With this new volume in the Budé series, Michel Patillon continues his contributions to the study of later Greek rhetoric, seen earlier in useful texts and translations of Theon and the Hermogenic corpus, more recently in the Budé of Cassius Longinus and Rufus. The format of this volume is that now usual in the Budé series: an extended introduction discussing the author (on which, however, see below), the contents of the works (with detailed summary), the sources of the text, and the editorial principles; then the Greek texts of the two works with French translation on facing pages, ‘apparatus criticus’, and some notes; at the end numerous ‘notes complémentaires’, ‘index nominum’, ‘index verborum’, and ‘table des lieux cités’. The ‘index verborum’ is an index of the text of Apsines, omitting common words. There is unfortunately no index of the learned discussions in the introduction and notes. Readers might also have appreciated cross-references in the notes to standard works on classical rhetoric such as those by Heinrich Lausberg (Leiden 1973, 1998) or Josef Martin (Munich 1974).

‘L’Art rhétorique’ (hereafter AR), attributed to Apsines of Gadara and probably to be dated to the second quarter of the third century, is a handbook, doubtless based on lectures, providing students of declamation with topics useful in organizing and composing their speeches. Although inferior to writings on rhetoric in the time of the empire by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Quintilian, or Hermogenes, or to the treatise De sublimitate, it is of interest to students of rhetoric because of the relation of its teachings and terminology to what is found elsewhere and for its information about declamation.

The treatise is divided into chapters on prooemion, prokatastasis (preparation for the proof), diegeis (narration), antitheseis (objections raised by the speaker), lysis (refutation of objections of the opponent), paradeigma (argument based on examples), lysis of paradeigmata, enthymeme (in the Aristotelian sense of a rhetorical syllogism), katastasis (proof), and epilogos. The last chapter, with its extended discussion of how to arouse pity, has been added to the work by a different teacher. He or someone else has also edited the treatise in other ways, including inserting citations of some of Apsines’ declamations into earlier chapters, with the odd result that Apsines seems to speak of himself in the third person.

‘Problèmes à faux-semblant’ is a short treatise on ‘figured’ problems of declamation: i.e., those in which the speaker affects to argue the contrary of his own interest to gain what he wants in an indirect or allusive way. P. makes the case that this is a genuine work by the same author as AR except for the first four sections, which have been copied from the chapter on this subject in Pseudo-Hermogenes, De inventione.

In an interesting passage in his introduction (XI–XVII) P. draws on Apsines’ examples to reconstruct a picture of his technique and style in declamation. Another valuable section (XCI–CII) is a collection of themes of declamation used in Greek schools, drawn from some thirty-one sources. It would be useful for this to be put on a web site, where it could be expanded by adding themes from Latin sources and indexed more thoroughly. In the middle of the account of themes (p. XCV) the name Antiphon is a mistake for Aristogeiton (cf. AR 2. 13).

The Aldine edition (1528–9) and the text printed by Walz in ‘Rhetores Graeci’ IX (1836) were dependent on Parisinus gr. 1741 and its apographs, known now...
as the B recension. Readings from Parisinus gr. 1874, known as the A recension, were first introduced by Bake in 1849, used selectively by Spengel in 1853, discussed by Hammer in two 1876 publications, and often adopted in Hammer's 1894 revision of Spengel, which was the first edition to provide a full critical apparatus. The A recension figures importantly in the text prepared by Mervin R. Dilts for 'Two Rhetorical Treatises' (D–K) and published jointly with me (Leiden 1998). Although P. has made some valuable contributions to the text, his editorial policy departs from that of previous editors and in a number of passages this has led to adopting questionable readings.

In many instances the B recension, usually wordier than A, seems to reflect the attempt of an early editor to improve the Greek style. P. initially acknowledges the value of the A recension (pp. CVI, CVII–CVIII), but in practice he often prefers B: he supplies a separate running apparatus of B and in constructing a text of AR he adopts around 140 readings of B where previous editors had followed A or offered conjectures. The result of this policy in a number of contexts is a return to faulty readings found before Bake and Spengel.

