D’une manière générale, B. présente le style de V. F. comme plus sobre que celui de Lucain, précisément parce qu’il joue en priorité sur la catégorie du point de vue (c’est ce qu’il appelle ‘die perspektivische Erzählweise’), par des touches très légères: recours à des adjectifs axiologiques, à des verbes "videndi", à des particules (at, ergo) etc... Ce sont là autant d’indices qu’il relève soigneusement dans le commentaire. Mais, comme ils sont très ténus, il est parfois difficile d’attribuer tel ou tel passage à tel ou tel point de vue. Ainsi pourra-t-on ne pas suivre B. pour le v. 586, les adjectifs saeuus et miserae relevant à notre avis du point de vue du narrateur plutôt que de celui de Médée.

Le seul regret que pourrait éprouver le lecteur, c’est que B. ne consacre pas, dans son introduction, une partie spécifique à la conception du monde de V. F. On trouve plusieurs développements remarquables sur ce sujet, mais dispersés. Or, pour une épopée que F. Mehmel avait qualifiée dès 1934 d’absurde (‘sinnlos’), la question est particulièrement importante et le livre 6 présente justement une difficulté majeure. On comprend mal, en effet, pourquoi les Argonautes prennent le parti d’Éétès plutôt que celui de Persès, qui avait pourtant proposé de leur rendre la toison d’or. C’est la volonté des dieux, dont le jeu n’est pas très clair (cf. à ce sujet l’article de B. dans Ratis omnia vincet II, 1998). Et, du coup, les plaintes de Persès après la bataille sont parfaitement justifiées: dans le commentaire B. parle bien à ce propos d’absurdité (p. 262–264). La question de la position de V. F. vis-à-vis du stoïcisme, philosophie dominante à son époque, n’est pas non plus abordée directement. Elle se pose de façon particulièrement aiguë à propos de la mort de Colaxès (p. 244–246). Jupiter accepte nolens le destin de son fils, parce qu’il n’a pas le pouvoir de l’empêcher. Rien là de bien stoïcien, donc. Il en va de même sur le plan de la morale, la virtus se trouvant souvent déprécidée, voire tournée en dérision (p. 164 et 263). Enfin, s’agissant des dieux, B. reprend à son compte l’opinion commune selon laquelle ils sont l’expression symbolique des sentiments des personnages, notamment de la part irrational de l’âme. Ainsi l’action de Junon sur Médée est-elle «Externalisierung des irrationalen Verhaltens der menschlichen Akteure» (p. 113). S’il y a dans cette affirmation une part de vérité, elle fait bon marché de la violence subie par Médée et de sa souffrance. Entre Junon et Médée c’est un drame qui se joue et l’intervention des dieux, mieux que tout autre procédé, permet de l’exprimer (Cf. aussi p. 122).

Au total, le livre de B. se révèle d’une très grande richesse, qui va bien au-delà de son titre. La recherche concerne en effet les ‘Argonautiques’ dans leur ensemble et même le genre épicque en général. C’est aussi un livre qui apporte du nouveau sur un auteur qui, s’il n’a plus à être réhabilité, demeure encore à découvrir.

Bordeaux

Sylvie Franchet d’Espérey


In an article of 1984 R. Caldini rescued from over 1000 years of neglect the true form of the date that Aemilianus gives in the opening clause of the Somnium Scipionis for his visit to Africa: hoc Manilio consule. As Manilius takes part in the
dialogue of *De re publica*, Aemilianus refers to him as ‘Manilius here’; but once the *Somnium* was detached from Book 6, *hoc* no longer made sense, and among the known manuscripts, which up to the 12th century number over a hundred and beyond it a few hundred more, all but two of those that C. has inspected replace it with *a* or *A* or an expansion. The exceptions are the oldest, A (Paris B. N. Nouv. Acq. Lat. 454, s. ix*¹*), which has *hoc*, and its close relative O (Bodl. d’Orville 77, s. x*²*), where the scribe left the opening words for grander lettering.

