This *libellus*, in origin a Harvard Ph.D., probes Greek thoughts and feelings about illegitimacy (a nodal point in ideas about reproduction, marriage, and citizenship) by inspecting the imagery and narratives in which it figures. In each of four chapters Ebbott tries to unpick some of the metaphors and associations of the *nothos*. The idea of bastards as 'belonging to darkness' (*skotios*) and 'maiden-like' (*parthenios*) is read alongside/through images of the seclusion of unmarried girls (including Danaë) and indeed even of married women in the oikos; bastards are 'conceptually affiliated' with females. Teucer, Ajax's half-brother (in Homer, Sophocles, and Euripides), allows consideration of the alignment of illegitimacy with evasive archers, slaves, and foreigners; Teucer's identity is originally secondary to that of Ajax, yet the latter's death allows him to come out of the shadows (cf. above on Hesk). Chapter 3 discusses the paradoxical link of bastards with both 'hyperfertility' and sterility, while the final chapter sets the Euripidean Hippolytos in relation to the concept of counterfeit coinage. The book offers perhaps too much of a cross-section of texts to be wholly satisfying, but its close focus on metaphor justifies itself by revealing something of the burden of anxiety carried by illegitimacy in Greek literature and culture.

doi:10.1093/gromej/cxi011 STEPHEN HALLIWELL

[13] *Imagining Illegitimacy in Classical Greek Literature*. By Mary Ebbott. Lexington Books, Lanham, 2003. Pp. xi + 121. Paperback £17.95.

Latin Literature

This collection, like its immediate predecessor, starts with two popular editions of Plautine comedies with text and facing Italian translation, one on the *Mercator*,[1] the other on the *Persa*.[2] Contrary to what is claimed on the title pages, there is nothing called *Prefazione* in either book. However, the first 60 pages of the *Introduzione* are identical in both books and are, presumably, Cesare Questa's *Prefazione*. The remaining 26 pages of the *Introduzione* to the *Mercator* are specifically attributed to Guido Paduano, and we must conclude that the remaining 27 pages of the *Introduzione* to the *Persa* are to be attributed to Elena Rossi. Both editions have substantial bibliographies including many works published in the last fifty years and, accordingly, compiled after the first editions, both of which are about fifty years old. The editions also include two pages of significant dates quite distinctively organized so as to meet the specific needs of each play. Once again, it is impossible not to be impressed by the apparent demand in Italy for such popular editions of the classics. Scholars have for many years shamefully neglected Cicero's philosophical and rhetorical works. There has been an unspoken, but not always unspoken, assumption that Cicero's philosophical works are entirely derivative and that his rhetoric is better studied by reading his practice than by delving into his theory. Happily, such neglect has been vigorously corrected in recent years. The texts are in many cases notoriously flawed but the work of Winterbottom, Powell, and Di Maria have gone far towards establishing a reliable

[1] *Tito Maccio Plauto* Mercator. Prefazione di Cesare Questa, Introduzione di Guido Paduano, Traduzione di Mario Scàndola. Testo latino a fronte. Classici Greci e Latini, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli. 2nd edition, 2004. Pp. 203. Paperback €8.

[2] *Plauto* Il Persiano. Prefazione di Cesare Questa, Introduzione di Elena Rossi, Traduzione di Mario Scàndola. Testo latino a fronte. Classici Greci e Latini, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli. 2nd edition, 2003. Pp. 208. Paperback €9.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gromej/cxi012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

