than one-fifth of the way through. K. knows about the mental disorder known as the Diogenes problem; he has read journalists' accounts of sex change in animals; he knows about that most expensive of clarets, Château Ausone St Émilion 1er Grand Cru Classé A (and, like most of us, has no direct experience of it), but also, to descend from the sublime to the ridiculous, bread soup (the *dodra* of 96–8). There is a careful explanation of *puncta* in 37 (in an argument against Mondin's recent reconstruction). Our understanding of the 'unique and remarkable' *Epig.* 87 is enhanced by K.'s quotation of passages from Suetonius and Quintilian explaining how infants should trace their letters; indeed, this perspective, I would argue, assists in the interpretation of ll. 3 and 4, where K., eschewing a third reference to triangles, prefers the traditional but very opaque *quadriangulum* to *qua triangulum.* With the latter word, long ago suggested by Menagius, we have a gentle progression in Eunus' learning skills and the learning outcomes intended by his mistress as she teaches him first to see, then to touch, and then (for he is a *ligurritor*) to lick. The concentration on the 'triangle concept' is not redundant, for as K. suggests, the letter imagery in this epigram progresses in order of difficulty and obscurity. Delta is the easy bit, and he needs to master that, and the methodology, first. There is a typically careful and illuminating exposition of *Epig.* 99, with its four Roman laws, one hitherto unintelligible, which concludes that in this reference to a *lex Titia* there is evidence of a law not extant (or perhaps a lost part of the late Republican *lex Titia et Julia*) which enjoined on a wife a responsibility to unmask a homosexual husband.

The high standard of scholarship in this work is matched by its pleasing appearance, its helpful layout, and its general accuracy.

University of Glasgow ROGER GREEN

TERENTIANUS MAURUS

C. CIGNOLO (ed.): *Terentianus Maurus:* De litteris, de syllabis, de metris. (Bibliotheca Weidmanniana 6: Collectanea Grammatica Latina 2.1, 2.2.) Pp. lix + 649, in two parts (Part 1: Introduzione, testo critico e traduzione italiana. Part 2: Commento, appendici e indici.). Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2002. Paper, €95.60. ISBN: 3-487-11631-6 (part 1), 3-487-11632-4 (part 2).

Terentianus Maurus' three versified books, which were already praised and respected in antiquity, are still an important source in so far as they provide the only detailed ancient description of the pronunciation of the Latin alphabet and a much more specific treatise on prosody and metre than is provided by the grammarians. At the same time, they are extremely unconventional and problematic; it is well known that Augustine recommended that they should be read only with guidance (*util.* 7.17 . . . 'sine magistro adtingere non auderes'). This complete modern edition is the first since Keil's multi-volume edition of the Latin grammarians (1874), and is particularly welcome, since it includes the first commentary since Santen/Lennep (1825) and the first ever translation of *De litteris* and *De metris*.

The promise to make use of previously unused sources of manuscript notes on the text arouses the highest expectations, since, after the loss of the only manuscript, the text itself is attested solely by the Milanese *editio princeps* from 1497. However, these sources turn out to consist only of the conjectures of Celio Calcagnini and an

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.385 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Anonymus in their copies of the *editio princeps* (1503) and of Micyllus (1532), together with the already known handwritten edition of Vázquez del Mármol (1609). All of these yield only obvious emendations anticipating those of later scholars (approximately thirty-five times) and are therefore only of historical interest (the attribution of conjectures is further corrected e.g. at vv. 1448, 1972); the text of Terentianus gains nothing. C.'s edition seems intentionally to avoid coming out of Keil's shadow, and often limits itself to orthographic indications (vv. 1560, 1668/2053 and 1304, 1493; the latter two already by Beck, *Terentianus Maurus, De syllabis* [Göttingen, 1993], p. 58; 'Terentianus Maurus: *non paenitendus inter ceteros artis metricae auctor*', *ANRW* II.34.4 [1998], p. 3243 Anm. 67; why not also e.g. v. 884, like 265?). Its conservatism is increased by the avoidance of textual changes (e.g. *De litteris*, *De metris* vv. 11, 183, 247, 1467, 1567-8, 1647, 1913, 2038, 2382, 2837), utilizing only select older conjectures (vv. 143, 232, 255, 1935, 2756, 2957); at 1510 and 1716 the conjectures are unnecessary or not correctly cited; punctuation changes are made e.g. at vv. 99 and 1522-3. C.'s textual reconstruction, according to her own programmatic explanation, is made 'con vigile rispetto per i dati della tradizione', yet it lacks awareness of the characteristics and problems apparent in the poorly transmitted text. In that case, one may ask why the transmitted letter-markings are not recorded, or why the allocation of vv. 2001–4to Septimius Serenus, in keeping with clear evidence from antiquity (Apthon., Servius), is rejected. It is a serious fault that the presentation, recalling that of a meagre *editio minor*, merely substantiates C.'s own textual decisions in the apparatus. In view of the nature of the content, many users of this text will be specialists, for whom a textual presentation which casually ignores other research will appear arrogant and hardly user-friendly. Only those familiar with C.'s two volumes, and who are willing to do some tedious searching, will discover the missing material in two appendices at the end of the second volume (pp. 581–600; for vv.1369, 1487, 2916 the original form is missing; 2001, 2117 are not correctly recorded; nor is my lacuna at 398, or the punctuation at 330. In contrast, e.g. at vv.1128, 1258 modern editorial distinction is quoted in excess ['maiore spatio . . . relicto']).

