late antiquity and the Arab world. Her survey of the Arab commentary tradition is very useful. Gotthard Strohmaier, 'Galen als Hippokrateskommentator. Der griechische und der arabische Befund' (pp. 253–74), is a valuable discussion of especially the contribution made by commentaries that are extant only in Arabic translation to our picture of Galen as a commentator. Klaus-Dietrich Fischer, '"Zu des Hippokrates reich gedeckter Tafel sind alle eingeladen". Bemerkungen zu den beiden vorsalernitanischen lateinischer Aphorismenkommentaren' (pp. 275–313), is a good discussion of the state of the art on the two widely read early medieval Latin commentaries on the Aphorisms. Sibylle Ihm, 'Untersuchungen zu einer Typologisierung medizinischer Kommentare' (pp. 315–33), is an attempt to classify Galen's commentaries under three commentary types (scholia commentary, expository commentary, and free discussion of the contents of the source text). Christian Schulze, 'Das Bild als Kommentar—zur Problematik von Pflanzendarstellungen in spätantiken und mittelalterlichen Handschriften' (pp. 335–53): interesting consideration of the possibility that visual representations in manuscript may fulfil 'commentary function'.

Use selectively.

University of Leiden INEKE SLUITER

SULPICIA THROUGH THE AGES

M. Skoie: *Reading Sulpicia. Commentaries 1475–1990*. Pp. ix + 362. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-19-924573-8.

In *Reading Sulpicia: Commentaries 1475–1990* Mathilde Skoie has produced a work that collects and tries to make sense of all the commentaries on poems that have come down to us under the name of Sulpicia. This commentary on commentaries becomes a kind of history of classical scholarship, and provides a useful reminder that literary, even textual, commentary/criticism, of any age, is a function not only of the commentator, but also of the social and intellectual atmosphere of that age. The book is an explicit vehicle for 'exploring issues of gender, literary theory and history of scholarship in the commentary tradition', and targets a very broad audience of classicists and non-classicists, of readers with or without 'theoretical knowledge' (p. vii).

Reading Sulpicia consists of six main, chronologically organized, chapters, plus introduction and conclusion. Appendices comprise the Sulpician poems, translations, and facsimiles of portions of the commentaries. A bibliography of primary sources and works cited, and a general index conclude the work. Germane illustrations are incorporated into the chapters, and receive the author's attention.

In the introduction, S. sets out her thesis: that all philology, even textual criticism, is hermeneutic, even if the philologist does not acknowledge a theoretical framework of interpretation or understanding. The main chapters provide illustrations, from the Middle Ages to the present, of that thesis.

The earliest commentators do not entertain the possibility that a female composed the poems. Cylennius (1475) treats Sulpicia as a male *amator*, a function, argues S., of the fifteenth-century mind's way of dealing with unmarried female sexuality: by denying it. The assumption is that Sulpicia is the fictional narrator of Tibullus' poems.

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.474 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Scaliger (1577) does not recognize a writer Sulpicia, but does recognize the female voice. For Scaliger, the subject of the commentary is not only Sulpicia, but Tibullus and elegy itself.

Heyne (1755–98), 'on the threshold between Enlightenment and Romantic criticism', was the first to make an argument, based on 'probability', that an Augustan woman named Sulpicia wrote some of the poems. S. tries to understand Heyne's conclusions in the light of his scholarly career—one that could not have been predicted given the circumstances of his birth and rearing. She describes his commentaries at length, noting that Heyne's personal voice is interjected, that he comments on his own commentary, which is a self-conscious attempt to combine aesthetic and historical criticism with textual criticism. S. pays attention to the physical arrangement of the commentary, which she describes as 'user friendly', and one that considers the needs of the reader.

Perhaps the most interesting illustration of the thesis comes in Chapter 4, where S. discusses the nineteenth-century editions of Ludolph Dissen (1835) and Otto Gruppe (1838). Dissen assumed that the Sulpicia poems had been written by a man, and found them to be masterful; Gruppe argued for female authorship, and therefore (or, perhaps, because) he found the poems inferior. S. observes that these two commentators reflect the relative valuation of male and female writing in the nineteenth century.

In the last two chapters S. treats two twentieth-century commentaries, that of Kirby Rower Smith (1913) and Hermann Tränkle's work on the *Appendix Tibulliana* (1990). Smith characterizes the author of the Sulpicia poems as an embodiment of feminine virtue, a characterization that reflects, according to S., the traditional nineteenth–early-twentieth-century American vision of womanhood. That vision is at odds, however, with the implications of sexual activity in the poems. So Smith has to contrive scenarios to allow the innocent Sulpicia to escape from charges of being a sexual creature.

