subtle traumatic afterlife in a wide range of poets, and this tradition would be worth piecing together again. Its presence in a volume about antiquity in antiquity is very welcome indeed.

Living proof that 'antiquity' is a relative concept is to be found in Isidore's view of the past, for whom Church Fathers are modern ('nostri') classical *auctores*, Socrates an expositor of Stoic moral doctrine, and Democritus a follower of the Academic skeptics, while the truest core of canonical classical authors consists of six Greek writers, from Thales to Xenophon. In the encyclopedic imagination of late antiquity, F. Gasti shows, 'antiquity' is a shorthand, paradoxically, for a pagan past that one no longer understands: here antiquity has truly become antiquated, and yet—whether despite or for that reason—is all the more valuable. The volume concludes with two essays in iconography. One, by E. Calandra, is relevant: it describes Roman imperial portraiture as a palimpsestic and almost 'archaeological' undertaking, containing a sedimented stratigraphy of representational layers, each recalling different pasts. The model is attractive, but just how confident can we be about its preciseness? The other, by M. Harari, resulted from an avowed misunderstanding of the call for papers, but nonetheless illustrates nicely, *e contrario*, how productive a focus antiquity's antiquities can be, and how unidimensional a straight iconography of Pygmies on Greek vaseware can in contrast be. Its inclusion in the volume, which in other respects is a useful guide to a growing trend, is strange.

University of Michigan JAMES I. PORTER

COMMENTING ON COMMENTARIES

W. Geerlings, C. Schulze (edd.): *Der Kommentar in Antike und Mittelalter. Beiträge zu seiner Erforschung*. (Clavis Commentariorum Antiquitatis et Medii Aevi 2.) Pp. vii + 371, ills. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2002. Cased, €100/$116. ISBN: 90-04-12528-0.

This volume is a collection of lectures presented in the context of the 'Graduiertenkolleg "der Kommentar in Antike und Mittelalter" ' in Bochum. The papers represent the full spectrum of commentary activity in antiquity: patristic and Hebrew commentaries, pagan literary exegesis, philosophical and medical commentaries (taking into account Greek, Latin, and Arabic traditions). In spite of some strong contributions, the volume is somewhat disappointing: many papers are introductory in nature, a number of them sadly underdocumented and lacking sufficient bibliography (e.g. Geerlings, Luppe). The English of non-native speakers has not been corrected. The general index, which could have done much to increase the usefulness of the collection, is particularly sad: it is apparently the result of a request of the editors to the contributors to send in a list of items. These were then simply pasted together. As a result, it contains items in three languages and is completely unreliable. For example, under 'commentaire', one finds the inherently unlikely reference to pp. 133–4 and 149–50 only. There are no lemmata for 'commentary' and 'Kommentar', but under the letter F one finds 'Funktion eines Kommentars', which, again according to the index, is only dealt with on pp. 335–6. There is no general introduction, just a one-page 'Vorwort' which announces that 'Randbereiche des Themas' have also been taken into account, with special mention of the paper by Lucie Dolezalova: reference is to a particularly disastrous piece with

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.472 Published online by Cambridge University Press

no connection to the theme of the volume whatsoever. This is no way to edit a volume, let alone one that costs over a hundred dollars.

If one looks at the volume as a whole, maybe the most important overall result is that one should constantly be aware of the interaction between generic features of the commentary, with their strong tradition and continuity across disciplines, and the context-oriented uses and interpretation of these forms. For example, although Augustine's *Enarrationes* may have been based on a lemmatic, and therefore fragmenting, approach to the Psalms, the structure of this particular 'commentary', particularly the transition between lemmata, is strongly determined by the rhetorical context in which it was orally delivered (Müller); interpreting Aristotle is a spiritual, philosophical exercise (Hadot); reading Plato may be a religious duty (e.g. Zwierlein, after the famous paper by M. Erler); commenting on the apocalypse may be a move to get the text into the canon (Pollmann).

The collection consists of the following contributions: W. Geerlings, 'Die lateinisch–patristischen Kommentare' (pp. 1–14), sets out the well-known fact that Christian exegetes rely to a large extent on pagan methods of exegesis, and speculates on the clustered reception of bible-books (Job and the letters of Paul), based on the theological background. Hildegund Müller, 'Zur Struktur des patristischen Kommentars. Drei Beispiele aus Augustins Enarrationes in Psalmos' (pp. 15–31), see above. A good paper. Karla Pollmann, 'Apocalypse Now?!—Der Kommentar des Tyconius zur Johannesoffenbarung' (pp. 33–54), is a wonderful paper. She presents an analysis of Tyconius' hermeneutical system and applies that to what we know of his commentary on the Apocalypse. Wolfgang Luppe, '*Σχόλια, ὑπομνήματα* und *ὑποθέσεις* zu griechischen Dramen auf Papyri' (pp. 55–77), is probably a great lecture, but less successful as a written paper. However, it does present (as a *parergon*) a new interpretation of the title of Euripides' *Hippolytos kaluptomenos* (namely, that someone dressed up as Hippolytus to trick Phaedra into revealing her passion) (p. 68). Otto Zwierlein, '"Interpretation" in Antike und Mittelalter' (pp. 79–101), could have usefully served as an introduction to the volume. In very broad terms it makes a competent, if necessarily rapid, tour of ancient textual exegesis in law, rhetoric, poetry, philosophy, and theology. References not quite up-to-date. Ulrich Schindel, 'Wechselwirkungen zwischen Autorenkommentar und systematischem Lehrbuch' (pp. 103–18), illustrates with some examples the topic indicated in the title. Lucie Dolezalova, 'The Cena Cypriani, or the Game of Endless Possibilities' (pp. 119–30)—see above. Gilles Dorival, 'Exégèse juive et exégèse chrétienne' (pp. 131–50), illustrates the two principal similarities between Jewish and Christian exegesis, namely 'une représentation du texte comme totalité ordonnée et cohérente . . . la distinction entre le sens obvie et le sens profond' (p. 149). Dagmar Borner-Klein, 'Rabbinische Kommentare zu Genesis 6,2–7' (pp. 151–162), is basically a collection and paraphrase, without further analysis, of commentaries on one biblical passage. Elisabeth Hollender, 'Hebräische Kommentare Hebräischer Liturgischer Poesie: eine Taxonomie der wichtigsten Kommentarelemente' (pp. 163–82): interesting choice of topic, namely Hebrew commentaries on literary poetry (which lacked the status of divinely inspired text or the authority of legal texts). Ilsetraut Hadot, 'Der fortlaufende philosophische Kommentar' (pp. 183–99): very competent discussion of formal elements and philosophical tendencies of the late antique philosophical commentary tradition. Cristina d'Ancona Costa, 'Commenting on Aristotle: From Late Antiquity to the Arab Aristotelianism' (pp. 201–51): excellently documented but slightly chaotic; it makes the unnecessary claim that Alexander of Aphrodisias' model of the commentary was canonized by Syrianus and therefore became the principal model in

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.472 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/53.2.472 Published online by Cambridge University Press