ARATUS

MARTIN (J.): *Aratos* Phénomènes*, Tomes I & II* (Collection des Universités de France sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. clxxxvii + 615, map. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1998. ISBN: 2-251-004696; 2-251-00470-X.

At the beginning of his career, Professor J. Martin published his first edition of this text (*Arati Phaenomena* [Florence,1956]) and a book on its textual tradition (*Histoire du Texte des Phénomènes d'Aratos* [Paris, 1956]); this was followed in 1974 by his edition of the scholia (*Scholia in Aratum vetera* [Stuttgart, 1974]). The present edition is thus the culmination of many years of work. The edition is particularly lavish: instead of having text, translation, and notes in one volume, as is usual with the Budé editions, M. has been able to produce two volumes. In the first there is an extensive introduction, followed by text, translation, and eight appendices; in the second we find a commentary and two astronomical maps. After many years of silence with only one other edition (M. Erren, *Aratos Phainomena* [Munich, 1971]), the occasional article, and inclusion in Hellenistic anthologies, suddenly two major editions of this Hellenistic poet were published (D. A. Kidd, *Aratus Phaenomena* [Cambridge, 1997], and the present work). In his own review of K.'s edition (*REG* 111 [1998], 375–6), M. laments the fact that he only saw this commentary when he had already brought his own proofs to the press. Responses to issues raised by K. have thus been limited to only two instances in the *addenda et corrigenda.*

That this edition has been thoroughly revised is already abundantly clear from the fact that M.'s previous edition spanned only 195 pages. The present commentary also deals with many issues other than the grammatical and textual. There are approximately forty-five changes in the text, and the translation is also thoroughly revised, now often giving a closer indication of the actual Greek word order than the 1956 edition. A remarkable feature are the numerous changes in the punctuation: usually commas replace semicolons and full stops, thus giving the reader a better impression of Aratus' characteristic style of stringing together long periodic sentences. Sometimes the division into smaller sub-paragraphs seemed somewhat arbitrary (e.g. p. 6). Verse 90 still belongs to 89, much more than the patterning seems to suggest, and the next section seems to me to start in 96, rather than in 98. The text here is less divided into neat sections of eight lines than the printing suggests.

In both new editions E (Edimburgensis *c*. 1290), the primary Planudean manuscript, is taken into account for the first time. M. and K. make use of the same eight papyrus fragments (some of which have not been used before), but confusingly number them rather differently. In comparison with K., who prints the readings of M, S, and E throughout his edition, and evidence from other MSS and sources only when necessary, M. includes a far fuller apparatus criticus: of a total of fifty MSS he routinely records the readings of nineteen, and usually adds readings of the scholia and the Aratus Latinus. He now omits references in his apparatus to Φ, the speculative Alexandrian edition of the late second or early third century A.D. Although less easy to consult quickly, the fuller apparatus criticus of M. is an advantage when one considers the various textual difficulties in more detail. It was particularly interesting to note that the Edinburgh manuscript, part of the M branch of the manuscript tradition, several times agreed with S against M (e.g. 234; 266; 284).

The Aratus text is still disputed: there are approximately sixty textual differences

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.23 Published online by Cambridge University Press

between M.'s and K.'s editions. Comparing the two commentaries in this respect, it is remarkable how often M. does not state explicitly why he has not chosen to adopt the reading of one of the major manuscripts. Several times I would have liked to know why exactly the reading of the MSS had been rejected and an alternative reading had been adopted (e.g. 34; 54 [emendation Maass]; 69; 126; 731; 775 [conjecture Voss]; 896 [own conjecture]; 1069). In 82 (πεπονήαται or πεπονείαται) M. does not discuss his preference for ει, but merely mentions A.R. 1.752. Here there is a similar split in the MSS, and Vian prints an η instead of ει; the same choice does not, however, seem to exist in A.R. 2.263 (πεπονήατο). In 763 M. quotes Hom. *Il.* 577 in defence of ἄλλῳ; but the verb used there is παράφημι rather than παρεῖπον, which is always constructed with a cognate acc. In 897 M. merely refers to 486 and simplifies matters there by saying that 'on ce retrouvera ce même verbe, avec le même sens, en 897'. However, ἐπικέκλιται is in 897 not the reading of the primary manuscripts, which read ἐπιέρχεται, but a reading of Π^4, several manuscripts, and the Aratus Latinus. In 80 M. reads λεπτοτέρη. One has to deduce from the apparatus criticus that it is the combination of the scholia and the Aratus Latinus which causes M. to adopt Maass's reading. K. adopts here the reading of the MSS (λεπτή) and adds καί (a scribal error easy to explain in the light of the repetition in the rest of the verse). The reading of λεπτή also gives more force to ἀλλ' ἔμπης in the next verse.