Finally, with her discussion of Tränkle's commentary, S. underscores her thesis. She takes his collections of facts—listed, classified, and without any overt reference to contemporary culture—and tries to show that even this commentary is interpretative, and dependent on the historical circumstances of the late twentieth century. Indeed, S. sees the Tränkle commentary as an implicit rejection of overtly interpretative articles on classical literature (given that articles rather than commentaries were now the main vehicle for discussing literature). So there is hardly a trace in the Tränkle commentary of the more recent attempts to view Sulpicia through the lenses of Lacan or feminist criticism, for example. Tränkle's approach is to get back to the facts, as if the facts were always discernible. S. notes, though, that Tränkle cannot avoid making judgements about the meaning of a poem, even as he attempts to establish the correct text. Tränkle's goal seems to be to return the commentary to its pre-eminent place in classical studies, and thereby to provide a foundation of informed, historically based, scholarship for students of classical literature.

S. has studied the large story of the Sulpicia commentaries, and of the commentators and their historical circumstances, within the even larger story of the evolution of classical scholarship. She has made her own significant contribution to that scholarship by reinforcing with her careful and comprehensive work the argument that context matters.

There is some awkwardness of language throughout (certainly understandable, given that English is presumably not the first language of the author) that could have been eliminated with careful editing.

One kind of awkwardness results from overly long sentences, whose punctuation is

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.474 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not helpful to the reader. For example, on p. 212: 'One could alternatively construe femininity in terms of what the commentators saw in their female contemporaries and/or give women a Latin of their own coloured by this language of feeling as Gruppe does, and which was to be the reigning interpretation for the next hundred years'. A minor matter, perhaps: I would like 'both' to be balanced by 'and', rather than by the 'as well as' found throughout this work. This carping, again, is aimed at the editor rather than at the author, who has organized the Sulpicia materials in such a way as to reveal some of the inner workings of classical scholarship, and some of the conscious and subconscious motives of classical scholars.

Decorah, IA M. JANE BORELLI

THE AQUEDUCT HUNTERS

H. B. EVANS: *Aqueduct Hunting in the Seventeenth Century. Raffaello Fabretti's* De aquis et aquaeductibus veteris Romae. Pp. xvi + 309, maps, ills. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002. Cased, $55/£39. ISBN: 0-472-11248-1.

Fifteen years ago it could justly be said that in Roman aqueduct studies the American contribution was regrettably weak. That is no longer so. Scholars such as Aicher (on aqueduct topography), Pagan (baths), and Evans (urban distribution) have gone far to fill the gap, with Rodgers's forthcoming edition of Frontinus soon to follow. Indeed, the University of Michigan Press seems to have largely cornered the market in this growing field, a claim further supported by this present excellent work.

In it Prof. Evans follows up his earlier studies by breaking completely new ground. His book is a study of Raffaello Fabretti, who, in the seventeenth century, dedicated much of his life to investigating and tracing the aqueducts of the Roman Campagna, even if his contemporaries credited his horse, Marco Polo, with the ability to find antiquities on its own, like pigs sniffing truffles. He published his findings in 1680 in his *De Aquis et Aquaeductis Veteris Romae*, which is the foundation of all later work on the Roman aqueducts. E.'s book has two aims. One is a critical commentary on Fabretti's discoveries; the other is an illumination of the methodology and attitudes of seventeenth-century classical scholars, who often lambasted each other with ferocious and robustly phrased polemics that grate on a modern ear more accustomed to scholarly courtesy. To get a taste of it, we may note his comments on Pirro Ligorio, a favourite enemy of his, in # 351 of the 1680 MS.: 'Quis enim alius paucissimis verbis tot ineptias concludere sciret?'

Fabretti's work has never until now been offered in translation from its often 'baroque and quirky Latin', and not readily available even in Latin, though a facsimile version of the 1680 Latin text was reprinted in 1972, in the series Printed Sources of Western Art (Portland, OR). Latinists and non-Latinists alike will now thank E. for making Fabretti easily accessible, even without the Latin text.

E. begins with an introduction to Fabretti, well superseding the pp. 2–3 account in Ashby's *Aqueducts of Ancient Rome*, and continues with an English version of Fabretti's three dissertations on Roman aqueducts, following each one with a critical commentary discussing and explaining the points raised in the text. The first dissertation, the shortest, is the most important for aqueduct studies; it centres largely

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.474 Published online by Cambridge University Press