Before correction, O shared with A several errors not found elsewhere. C. postulates a common source, *a*, and deduces from the most striking of its errors, §14 (*et* *Paulus pater et alii*) and §15 (*quaer et tabi Publil*), that an ancestor was written in columns of about 16–17 letters (though the second omission could have been caused by ‘saut du même au même’), and from another, §15 *stulta for est vita*, that in *a* or an ancestor a pre-Caroline *i* was misread as *l*. Could O not descend from A, as Barker-Benfield held for Macrobius’s commentary and Powell for *De senectute*? C. replies that in the *Somnium* the stratification of the corrections in A rules that out, and she has a reasonable even if not an overpowering case; at the very least, the ball is back in the other court, because neither Barker-Benfield nor Powell has published any reasons for deriving O from A.

C. now presents a similar revelation about the closing sentence, printed in all previous editions as *Ille discessit; ego somno solutus sum*. Not only A and O but the least interpolated of the other manuscripts omit *sum*, and furthermore *somno solutus* elsewhere means not ‘awakened’, an illusion created in the context by *sum* (and perhaps reinforced, one might add, by Apuleius *Met.* 11.7.1 *somno protinus absolutus*), but ‘fast asleep’. Evidently whoever detached the *Somnium* left a loose end.

Her argument that if *est* had been the last word of *De re publica* no scribe would have been so inattentive as to omit it (p. 247) is weakened by the end of Livy 30.

Among the stemmatic questions that arise about the tradition, these passages raise two of the broadest. From the first passage it seems to follow that all the manuscripts apart from *a* (the common source of A and O) form a single family; C. accepts this conclusion and calls the source of the family *β*. In a tradition free from contamination, it would then follow that wherever some descendants of *β* agree with *a*, as in the second passage, all other readings are innovations; but this conclusion would not hold if some descendants of *β* took readings from the family of *a* or from manuscripts not derivable from the common source of O). How far, then, has contamination affected the family of *β*?

To take *β* itself first, there are two ways in which it might be a figment. If scribes would have had obvious reasons for replacing *hoc* with *a/A*. rather than with something else, the shared innovation might be polygenetic. Rightly in my opinion, C. dismisses the possibility (p. 95), but she has already let it in by the back door. She suggests that *a/A*. was chosen because an abbreviation for *hoc* might have been misread as *b* and that in turn interpreted as a slip for *a/A*. since the letter *b* would have been pronounced *ha*; and she describes such confusions as frequent (p. 92). Really? ThLL under *b* cites none, and it is hard to imagine a suitable context. The other way in which *β* might be a figment is this: if in an ancestor of A, after *hoc* had passed into the copy from which it reached A, someone erased it and substituted *a/A.*, all later copies would indeed have a common source, but they would share it with A, and so the stemma might still have any
number of branches. C. does not consider the possibility, which makes it necessary to define \( \beta \) by innovations unlikely to be deliberate. Here C.’s strongest evidence is the various corruptions of § 22 transnatare quis in reliquis, corruptions that probably arose because a scribe jumped from -re to re- and an unclear correction was made.

Predictably, the question of contamination in the family of \( \beta \) takes up the longest and most complex section of the book (pp. 97–281). Hitherto, editors have adopted an eclectic approach on the assumption of inextricable contamination, and admittedly the difficulty of establishing a relative dating even for the earliest manuscripts, together with the amount of correction visible in many of them, appears to hold out little promise of stemmatic footholds, least of all in a text so short and so much copied already in a period from which a high proportion of the copies made have probably not survived. There is the further discouragement of possible contamination from the lemmata in Macrobius’s commentary, which add up to about two thirds of the text. C. has therefore risen to a formidable challenge. With the aid of Munk Olsen’s surveys, she makes her task manageable by concentrating on the 30-odd manuscripts probably written before the 12th century, still many more than previous editors have used; others that she or pupils have consulted are mentioned in passing (usually without a shelfmark, an unhelpful economy). In one respect, her results will cheer antistemmatists: she derives no extant manuscript from any other. She also gives ample room to contamination, polygenesis, conjecture, and unstable exemplars. On the other hand, she argues fundamentally from shared innovations such as omissions and transpositions; sets a stiff test for attractive but uncommon readings, which she can often show to be conjectures; takes pains to identify the source of any contamination diagnosed, especially where Macrobius’s commentary may be involved; and ends by fitting all her manuscripts into a stemma that derives A and O from \( \alpha \), four manuscripts from a descendant of \( \beta \) that she calls \( \gamma \), and the rest from another descendant of \( \beta \) that she calls \( \Delta \) (p. 305). Of \( \gamma \) she postulates two states, of \( \Delta \) no fewer than seven; and she argues that contamination does not block the reconstruction of an archetype \( \rho \) from \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), because it mostly took place in the family of \( \Delta \). Her bipartitions, which antistemmatists will find suspicious, continue when she brings in the indirect tradition (pp. 341–2).