C.'s sixteen-page table of abbreviated titles is of equally limited use (pp. IX ff.); it contains standard reference works like *OLD* and *RE*, but it lacks a good deal of literature relevant to Terentianus, which could be easily documented. C. provides neither a bibliography nor an overview of research, nor even a reference to the existence of works by others which have prepared the ground for the study of this text. Given that C. announces her own list of variable verse types as an improvement on older editions (p. LIX '. . . sono prive tutte le precedenti edizioni'; the attribution after v. 1875 is incorrect), scholarly fairness would surely require mention of an existing twofold list as well as of a more detailed schematic classification and of attempts to identify Terentianus' verse examples, which have been used by C. for her own index (at pp. 616–17, *Georg.* 1.463 is confused with *Aen.*, *Aen.* 9 with 11.721; *Georg.* 1.271 and 317 are recurring single word examples and not identifiable in v. 1256. C.'s restriction to non-manipulated verses, unchanged for metrical reasons, is senseless, because the focus has to be on the use of authors.). The interpretation of the example in v. 1245 is taken from modern discussions, but without reference to them. The existence of a special concordance for Terentianus can be gathered only from a note in C.'s own index (p. 619). The valuable index for the *Grammatici Latini* by Marinone/Lomanto appears not to have been used at all.

The introduction (pp. XXV–LIX) is directed toward the 'personalità dell'autore' and the problems with dating, content, structure, completeness and sources. C. is not really interested in going beyond superficial knowledge. A more detailed description of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.385 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the *editio princeps* is missing (nothing about its correction attested in the *Praefatio*, too little about the *litterae longobardae*, no mention of an easily acquired facsimile). Discussion of genre does not go beyond a simple identification as 'opera di poesia didascalica' (p. VIII), and a consideration of relevant research is missing. Too little is said about the evidence for the author's earlier activities as a poet, and nothing about the addressees of the works. Also missing is precise and detailed discussion of the sources; after dealing with *De metris*, more should have been ascertained about Caesius Bassus (there is also too little e.g. on pp. XXIX and XLII–XLIII about the deviations from the grammatic-metric tradition, and too little about the title [*De metris Horatii*?]; the alleged 'significative e frequenti dipendenze' [p. XLIV] on Horace and Quintilian is without proof). The most recent literature concerning the so-called *poetae nouelli*, with a later dating of Septimius Serenus, has been overlooked (an additional argument for my late dating; on the *c*/*g* question my discussion has been abbreviated to a misleading extent: it is not a phenomenon exclusive to late antiquity, but is especially obvious here. Even page references to my 1998 *ANRW* article are mostly incorrect.). C.'s combination of the three individual tracts (although later authors treat them as separate), and her explanation of the incompleteness of the text as due to the sudden demise of the elderly author, is completely speculative.

Except for a general statement about the 'citazioni dei grammatici posteriori' (p. XXX) and the mere mention of three passages, there is no real comparison with other specialized texts. This is the most surprising aspect of the commentary: C. has managed to explain a specialist text on grammar and metrics without utilizing the corresponding literature from later Roman antiquity. Given that the ideas and formulations of later grammarians originate from the same tradition that Terentianus must have used, their terminology and standard examples are important for the assessment of Terentianus' content and language. But reference is limited mostly to earlier authors and to Terentianus' imitator Apthonius, often with insufficient evaluation (e.g. it is overlooked that Apthon. seems to have read more than we have in vv. 235–6).

