p. 109) which focus 'on the . . . narrative chain at the expense of cognitive states' (second-order reasoning: pp. 176–7).

We cannot fault Z.'s oft-repeated conclusion that 'the collection's ethics represent general and widespread views from Greek thought' (pp. 43, 109). But, regarding 'ethics', Z. is handicapped by these conclusions being fundamentally negative: the collection 'lacks a philosophical approach to ethical life' (p. 178); it misses 'a great deal of Greek thought on inner qualities'; it does 'not often feel the need to define a specific mode of behaviour'; 'the description of inner qualities in action . . . lacks many of the aspects of Greek philosophical thought on them'; 'ethical action as a product of reasoning and will is defective' (all p. 180). Thus Z. is forced to pull out a chestnut: the ethics are simplistically rendered—'pragmatic and practical and not idealistic'—because they 'offer guidelines to the lower strata' (p. 179); it is 'a corpus of exemplary cautionary lessons on practical ethics' (p. 183). This Victorian conclusion opposes Z.'s open-mindedness in judging 'popular' literature as only 'class-oriented' (pp. 10, 37ff.).

Z. has opened up new avenues of exploration for fable scholars. Students of mores would benefit more from a scholarly commentary on the *Augustana*—a task suited to Z.'s careful scholarship (e.g. p. 168 n. 53), his acute close readings of individual fables, and his colloquial translations.

Adelaide University VICTORIA JENNINGS

QUINTUS SMYRNAEUS

A. James, K. Lee: *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna,* Posthomerica V. Pp. x + 172. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2000. Cased, $68. ISBN: 90-04-11594-3.

More than forty years on from Francis Vian's study of the manuscript tradition and his fundamental *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne* (both Paris, 1959), and twenty years after Malcolm Campbell's commentary on the Trojan horse episode in Book 12 (Leiden, 1981), Q. at last earns an English commentary on a second of the fourteen books of his *Posthomerica*, marking a further stage in his slow but steady rehabilitation. The long interlude, if hard to excuse, is not without benefit: J. and L. exploit the considerable intervening scholarship on later epic, taking a firm stance on disputed issues. So, despite others' reservations, Bodmer papyrus 29, the 'Vision of Dorotheus', is accepted as the work of Q.'s son, thus fixing Q.'s own date in the mid- to late third century, following the loss of the Cyclic epics perhaps in the mid-third (pp. 6–9). Keydell's view of direct imitation of Latin authors, here Ovid, *Met.* 13.1–381 (the Judgement of Arms), is favoured against the weighty counter-arguments of Vian (p. 11 with further references). Perhaps most important of all is the new suggestion (p. 30) that Q. can illuminate the techniques of Homeric composition: analysis of his formulas indicates that they do not differ in kind from those of the Homeric poems, but only—though this may be crucial?—in length (Q.'s longest verbatim repetition is apparently two lines only) and in frequency of the same combination (much lower in Q.). J. and L. accordingly endorse Hoekstra's view that Q. employs a formulaic technique like that of Homer. But Q. cannot have composed without the aid of writing. Therefore the Homeric technique is also 'fully compatible with composition aided by writing' (p. 30). The gauntlet lies at the feet of Homeric oralists.

Book 5 describes the Judgement of Arms (1–351) and Ajax's subsequent madness,

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

suicide, and funeral (352–663). The debate over the arms and its preliminaries (128–316), Ajax's death soliloquy (465–81), and three laments (487–598) produce a figure of 45% for direct speech, the highest in the poem, close to the *Iliad* (44%) and far exceeding Q.'s overall 24% (pp. 16–17).

Q. opens with an ecphrasis of Achilles' Shield, recalling Homer in initial cosmic allusions, selection of scenes of war and peace, and the latter's harvest and celebration tableaux, but departing from the prototype with clustered martial personifications (pp. 45–6), an Aphrodite *anadyomene* probably modelled on Apelles (p. 58), the marriage of Peleus and Thetis (one of four in Q., p. 60), and, most curiously, the Hesiodic mountain of Arete (ll. 49–56). Q.'s Arete stands on top of a palm-tree, the paths to her blocked by thorns (53 *σκολόπεσσιν*, unique in this sense in epic, p. 55), an image which J. & L., following Koechly, link with Achilles' choice of a short but glorious life (p. 53). If Byre's case for connecting Q.'s description with a Lydian funerary relief (p. 54) convinces, J. & L. surely understate in calling it a noteworthy exception to Q.'s general literary conservatism. This opening set-piece illustrates Q.'s complex use of literary as well as visual models.

For Ajax, Q. looks constantly to Sophocles, but J. & L. argue (pp. 128, 131) against Vian, for one instance only of close imitation, Ajax's curse (470–5 ~ Soph. *Ajax* 835–44). The stature of Q.'s Ajax is enhanced by sixteen similes, a cluster of four (364–89 storm, beast, boiling cauldron, tempest/fire) describing his madness, while two (641–9) relate his burning on the pyre to Zeus' extermination of Enceladus and Heracles' noble death on Oeta; Athene's hatred and the Sophoclean quarrel over the body are dropped. In conjunction with Ajax's creditable performance in the debate with Odysseus (p. 80), the effect is unambivalent heroization of Ajax, for whom Q. explicitly declares his prejudice (ll. 129–32, pp. 71–2).

The case for direct imitation of Ovid emerges from J. & L.'s view of Q. as a creative artist, demonstrated at several levels—independence of Homer in noun–epithet formulas and of Sophocles in Ajax's characterization, Q.'s wider debt to tragedy, to Apollonius for emotionally charged scenes, to forensic practice for the structure of the debate between Ajax and Odysseus (each is allotted a short second speech), and to prose usage (p. 22 and index s.v.). With this perspective—surely correct—close links between Q. and O. (e.g. 5.194–6 ~ O. *Met.* 13.43–54, on Philoctetes) can be viewed as straightforward imitation (although not all proposed linguistic echoes convince), whereas divergence (e.g. in Odysseus' speech (5.237–90 ~ *Met.* 13.128–381) can be attributed to Q.'s distinctive characterization of Odysseus, and his succinct and skilful rearrangement of Ovidian material. A subjective element is hard to avoid, but one founded on measured assessment of Q's strengths carries weight.

Through literary analysis within a well-established framework, testing general conclusions against Book 5, the introduction delineates the subtlety of Q.'s relationship with Homer and his originality—visual effects, Stoic influence (e.g. Heracles' apotheosis, p. 155), use of Apollonius and special interest in medical matters (pp. 107–8 for both). The commentary combines meticulous linguistic analysis with sensitive, learned, and wide-ranging treatment of literary issues. Textual problems are handled with robust independence (e.g. 31, 43, 88, 457, 644, 649). Typographical distinction of introductory discussions from detailed commentary would have enhanced layout, but three excellent indices facilitate navigation. Packed with spare scholarship, this commentary demonstrates the rewards available to serious students of Q. It is a great sadness that Kevin Lee died suddenly soon after its publication.

King's College, London MARY WHITBY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.280 Published online by Cambridge University Press