Without checking the manuscripts, I can only say that I find her arguments generally convincing. Too readily for my taste she uses orthographical variants such as inquid and asspic-, but I cannot point to any manuscripts that she seems likely to have misclassified as a result. Her stemma allows a simple conclusion, that in the direct tradition no reading not in A, O, J (Clm 6369), or G (St Gallen Stiftsbibl. 65 + Voss. Lat. Q 33), has any authority.

The connexion that she sees between the corrupt forms of § 9 Masinissam in A and J (p. 111) is doubtful, because the redundant element in J is not what she says it is. She rejects the possibility that \( \Delta \) was a later state of \( \beta \) rather than a copy (pp. 274–5), but I should have welcomed a clearer account of how \( \delta \) \( \delta \) differed from it; she calls \( \delta \) «la prima fase ricostruibile del lavoro filologico su \( \delta \)» (p. 275), and it is \( \delta \), not \( \Delta \), that appears in her apparatus. Should the line that leads down to \( \zeta \) not be dotted (cf. p. 279)?

C. agrees not only with Ziegler that the divergences from Macrobius’s lemmata make it unlikely that he fathered the direct tradition by appending a full
text (p. 370) but also with Barker-Benfield that the absence of the Somnium from 9th-century relatives of A in the commentary makes it unlikely that the two works reached Carolingian scholars together (pp. 385–7). Though AOJG and many other manuscripts of the Somnium include the commentary, she suspends judgement on whether β included it until the commentary has been better edited. She also argues that contamination from the commentary is rarest in the most primitive manuscripts and easily traced; a particularly elegant suggestion here is that more contamination occurs in C and its relatives than elsewhere precisely because many of them do not include the commentary (p. 420).

Michael Winterbottom has recently investigated with similar results the influence of Boethius’s commentary on the manuscripts of Cicero’s Topica: ‘The integri of Cicero’s Topica’, ClQu n.s. 46, 1996, 403–10.

Other sections between her descriptions of the manuscripts (pp. 17–60) and her actual edition (pp. 431–44) deal with a 9th-century manuscript wrongly taken to present a chunk of the Somnium rather than the commentary (pp. 61–5), Favonius’s Disputatio (pp. 309–12), quotations in grammarians and Boethius (pp. 329–32), the version of §§ 27–8 later included in the Tusculans (pp. 343–57), the articulation and punctuation found in the manuscripts (pp. 379–84), and the identification of the scholars who worked on the text from the 9th century to the 11th (pp. 391–426) when only one name, that of Hartwic, is explicitly connected with an extant manuscript (p. 424). At first sight, Lupus, Heiric, Abo, and Gerbert, look too much like the usual suspects, but C. assembles circumstantial evidence, such as the striking variant reverberatur for vincitur in § 12 (p. 413), and doubtless more will emerge; Lupus she associates with the protracted revision of δ, Heiric with the creation and revision of its descendant ζ.

In the last thirty years a descendant of ζ, namely H (Brussels 10146), has been pushed back from the 11th century to about 900, and now two colleagues that C. has consulted have pushed it back into the 9th century. True, Heiric probably died about 876–7; but ζ and its lost ancestors have no other descendant earlier than the 10th century, and probably the late 10th at that. I trust C.’s methods enough to mistrust the redating.