The commentary (pp. 217–578) makes an effort, but is again rather unsophisticated and superficial, never really thinking through the three books. An explanation is given for almost every verse – particularly extensive for the *Praefatio* (twenty-nine pages for eighty-four verses), although after that apparently motivation decreases (near the end seven or eight pages for the same number of verses). Valuable parallels are of course gathered for the elucidation of individual phrases in reference to Latin linguistic usage. Yet beyond that, an interest in the content and in Terentianus' peculiar and at times difficult thought-processes cannot be discerned. There is no attempt to interpret individual passages in a larger context, as is necessary especially for those passages which are argumentative and not merely descriptive (the briefly expanded, title-like details, repeated from pp. XXXI–XXXVII, are too short to introduce the individual sections). What is explained is too often trivial, as is seen in the examples, which could be well understood by themselves and by the additional translation (e.g. v. 1858 as 'esemplificazione del metro' or 1780 and 2376–9 as 'exemplum fictum' after the previous *qualem modo fingo* 1779, *possis fingere* 2375; see also e.g. 1477 'scil. *pedes*', 1478 'scil. *est*', 1569 'scil. *tempora*', 1992 *lyrici* 'scil. *poetae*' with supporting argument), or without specific relevance to Terentianus, e.g. when the origin of *hexameter* or of *pes* as technical term is traced back to the fifth/fourth centuries B.C. (1337, 1580). Instead a comparison of e.g. vv. 218–21 with 785–8 is missing. The problem of the etymology or meaning of the names in vv. 441 and 887 is not observed. At vv. 1727ff. nothing is to be found on the metricians' alternative scansion. The little *Aeneis* in mini-cento of

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.385 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vv. 2163–76 is unnoticed. At the end, a hint about the lost *Epodes* of Horace is lacking. In addition, we can surely expect that a real and argumentative position should be taken, instead of, in most cases, simply ignoring the latest research (including attempts at textual emendation), and that an explanation of the editor's own should be given for the problems encountered (e.g. the comment at p. LIII, 'non sempre giustificata', is too short and lacks argument; v.111 is again shortened and incorrectly cited: problematic is the addition *ab ore*. On v. 884 the alphabetical order of examples is underscored, but the discussion does not take the necessary conjecture into account.).

The translation is also at times questionable, e.g. that of the very first sentence ('audiui . . . uirum . . . dicere' or more likely 'audiui . . . dicere fabulam' as Plin. *NH* 28.123?). Verse 825 is to be used to explain 226; the cited parallels are not comparable (the structure is different and there is no object). The explanation of the alphabet markings vv. 329–41 is nice, but does not respect the wording. Verse 719 is no real proof for 1280 (*q* is comprised of two *litterae*, but not the syllable *-ptum*). The system of case studies and demonstrations is often not understood (particularly vv. 520–777, 1238, 1258–81; 1201–57 is not mentioned as an excursus) as well as the obvious structure of *De syllabis* with its two large parts, obviously separated from each other also by the change of metre (pp. XXXII–XXXIII; v. 279 'rite metro . . . heroico' is simply paraphrased, not explained). The separation of the two consonant vowels as a particular group (vv. 146–81, 520–777) does not represent Terentianus' classification. The importance of *caesura* in *De metris* is not observed after v.1719 (p. XXXV).

There is no room left here for additional criticism of detail. C. presents an introductory reference to vv. 1603–5 'et si non ualebo plurima/ attingam uel pauca tamen . . .', appropriately assessing her performance. Terentianus' own warning is not enough respected (vv. 317–23 'labor . . . ferendus in legendo est maximus:/ non enim cursim aut remisse tam minuta acumina . . .'); he was in fact correct: 'pro captu lectoris habent sua fata libelli' (v. 1286).

University of Regensburg JAN-WILHELM BECK

SERMONIS POMPA ROMANI

D. AMHERDT: *Sidoine Apollinaire: Le quatrième livre de la correspondance*. Pp. 589. Bern, etc.: Peter Lang, 1999. Cased, £40. ISBN: 3-906766-82-9.

This commentary deals with one of the longest and most interesting of Sidonius' books of correspondence. It includes a letter by Claudianus Mamertus to Sidonius (Amherdt compares the presence of letters from Symmachus' father and from Ausonius in Book 1 of Symmachus' collected correspondence), a succulent letter of praise addressed by Sidonius to Claudianus, and a further letter, Letter 11 to Petreius, bearing a tribute and an epitaph on the same Christian philosopher. It also contains the letter (12) in which Sidonius, before slagging off the senseless blockhead who had lost the letter he was carrying, reveals that he is helping his son read Terence by forgetting his sacred calling (*professio*) and consulting what he evidently called Menander's *Epitrepontem*. Most of these letters were written after Sidonius' consecration as bishop in 470.

No text is provided; there are good and helpful editions in the Budé and Loeb series, and the addition of a text would have added to the book's already considerable bulk. But it does lead to difficulty in following up A.'s copious cross-references; since he

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.385 Published online by Cambridge University Press