exceptions to evade having to answer charges brought against them. It is unwise to cite Schissel's somewhat flimsy treatment of the family of Minucianus as if it were the last word on the subject (p. 151 n. 5): for Nicagoras see now *FGrH* 1076, and my discussion in *ZPE* 113 (1996), 66–70, which also (p. 68, cf. *Eranos* 96 [1998], 51) offers reason for believing that the Stoic philosopher Musonius is not wholly unknown to us (p. 146 n. 18). Is it satisfactory simply to assert (p. 154 nn. l, 5) the falsity of the attribution of *On Sublimity* to Longinus, as if this were a known and uncontested fact (see *PCPS* 45 [1999], 43–74)? The editor of Psellus' *Oratorio minora* is A. R. Littlewood, not (p. 179 n. l) 'A. Robert'. On Longinus' Homeric scholarship see A. R. Dyck, *MH* 46 (1989), 1–8. The assumption that the Harpocration of the Anonymus Seguerianus is identical with the Harpocration of the scholia to Hermogenes (p. 237 n. 3) is unsafe: even when we have excluded the lexicographer, the *Suda* attests more than one sophist of that name.

University of Leeds MALCOLM HEATH

AESOP

C. A. Zafiropoulos: *Ethics in Aesop's Fables: the* Augustana *Collection*. Pp. xiv + 202. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2001. Cased, $78. ISBN: 90-04-11867-5.

Zafiropoulos believes the Augustana's 'pragmatic' fables, from 'a late stage in . . . Greek literature' (p. 143), demonstrate the continuity of '"popular" Greek thought' (p. 144): 'fable has ethics of its own which can be placed in the general framework of Greek thought' (p. 7).

Chapter 1 ('The Greek Fable') explains fable collections, history, function, terminology, and scholarship. Z. is comfortable with the sources (e.g. pp. 23–26 on MSS). 'Aesop's Fables' is not false advertising—the *Augustana* warrants the title (pp. 10–12). On fable in education (pp. 21–22), Z. might note post-1964 work.

Using interpretative, not 'narrative level', analysis, Z. seeks 'the level of social reality and ethics, to which the Greek fable referred allegorically' (p. 36 n. 127). Althusser surfaces ('ideology', 'recognition function': pp. 37–8), but Z. is practical, dividing the 'unsystematic network' of fable 'messages and behavioural patterns' into thematic groups ('agonistic conflict', 'reciprocity'), examining 'thematic' over 'structural homogeneity' (pp. 4–5, 8) to compare behaviour promoted or condemned with themes 'recognizable throughout the history of Greek ethics' (p. 42).

Obstacles appear insurmountable: we cannot date collection/fables (pp. 102–3). Alphabetization fragments coherent narrative into 'a different fox in each case' (p. 41). Authorship is multiple (p. 3). Epimythia (later single readers' ethical expectations: p. 7) camouflage *Ur*-text. Do we read *as a collection*? Who compiled it? Did audience (and ethics) change (pp. 19ff.)? In what sense(s) is this 'popular literature'? *Nachleben*

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.276 Published online by Cambridge University Press