C. provides her text with an economical but not inert apparatus. For the sake of people who want to own the best edition of the Somnium, which this unquestionably now is, one must hope for separate publication. She follows the edition with a discussion of all passages where the reconstruction of α and β is problematical, or they differ, or their common source, ω, differs from Macrobius’s lemma, or a unanimous reading may be wrong. Sometimes she refers to a discussion conducted earlier in the book, so that the discussion here (pp. 445–550) is effectively even more substantial than it looks. The range and depth of her arguments leave very little scope for disagreement. It is a pity that she did not index her valuable contributions on such points as accolere, circus, de via, leviter/le

I confess I did not know that in Plautus itaque (§ 9) often has the force of ista in what one might call inverted result clauses; C. is very sensitive throughout to the colour of the language. In § 15 cum after nisi is surely essential, because its absence would imply that some people are never released from life; on the other hand, I am no more convinced than Powell that humanum serves any purpose. C. follows previous editors in starting a new paragraph after rather than before § 22 ipsi autem qui de nobis loquentur quam loquentur
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dui?, but Africanus here passes from place to time. At the end of § 26, the only passage where she obelizes, C. prints ut †ipse mundus ex quadam parte mortalis ipse deus aeternus† sic fragile corpus animus sempiternus movet, with the variants ille mundum [ex] … mortal…

In the table of sigla δ should be aligned with γ, not with α and β; but otherwise the printers have done excellent work, and the few slips that I noticed are probably C.’s.

A book so long and so full of detail may put readers off or lose them, a danger that C. has acknowledged by summarizing her main results in Paideia 55, 2000, 76–101. It may be thought to have deserved a longer review, but I have opted for brevity so as to convey more quickly that it is an outstanding achievement and essential reading for anyone who studies the Somnium, deals with textual traditions, doubts whether there is still useful work to be done on manuscripts of classical authors, or enjoys weighing finely balanced variants. Complex its arguments may often be, and the need to keep their structure clear may sometimes have led to repetition and prolixity; but its thoroughness and intellectual grip are impressive, and there is nothing flimsy, opaque, or trivial, about its main conclusions.

Pembroke College, Cambridge

Michael D. Reeve


Rubinstineins (R.) klar gegliederte und folgerichtig aufgebaute Untersuchung geht von der zutreffenden Feststellung aus, daß Funktion und Bedeutung der Synegoria für das attische Prozeßwesen bislang weder systematisch untersucht noch angemessen gewertet worden seien. In der Einleitung (13–25) wird der verbreiteten Meinung, Kooperation mehrerer Personen habe zwar häufig im Vorfeld von Prozessen stattgefunden, vor Gericht selbst sei es hingegen im wesentlichen um die Konfrontation von Kläger und Beklagtem gegangen, zunächst die schlichte quantitative Evidenz entgegengehalten, derzufolge ungefähr ein Drittel aller erhaltenen Gerichtsreden von Sprechern vorgetragen wurden, die nicht direkt Prozeß partei waren. Während die bisherige Forschung die subsidiäre Funktion der οὐνιγόρος betonte und diese entweder als ‘super-witness’ oder – ausnahmsweise – als ‘vicarious voice’ wertete, will R. die Aufmerksamkeit auf die wenig beachtete Option lenken, daß mehrere Sprecher sich einen Fall wirklich teilten und jeder etwas beitrug; der Nachweis der verbreiteten Existenz von «truly joint litigation» (18), bei der alle Beteiligten «contributions to a team effort» (17) leisteten (einen Prozeßführungstypus, den man bisher nur für die Sonderform der ἀπόφασις angenommen hatte), ist das Grundanliegen des Buches, auf dem die weiteren Erörterungen aufbauen.

Kap. 2 (24–71) beginnt mit einer kritischen Sichtung des Quellenmaterials, d.h. mit einer Sammlung sämtlicher Reden, die von οὐνιγόροι vorgetragen wurden.