FRONTO'S OPUSCULA

A. Peri: *M. Cornelii Frontonis Opuscula I:* Arion—De feriis Alsiensibus. Edizione critica e commento. Pp. xxviii + 172. Cassino: Università degli Studi di Cassino, 2004. Paper. ISBN: 88-8317-022-9.

Alessandra Peri, having in 1997 published some new readings in *De feriis Alsiensibus* 3 derived from direct inspection of the palimpsest Milan, Ambros. E 147 sup., known as A, now presents a full-scale edition of that epistle together with the tale of Arion, whose portrait, from Room 37 at the Villa Romana del Casale, graces the dust jacket of this handsomely produced book.

After an introduction clearly stating the difficulties that Mai, Hauler, van den Hout, and the ancient corrector have created for the editor, the text is printed above two apparatuses, the first for reports of A since Mai's first edition, the second for conjectures; the distinction is thus sharply and laudably drawn between what scholars thought they saw and what they thought Fronto had written. The readings of the second hand are subjoined to the first bank; unlike van den Hout, P. does not cue them to the text, nor include them in her line-numbering; this numbering, by page of her text, is the only mode of reference, since all section-numbers are suppressed.

Ignoring punctuation, and also the square brackets round letters discerned by previous scholars but no longer legible, I have counted over forty places where P's edition varies from van den Hout's second. In some places she amends her predecessors' reports of A (12.2 = 227.13–14 *quod quisque*, a great improvement; 21.2 = 230.21 *supremas*), or decides between them (6.3 = 241.11 Brakman's *duxere* against Mai's *ducere*); in others, the readings that Hauler claimed to discern are mirages in the desert (most spectacularly at 15.7, where between van den Hout's 228.21 *rescribas et* and 24 *mare ipsum* only eight letters are identified: *s*, *grav*, and *est*). Sometimes A's spellings are retained (6.4 = 241.12 *autscultaret*; 13.6 = 228.2 *matiis*; 17.6 = 229.13 *proavos* nom. sg.; 18.5 = 230.2 *optimom*); at 29.6 = 233.14 P. restores the *domum* silently omitted by Haines and van den Hout before *redirent*. At 6.2 = 241.10 she accepts A.'s *possiet*, which gives a clausula (*mol. cr.*) found elsewhere in this text (*potissimum delegit*, *deprecari ausi sunt*), rather than a run of ten long syllables (*-tu vitae quantum posset cantaret*), and epideictically exploits the double sequence of tenses admissible with the historical present.

Unwilling to emend in the dark (see p. 115 on her refusal of Kiessling's *ain* at 21.3 = 231.1), P. is prepared to change what she can see, at 14.2 = 228.6 writing *Fausti<ni>ana*; for the corruption see Jan–Mayhoff at Plin. *NH* 14.62–3. At 14.7 = 228.11 she adopts Haines's *locu<lu>m*, at 18.1 = 229.15 Timpanaro's *avom <duom>*, and at 19.4 = 230.9 Mai's *tuone* for the *tunce* she reads in A. Although her editorial choices sometimes admit debate (*Faustiana*, if it existed, better fits *Faustus*; between *Proavos vester* and *pater vester* one hardly expects *avom duom vestrum*, nor as Timpanaro concedes is *item* found in third place), they always deserve respect; she does not, as some editors do, palm off manifest impossibilities on her readers.

P.'s readings are justified in the ample commentary, which also covers 'lo stile, il gusto letterario, il metodo compositivo del retore di Cirta', and evidently takes van den Hout's *magnum opus* as read; thus at pp. 49–50, on 6.7–8 = 241.15–16 *scilicet . . . commemoramentum*, she starts from his conclusion that the rare noun means 'homage' (p. 546), by translating 'cioè l'estremo saluto della sua arte al mare e al cielo', and goes on to bring out the stylistic value of the word.

Naturally a few faults may be found: at p. 40, on 5.8 = 241.6 *maxime* P. should have

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni301 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cited not *TLL* 9.2.635.45–9, adverbs of measure used with *onero* 'a partire da Agostino' (or rather Columella 4.21.2), all of them *ad quid*, but 8.71.4–17, *maxime* used 'ubi adi. poni poterat'. At p. 55, in context 7.4 = 241.21 *memorat rem gestam*, despite resembling the second half of a Saturnian, has rather a forensic than a military ring; cf. Cic. *II Verr.* 1.88 *Milesiisque rem gestam renuntiarat*. Nevertheless, one can but wish that P. will go on to produce a full edition of Fronto, making use of technological advances such as the multispectral imaging that has revolutionized the study of Herculaneum papyri.

Oxford LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni301

VEGETIUS

M. D. Reeve (ed.): *Vegetius:* Epitoma rei militaris. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) Pp. lx + 180. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Cased, £35. ISBN: 0-19-926464-3.

First, a warning. I had asked Professor Reeve's advice while investigating Vegetius' prose rhythm and had answered his queries on Thesaurus material. Since he also kindly sent me a copy of the book, I am ill placed to criticize it objectively; but it is clear enough that this edition of the *Epitoma* is greatly superior to its predecessors.

The main advance is in our knowledge of the manuscript tradition. There are more than two hundred witnesses, investigated, with a remarkable variety of approaches, in two earlier articles, 'Editorial Opportunities and Obligations', *RFIC* 123 (1995), 479–99 and 'The Transmission of Vegetius's *Epitoma rei militaris*', *Aevum* 74 (2000), 243–354. R. has three families, ϵ (ruthlessly weeded), δ (clarified by discounting contaminated witnesses and rightly dissociated from ϵ), and β (once represented by a single manuscript, now by two). A clearer picture of δ also shows that it ended at 4.39.1. Fortunately its place is taken by ϕ, the descendant of a δ manuscript, which supplied the missing ending from yet another source. For the main part of the text agreement of any two families against the third almost always gives the better reading. Each family occasionally preserves the truth when the others agree in error, ϵ most often, β very rarely. Doubtless there was manuscript conjecture and coincidental error; but there will also have been variants in the archetype. For instance, at 2 cap. 13 *de centuriis atque vexillis peditum,* preconsonantal *atque* usually serves rhythm; is it chance that ϵ omits *peditum* to give Vegetius' favourite clausula? But the same heading at 2.13 tit. has *peditum* in all families. Perhaps, then, *peditum* was an addition to the archetype in both places. At 3.12.1 one might even speculate about authorial variants: *explora* of $\epsilon\beta$ fits the patch of second person instruction in this part of Book 3, rare elsewhere (see D. Schenk, *Flavius Vegetius Renatus, Die Quellen der* Epitoma Rei Militaris [Leipzig, 1930], pp. 59–61); δ's equally Vegetian *convenit explorare* might be an attempt to remove a potentially tactless imperative (admittedly others remain).

R. sees traces of authorial revision in two places where the manuscripts agree. The last sentence of the summary that prefaces the whole work is strangely isolated. Editors have deleted or transposed it to the beginning of 1.1, where it connects well with the following sentence, badly with the one before. R. sees the summary as a consequence of the amalgamation of the separately published first book into a larger work, with the final sentence intended as a link to the specific themes of Book 1. The whole summary is then out of place. Transposition to the end of 1 prol. is possible;

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni301 Published online by Cambridge University Press