Plutarch's education and writings. Rhetoric certainly plays an important rôle in Plutarch's writings, but only as an ancillary device for effective display of the content. His thinking, characterized by truly intellectual mistrust of dogmatism and incessant inquiring about any aspect of our existence in our world, is always what attracts new readers.

Lamberton has succeeded in combining a critical, sceptic approach and an attitude of positive assessment in dealing with Plutarch and his vast bulk of writings. The result is a book that incites the reader to (further) study of this central intermediary between antiquity and modern times.

Göteborg SVEN-TAGE TEODORSSON

PLUTARCH'S TABLE TALK

A. Caiazza (ed.): *Plutarco:* Conversazioni a tavola*, Libro secondo. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*. (Corpus Plutarchi Moralium 36.) Pp. 403. Naples: M. D'Auria Editore, 2001. ISBN: 88-7092-198-0.

Antonio Caiazza has previously demonstrated his evident competence as an editor, translator, and commentator in his excellent edition of Plutarch's *Political Precepts*, published in the CPM in 1993. The present edition fulfills great expectations equally well.

The vast and detailed introduction bears upon the work as a whole, not only the second book. The author shows that he has indeed imbibed the cultivated, intellectual atmosphere of the Plutarchean symposium, where the majority of participants are men of nimble wit, who, whenever they meet, either in Plutarch's home in Chaeronea or elsewhere, seize the opportunity to make an amicable reunion, enlivened by wine, and devoted to elegant intellectual entertainment and partly more serious discussions. The characterization by C. appears entirely just and proper, founded on precise observation of content and style, personages, and environment, as well as the shape of each particular symposium, and thus gives a vivid picture of the Plutarchean circle.

C. uses a conservative philological practice, avoiding hazardous emendations, and succeeds in proposing some well-founded conjectures. At p. 154, 633C10, the reading <ἀδύνατόν <τινα> ὑποδείκνυς τὴν σωτηρίαν is plausible, and at 633D7 the author rightly observes that ταῦτα refers to the defects, and thus he adopts προσέτι, δόξας Wytt., Bern. At p. 160, 634D9 he argues convincingly in favour of <εἰς τὴν φιλοινίαν> Wytt., at p. 170, 636A2, C.'s conjecture εἶλκον is obviously preferable to εἵλκετο Hubert, at p. 178, 637C5, he rightly adopts τὸ ζῷον Doehner instead of τὸν ἄνθρωπον Hubert, and at p. 180, 637E5–6 ἐκ τῆς ἰλύος MSS Planudei (*Π*) is doubtlessly correct.

At p. 184, 638C3–6, C. succeeds in explaining a difficult passage only through the choice of πᾶν T instead of πάντες O (*Ω* by mistake in app.). At p. 194, 640C3, he preserves τὰ ἐλαιώδη T, probably rightly; at p. 198, 640E8–10, he shows that no change is necessary, while at p. 198, 640F1, Hubert's conjecture ἐμβολάσιν could have been put in the text.

At p. 202, 641C11, the author rightly prefers συμπτώματος Wil. to συμπτωμάτων Madvig, Paton. The generic sense 'coincidence' is likely to be expressed by the singular. In pp. 202–3, 641D11–E6, C. preserves καί after διαλαβεῖν, thus constituting the long

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.74 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sentence in a coherent, probably correct form. Convincing also is his emendation <ὁ ἰατρός> at p. 212, 643C2.

Less convincingly C. preserves the not reduplicated form δειπνηκότων T, alleging that it be a colloquial form, although parallels are not found in Plutarch.

In the commentary, p. 298 n. 145, C. affirms that μετά, p. 164,3 means 'durante', while he translates it with 'dopo'. The true sense lies between, namely 'verso la fine', which he himself suggests at p. 298.

At p. 315 n. 163, he mistakenly takes στοιχεῖον to be a Pre-Socratic term. At p. 350 n. 230 the river Cephisos is correctly identified as the Boeothian, but p. 118,14 as the Attic one.

Several, mainly orthographic, mistakes occur: p. 38,3 Plotino for Platone; at p. 46,4 one reads 646 for 637; p. 77 Bolkenstein; p. 110 *Die Ordnung der Olympic Spiele*; p. 296,1 Stantford and p. 296,21 Strantford; p. 358 n. 245 δαπανώσης for δαπανωμένης (twice); p. 367,7 Plutarch's father, Autobulus, has got the name Autolico.

Such mistakes are, however, of marginal significance and cannot detract from the evident merits of this edition. C. has accomplished an excellent work which will occupy a place of honour in the series of editions of the CPM.

Göteborg SVEN-TAGE TEODORSSON

VARIA LUCIANEA

A. CAMEROTTO: *Le metamorfosi della parola. Studi sulla parodia in Luciano di Samosata*. Pp. 349. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-161-2.

P. VON MÖLLENDORFF: *Lukian:* Hermotimos*, oder* Lohnt es sich, Philosophie zu studieren? Pp. 226. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000. Cased, DM 78. ISBN: 3-534-14976-9.

M. BILLERBECK, C. ZUBLER: *Das Lob der Fliege von Lukian bis L.B. Alberti. Gattungsgeschichte, Texte, Übersetzungen und Kommentar*. Pp. 264. Bern, etc.: Peter Lang, 2000. Cased, £29. ISBN: 3-906765-24-5.

Three recent publications reflecting very different approaches to one of the most elusive of ancient authors are reviewed here. The bibliography on Lucian is growing slowly as his sophistication—apparently so congenial to the self-consciousness of this millennial age—is more appreciated, and as his self-arrogated status as a literary and cultural 'outsider' is more sympathetically and intelligently assessed. The emergence of detailed, research-level commentaries on individual texts, in particular, is a relatively recent phenomenon, and one to be applauded: detailed attention to his language and intertextuality certainly helps to substantiate the broader claims made on his behalf.

C.'s book is the only non-commentary in this batch, but certainly does not lack detail or attentiveness. Ranging across the entire *oeuvre*, C. presents (in over 300 pages of text) a global theory of Lucianic satire, predicated upon Genette's distinction between hypertext (parodying text) and hypotext (parodied text), and arguing for a dynamic, productive relationship between the two. Lucian's satire is (a *donné* of modern criticism) fundamentally hybrid, a mixture of genres and registers, of seriousness and comedy, and also of prose and verse; it constructs itself as pluralist

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.74 Published online by Cambridge University Press