textual base for further scholarship, providing an opportunity for wide ranging research and a complete re-evaluation of these most important works. Here we have two new editions in this tradition. Tobias Reinhardt's edition of the *Topica*[3] re-examines the issues raised by the work, starting with an introduction of 112 pages, which treats 1. 'The *Topica* in Cicero's Oeuvre' comprising: 'The Origins of Thetical Rhetoric', 'How and Why was Cicero Attracted by Thetical Rhetoric?', 'The role of Philo', 2. 'A Short History of the *Τόποι*' comprising: 'The Pre-Aristotelian Phase', 'Aristotle's *Topics*', 'Aristotle's *Rhetoric*', 'Theophrastus', 'Standard rhetoric after Aristotle', 'The Rhetorical Tradition after Cicero', 'Boethius and Themistius', 3. 'The Anonymus Seguerianus' comprising: 'The Anonymus', 'The *τόποι* and their Context', 'The Passage Introducing the *τόποι*', 'Peripatetic Rhetoric and the Fourth Academy', 'Themistius/Boethius', 4. 'The Legal Aspect of the *Topica*' comprising: 'Roman Legal Science', 'Cicero's Proposals for a Reform of the *Ius Civile*', 'Rhetorical vs. Legal Invention', 'The *Topica* as a Source for Early Legal Texts,' 'The *Topica* in the Twentieth Century', 5. 'The Transmission of the *Topica*' comprising 'The Manuscripts' (he reports the existence of 140, which he reduces to 52 by eliminating all written in the fourteenth century or later), 'The Hypothesis' (a very closely argued reconstruction of a stemma to show that all known manuscripts descend from a single archetype surviving into the ninth century), 'A, B, and m' (a detailed analysis of the most important manuscripts), 'The Surviving a Errors' (the errors that define hyparchetype a), 'Boethian Contamination and its Role in the Assessment of Manuscripts' (the assumption is that mediaeval scribes may have, from time to time, had Boethius' commentary before them and deliberately or otherwise have substituted a Boethian paraphrase for the text before them), 'The Analysis of the Tradition', 'The Apparatus Criticus'. There then follow 154 pages of text and translation, six pages of variant readings deemed too unimportant to be included in the apparatus, 192 pages of very thorough commentary, a two page Appendix on *ad Familiares* 7.19, 42 pages of bibliography (rather unhelpfully divided into five sub-categories), 14 pages of an *Index locorum*, two pages of Latin and one page of Greek terms (they are not explained here but the reader is directed to where they occur earlier in the book), and, finally, five pages of 'General Index'. This is indeed a formidable work of scholarship whose proper assessment must await the kind of close attention it so obviously deserves. A first impression suggests that the worst judgement it is likely to encounter is a feeling that, from time to time, the subtlety of the author's argument outstrips his ability to express it with the clarity it deserves. The same *caveat* might also be made of the second piece of major Ciceronian scholarship, also on a hitherto neglected work, to be reviewed here. Andrew Dyck's commentary on Cicero's *de Legibus*[4] is a natural successor to his 1996 commentary on the *de Officiis* and readers familiar with that work will feel immediately at home with this one. There is no text and no translation but there is a formidable bibliography and a very thorough and closely argued commentary. The publisher's blurb: 'Andrew R. Dyck's full commentary on this work is the first to appear in English or any other language for more than a century' is entirely justified. Given the notorious difficulties in the text of the *de Legibus*, Dyck was fortunate to have

[3] *Cicero's* Topica. Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary by Tobias Reinhardt [Oxford Classical Monographs]. Oxford U.P., 2003. Pp. xvi + 435. Hardback £70.

[4] *A Commentary on Cicero*, De Legibus. By Andrew R. Dyck. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 2004. Pp. xlix + 645. Hardback £44.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gromej/cxi012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

been given access to Jonathan Powell's forthcoming Oxford text, an excellent example of the best kind of scholarly co-operation confirmed by Dyck's choice of dedicatee. As in the case of Reinhardt's *Topica*, it would be very unwise to rush to judgement but these two works must have created a platform on which all subsequent work should be built. In *Comedy and the Rise of Rome*,[5] Matthew Leigh sets out (p. 1) 'to investigate the comedies of Plautus and Terence in the light of Roman history and Roman history in the light of Plautus and Terence.' There follow four chapters entitled 'Plautus and Hannibal', 'The *Captivi* and the Paradoxes of *Postliminium*', 'City, Land, and Sea: New Comedy and the Discourse of Economies', and 'Fatherhood and the Habit of Command: L. Aemilius Paullus and the *Adelphoe*'. Each topic is methodically and clearly discussed; the arguments are invariably based on the texts all of which are translated. It is not possible here to engage with either argument or conclusion but it is clear that this is not a book that those working on Roman comedy can sensibly ignore. Countless readers will rejoice to learn that Nisbet and Rudd's long awaited commentary on Horace *Odes* 3[6] has finally appeared. Only eight years elapsed between Nisbet and Hubbard's *Odes* 1 and their *Odes* 2; but a further 26 years have intervened between *Odes* 2 and *Odes* 3. That time has been significantly devoted to reading and evaluating the vast scholarly literature published since 1978. Readers familiar with Nisbet-Hubbard *Odes* 1 and 2 (which is to say all readers with any claim to significance) will feel very much at home here. At first sight the format is identical (general introduction to each ode followed by detailed analysis) but there has been one interesting change. Whereas before there was no text provided, here the lemmata to the notes provide a continuous and complete text. Depending on their taste, readers will note with pleasure or dismay that the waspishness often present in the editors of *Odes* 1 and 2 survives in book 3; at the end of the introduction to *O fons Bandusiae* (3.13) several published interpretations are summarized and dismissed with: 'Such notions remind us that to be open and receptive is not the critic's only business.' Our wait for Nisbet and Rudd's Horace *Odes* 3 pales into insignificance when compared with our wait for an Oxford text of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, a wait that goes back before the birth of anyone likely to appreciate it. The reason for the delay is evident on every page of Richard Tarrant's[7] splendid edition. In the *Praefatio* we are reminded that more than 400 fragmentary and complete manuscripts of the work are extant, a testimony to the popularity in every age from the time of the Senecas to and including the Middle Ages; no complete manuscript, however, from earlier than the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth centuries still survives. From the more than 400 available witnesses Tarrant has selected about 40 to base his text on, a vast act of judgement in itself fully documented in the *Praefatio*. Other problems include the apparent existence of two different rescensions (a problem also present in Statius' *Thebaid*), the vast literature on the text starting in antiquity, never fully drying up and now again in full flood, and, by no means the least consideration, the sheer length of the poem. Through all these problems and more, the