Inevitably some of the same ground is covered in the introductions and the commentaries themselves, but there are also interesting differences. M.'s work on the history of the text is visible in the long sections in the introduction on Aratus' biography, the sources, and the manuscript tradition. Here I found it useful to read K.'s concise accounts of the main issues first, before reading the very detailed chapters in M.'s edition. M. develops here some interesting hypotheses about the astronomical tradition, the relationship between Eudoxus and Aratus, and the problems surrounding the source for the second half of the poem. In his commentary M. often treats at length the history of scholarship on a word or verse, paying particular attention to the scholia, Hipparchus and Aratus Latinus (e.g. the entries on 2 and 22). K., on the other hand, includes particularly helpful and interesting sections on the language, style, and metre of the *Phaenomena*.

The Stoic background of the *Phaenomena* and the proem in particular has been debated often (e.g. James, *Antichthon* 6 [1972], 28–38; Kenney, *CR* 29 [1979], 71–3), and the *communis opinio* is that, apart from the proem, Stoic influences should not be overstated. Both K. and M. more or less adopt the same position and stress the influence of the poetic tradition, but closer comparison of their comments on the proem and, for example, 112–13 reveals subtle differences, with K. adopting the more Stoic stance.

The two editions often mention the same parallels, but M., who is less constricted by the demands of space, is usually able to quote the Greek and often a translation as well. He often tries to explain the echoes and the exact reason for the imitation, rather than just cite the parallel. Inevitably one does not always agree with the chosen parallel or the given explanation. Quoting *Od.* 3.48 as a parallel for l. 4 (K. merely cites it), M. remarks that 'chez Aratos également, ce besoin que les hommes ont des dieux se manifeste par des pratiques cultuelles'. But the situation here is slightly different, and it is the differences which give the echo its proper significance: the presence of Zeus everywhere is emphasized by the addition of πάντη and the positioning of πάντη and πάντες at the beginning and the end of the sentence, picking up the repeated πᾶσαι of ll. 2–3; only Zeus is mentioned instead of the more general θεῶν of the *Odyssey*; in the *Odyssey* the reference to praying is specifically made with εὔχεσθαι

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.23 Published online by Cambridge University Press

being mentioned immediately before, whereas here the absolute dependence of men on Zeus is made more forcefully by the connection with the preceding lines and the general human activities described there.

Providing a wealth of information, the two editions often complement each other, but also offer information on different points and often disagree with each other in the interpretation of particular issues. I have found this stimulating, as it made me focus with more precision on the text (e.g. 107: ἤειδεν). In 128 (παπταίνοντας) K. detects a note of 'wistful sadness', quoting A.R. 1.1171 to support his claim, and adds that in Homer the feeling is often that of fear (cf. 1046). M., on the other hand, emphasizes the movement of the eyes around oneself and the searching with the eyes. In the example from A.R. there is not so much sadness as nervous apprehension present, I think. The same emotion would surely occupy the people here who have just heard the frightening prophecy from Dike and must realize the enormous implications of her departure.

In conclusion, this is a very important contribution to the study of Aratus, Hellenistic and Latin poetry, and textual criticism in general. It seems foolish to think that Aratus will regain something of the immense popularity he enjoyed in antiquity, but I sincerely hope that this fine edition will spark new research into him.

University of Durham MIRJAM PLANTINGA

ALEXANDER OF AETOLIA

E. MAGNELLI (ed.): *Alexandri Aetoli Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Pp. 304. Florence: Università degli Studi di Firenze, 1999. Paper.

This book opens modestly: 'senza pretendere che tale ricerca fosse un urgente *desideratum* della filologia . . .'. Such self-effacement is undue: this is a work of very high quality indeed. The small scope of the project (a mere seventy-two verses of Alexander of Aetolia survive, excluding a few dubious epigrams) has enabled a thorough and meticulous treatment of the subject, one which incidentally sheds light on many other topics.

It contains a new edition of the twenty-seven fragments of Alexander of Aetolia, plus testimonia; a substantial introduction, with sections on *Vita*, *oeuvre* and literary context, style and metre, *Nachleben*, and printed editions; and intensive commentary. At the end there is a translation of fragments (not of their context), including Cornarius' rendering of fr. 3; a *comparatio numerorum*; and *indices fontium*, *verborum*, subjects, and passages cited. The book is very attractively laid out and typeset. The bibliography is placed rather oddly, though, in between the Introduction and Testimonia/Fragments. It is arranged in four sections, the fourth further subdivided—something of an impediment to speedy use.

The collection of fragments is the fullest yet (nineteen authentic fragments, eight Dubia, and a collection of Spuria: Powell offered sixteen authentic fragments, five Dubia, and a collection of Falsa), though this is mostly achieved through rearrangement of material (e.g. the *Φαινόμενα*, Powell's dub. frag. 20, receives two mentions, the testimonium among the genuine fragments, and the verses of Alexander of Ephesus[?]

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.23 Published online by Cambridge University Press