Contexts where P. prints the text of B and rejects those of later editors can be found in AR 4, 8, 1 ἐκάστοτε; 4, 9, 2 τὴν ἀντίθεσιν; 4, 9, 8 ἐποίησεν; 4, 10, 15 ἐγθόρος; 5, 16, 3 ἡ; 3, 20, 6 ἡ; 6, 1, 7 πρελαμβάνει...ἡ; 6, 5, 3 τίνα; 6, 15, 2 omission of μὴ; 10, 3, 24 ἴσον καὶ τοῦ λόγου; 10, 3, 29 ἴσον καὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐχεῖ; 10, 5, 6–7 παράδος; 10, 21, 14 τοῦτον...Ἐλλάδος; 10, 40, 5 τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; 10, 41, 5–6 ἀκόσμων ἐπεδήλωσεν; etc. At 1, 47, –21 P. makes a good case for B, but at 1, 73, 3 his preference for B leads to inclusion in the text of what is probably a marginal gloss. At 1, 84, 3–4 the deletion of κατασκευή...μεγάλα (actually καὶ...μεγάλα) attributed to D–K derives from Hammer’s 1876 Philologus’ article. In several instances P. overlooks conjectures made by Hammer in his Programma Guntianum (also 1876). Thus in 1, 58, 4 he does not consider Hammer’s μὴ which seems needed in the context: εἰ δὲ μὴ καὶ τιμωρεῖε. The apparatus at 1, 63, 1 fails to note Hammer’s conjecture βεβοίεις. At 1, 4, 2 P.’s apparatus ignores Bake’s κατι, but inserts et in the French translation; then just below P. adds an unneeded κατι to 1, 8, 2. At 5, 22, 8 P. omits notice of the reading ἐν δευτερολογίᾳ ὡτιάν ὡς προφητεύμαλον, observed by Dilts in A (cf. D–K p. XXIV).

P. himself ventures a startling number of over 80 new conjectures in AR and another 25 or more in the ‘Problèmes’. These departures from the traditional text are often ingenious but most have little or no effect on the meaning and, like P.’s fondness for the B recension, they often seem attempts to improve the style of the Greek, much as the scribe of B tried to improve the style of his source.

Thus P. is given to accepting conjunctions found in B but not in A: cf., e.g. 1, 52, 4; 1, 67, 2, 3, 4; 2, 7, 9, 8, 9, 16, 1 and 4; 9, 18, 3, etc. Late Greek technical writing is notoriously cumbersome and there is no reason to expect Apisines’ lectures and handbooks, perhaps taken down by students, to have the elegance he presumably sought in orations and declarations. A few of P.’s conjectures, however, deserve to be accepted or at least seriously considered. In 1, 44, 11 the conjecture ὑψίζεσθαι supported by Quintilian 4, 2, 100, is very likely correct, as is the plural αἰτητοψίων in 1, 58, 1, and in 1, 81, 7 P.’s δὴ is
also probably right. At 2. 14, 1 P. may also be right; Hammer followed Spengel in deleting ἐξ διορθομενού as marginalia, but if the reference is to Demosthenes 19. 4 and not to 19. 9–28, as I had thought, a new section should begin here. At 3. 28, 12, however, there is no need to try to improve the style by expanding τὰ in AB to τῶν. At 4. 5, 3–7, influenced apparently by the problematic condition of B, P. inserts eight words where Spengel and subsequent editors were satisfied with minor adjustments of A and the possibility of a lacuna. At 5. 20, 2–3 P. again avoids a lacuna, here by a conjecture of twelve words. Conversely, at 8. 8, 10 he proposes a lacuna, resulting in part from treating Apsines’ paraphrase of Demosthenes as though it were a direct quotation. P. does not comment in the introduction on his policy in treatment of Demosthenic quotations, which seems inconsistent: cf., e.g., 4. 13, 4–5; 5. 15, 4–5; 8. 14.2; 8. 23, 1–2; 8. 16, 2. But his punctuation of three separate quotations in 10.16, 4–6 is an improvement. At 10. 19, 1 P.’s τομαφθοίρεσε is impossible, since in the middle voice the verb means ‘seek vengeance, avenge oneself’ (cf. LSJ s.v. I 3). P.’s conjectures at 10. 23, 3 and 10. 25, 7 seem unnecessary and are not reflected in his text, and τὰ παραπολοθύηνεν in the apparatus should refer to its occurrence below in 10. 26, 2. Editors’ deletion here of κατ, described by P. as perpeam, results from their accepting the reading of A, whereas P. prefers that of B. P.’s ἐν συμποσίωνς in 10.27.4 is, however, rather attractive. In 10. 35, 7, instead of arguing for a lacuna (n. 636), one might simply regard the example as poorly chosen.