[5] *Comedy and the Rise of Rome*. By Matthew Leigh. Oxford U.P., 2004. Pp. xii + 241. Hardback £50.

[6] *A Commentary on Horace Odes Book III*. By R. G. M. Nisbet and Niall Rudd. Oxford U.P., 2004. Pp. xxx + 389. Hardback £70.

[7] *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses*. Edited with critical commentary by R. J. Tarrant. Oxford U.P., 2004. Pp. xlviii + 534. Hardback £20.50.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gromej/cxi012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Praefatio picks its sure-footed way. There is now a text to form the basis of all serious study on one of the most captivating works to have come down to us from antiquity. Susanne Gippert's commentary on Joseph Addison's commentary on and translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*[8] is not easy to read. Only a small selection of Addison's translation is provided together with the corresponding parts of the Delphin edition collected at the end of the book as an appendix complete with pagination in Roman numerals. Addison's commentary is treated more harshly still; he is never given an opportunity to speak at any length for himself. Instead, Gippert constantly intrudes. This arrangement makes it very difficult to judge the quality of argument displayed either by Addison or by Gippert. In 1987, Leofranc Holford-Strevens published, to wide acclaim, a study on Aulus Gellius, (not reviewed, it seems, by this journal). There now follows a revised edition.[9] It would be an impossible task to give a proper appreciation of this work in the space allowed here. The author's immense learning is, of course, fully displayed but made the servant rather than the master of a modern humane scholar writing sympathetically about an ancient humane scholar. There is also, in the *Preface*, a beautifully crafted recantation (p. xi) of some opinions expressed in the first edition which are no longer an exact reflection of his opinion now. Rarely do modern critics pay proper attention to the need to make their writing pleasant as well as instructive. This is a most signal exception. At first sight, it might seem pointless to provide a translation of a part of Servius for those with no Latin. However, such is the care and ingenuity shown by three scholars working together that the implausible has become fascinating. Servius' Commentary on Book Four of Virgil's *Aeneid*[10] starts with an informative introduction on what we know of Servius and his commentary followed by a statement on methodology. The main body of the work consists of a text of *Aeneid* 4 as known to Servius in the top half of the left hand page faced on the top half of the right hand page by an English translation ('an ugly crutch to our readers'). Beneath Virgil's text is to be found Servius' and, beneath the translation of Virgil, a translation of Servius: 'so that the reader has...all four texts available at once.' A single example should illustrate both the strengths and weaknesses of this approach. At 4.340, Virgil writes: *et nos fas extera quaerere regna* translated here as: 'And it is right we go in quest of foreign realms as well.' Servius comments: ET NOS FAS 'nobis fas' dicimus, sed hoc loco non est iugenda elocutio, ne sit uitium; nam legimus 'fas mihi Graiorum sacrata resoluere iura.' [2.157] sed hoc dicit: *fas est etiam nos extera regna requirere*. This is translated: AND IT IS RIGHT WE we say "right for us," but in this passage the expression should not be joined together, otherwise it would be a solecism; for we read, "it is right for me [dative] to break solemn oaths of the Greeks." [2.157] But this says, "it is right that we [nominative] go in quest of foreign realms as well." But, from a Latin point of view, the *nos* is, of course, accusative which would have required much explanation. The note at the end of the book hardly helps: 'Servius points out that the grammatical way to say "it is right for us to

[8] *Joseph Addison's Ovid.* An Adaptation of the *Metamorphoses* in the Augustan Age of English Literature. By Susanne Gippert. Die Antike und Ihr Weiterleben, Band 5. Gardez! Verlag, Sankt Augustin, 2003. Pp. 259 + xli. Paperback €33.

[9] *Aulus Gellius An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement.* Revised edition. By Leofranc Holford-Strevens. Oxford U.P., 2003. Pp. xxiv + 436. Hardback £70.

[10] *Servius' Commentary on Book Four of Virgil's* Aeneid. An Annotated Translation. By Christopher M. McDonough, Richard E. Prior, and Mark Stansbury. Bolchazy-Carducci, Wauconda, Illinois, 2004. Pp. xxiv + 157. Paperback $29.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gromej/cxi012 Published online by Cambridge University Press

do something" requires the pronoun in the dative (*nobis*) rather than the nominative [*sic*] (*nos*), which is why he says the line should be read as though the impersonal *fas est* introduced the clause with *nos* as its subject.' Michael Reeve's Oxford text of Vegetius' *Epitomata rei Militaris*[11] displays diligence and thoroughness to a very marked degree. The work was very popular indeed in the middle ages but much neglected since, with the result that any editor now must examine a vast host of hitherto poorly reported manuscripts before seeking to judge what modern resources are available; by 'modern', I mean anything published since 1800. One of the many controversies that have been aroused over the years is the question of how or whether various manuscripts are related to one another. Reeve has given much thought to this question and has accordingly allowed himself to cite in his apparatus reconstructed readings. No doubt, as he himself predicts, some will complain but no one should be deceived and the practice does make for some clarity and brevity in an apparatus which is still very full indeed. Others, or perhaps many of the same, will lament the substitution of English for Latin in the title page and introduction, though not on the dust cover or apparatus. Whatever view one takes on this point, it is probably the case that of those non-native speakers of English likely to be interested in this text, most would be more comfortable with Latin than with English.

doi:10.1093/gromej/cxi012 D. E. HILL

[11] *Vegetius.* Epitomata Rei Militaris. Edited with critical commentary by M. D. Reeve. Oxford U.P., 2004. Pp. lx + 180. Hardback £35.

Greek History

If almost all the books under review here are in some sense postponed – reprints, translations, paperbacks and so on – the late Geoffrey de Ste. Croix's *Athenian Democratic Origins* must win the crown for the circumstances of its publication.[1] These and other pieces were set to form a collection of essays in the mid-1960s, when their publication was put aside as one intended chapter mushroomed into de Ste. Croix's *Origins of the Peloponnesian War.* They were written for an intriguing range of original audiences: for schools, sixth-form conferences, and university societies (so, for example, a remarkably fresh piece on trade and colonization) as well as for a more scholarly readership; one chapter here, arguing against what is now the consensus on Solon's reform of *hektemorage*, originated as a pair of letters to de Ste. Croix's Oxford colleague Anthony Andrewes. (Will similar pieces be patched together from our generation's emails? I think not.) The editors took the sensible decision not to try to second-guess how de Ste. Croix's mind might have changed across four decades, but have instead included short afterwords to all the pieces in the volume, setting them deftly and economically against the background of subsequent work. The pieces themselves are everything one might expect from their author: pungent, meticulously detailed, ruthlessly, often magnificently, forensic – and they are all still worth reading. In a sense, however, it is their urgency – the overwhelming conviction that Solon's property classes, say, are worth such sweat and tears, and that the topics of Oxford 'Greats' are self-evidently the topics of Greek history - that gives them the look of museum pieces, as if the

[1] *Athenian Democratic Origins.* And other essays. By G. E. M. de Ste. Croix. Edited by David Harvey and Robert Parker. Oxford U.P., 2004. Pp. vii + 464. Hardback £80.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gromej/cxi012 Published online by Cambridge University Press