Few today will read Apsines’ treatise through in Greek; scholars may occasionally look up some contexts. Minor faults in P.’s text noted above will thus have few if any consequences for scholarship. The value of this edition is found not so much in the text as in the introduction and notes, and the existence of a French translation will be a convenience for those wanting to gain a quick impression of Apsines’ teachings.

There should have been an opportunity before publication of this book (‘achevé d’imprimer en avril 2001’ according to the cachet at the end) for P. to react at least briefly to arguments against Apsines’ authorship of AR published by Malcolm Heath three years earlier (AJPh 119, 1, 1998, 89–116). Heath’s proposal in brief is that, given the third person references to Apsines in the text and some other evidence, AR is more likely the work of one of Apsines’ students, perhaps Aspasius of Tyre, who in the process of composition among other things revised the account of prokatastasis in the Hermogenic treatise De inventione, a work which, ironically, Heath thinks should be attributed to Apsines. Crucial to Heath’s arguments are two passages in Syriacus and a fragment of Lachares that cite Apsines as the source of discussions found in De inv. Syriacus’ references are to De inv. 4. 13, the chapter on figured problems, but chapters 13 and 14 are unlikely to be by the same author as the rest of De inv. Among other things, the verb μελετῶ is frequent here but not elsewhere and τὰ αὐτῶν κοινωτά is used here but not elsewhere to mean ‘and so on’. Further, Lachares’ reference to Apsines’ discussion of πνεύμα may be to the lost source of De inv. 4. 4, which could thus be attributed to Apsines, and not to De inv. as we have it. In an earlier study (ANRW II 34, 3, 2079–83) P. proposed that De inv. should be attributed to another Aspasius, Aspasius of Ravenna. This attribution is also largely dependent on a passage from a declaration cited in De inv. 4. 13 and thus equally open to question. I am inclined to agree with P. that AR is basically the work of Apsines of Gadara, edited by someone (Heath’s Aspasius of Tyre seems a possibility) who added the citations of Apsines’ declamations and the chapter on the epilogue; but the relation of the work to the Hermogenic De inv. remains in
doubt. It would be of great interest if P. would publish his views on these and related matters, on which his editions of Theon and Longinus and his study of Hermogenes show his fine knowledge of later Greek rhetoric.

I am grateful to Mervin R. Dilts for advice in composing this review; responsibility for the contents is, however, solely mine.

Fort Collins, Colorado

George A. Kennedy


In choosing the phrase *dulce periculum* from Horace's Ode of Bacchic enthusiasm to entitle this third volume of his combined translations and commentary, West might seem to signal his two-fold aim as expressed in the two preceding volumes of the series of *stimulating young readers who have to study the poems* and adding to scholarly debate by putting forth his own views.¹ In fact these two previous volumes *Carpe Diem* and *Vatis Amici* have been widely noticed, and treated seriously by scholars. Readers acquainted with the volumes will know that the Commentary consists not in a traditional form of word or line annotation but rather in explanatory essays touching upon a variety of topics at the author's discretion but always, in sum, comprising well designed cameo interpretations. This volume follows that same general format, with its Introduction subdivided into a brief biography, a guide to metrics and accentual stress aiming to foster oral reading, and a set of thematic essays. In this case a second, more extensive set of thematic essays directly prefaces the Roman Odes covering topics relevant to their perceived unity, but also as W. observes in a footnote, to his understanding of the book as a whole. One added challenge confronting this third volume, as he modestly observes in its preface, is the «totally different experience of working without Nisbet and Hubbard», whose guidance he had valued in the earlier books; one feature new to this volume is the inclusion under the heading 'Other Opinions' of extracts from previous interpretive writing intended, as W. puts it, to offset the appearance of dogmatism by giving some idea of the range of responses these poems arouse. Collectively this range extends from Bentley to Michèle Lowrie, but draws most heavily upon writings of the decades 1960–1990.

The new Introduction is by no means a mere repetition of its predecessors. Both the biographical and metrical sections have been revised and amplified while the two essays on 'Praise' and 'Humor' treat topics not previously addressed. Whereas the biography of the 1995 volume offered only a skeletal vita abstracted from ancient sources, this much fuller version incorporates a contemporary critique of those sources, reflecting the argument elaborated independently in 1995 both by G. Williams (mentioned) and W. S. Anderson (not mentioned) to the effect that Horace's 'freedman father' was by no means a born or life-long slave, but rather a free citizen of Venusia taken prisoner during the So-