eine weitere: Ein Druckfehler an bedeutsamer Stelle («contemplation of an image» (153) statt wohl richtig 'contemplation or an image') trägt noch das Seine zur Verwirrung bei.\footnote{In diesem Zusammenhang sei auch auf einen unmittelbar folgenden Zitierfehler verwiesen: Statt +450a23–29+ muß es richtig heißen: +450b20–27+.}

Schwere Lesbarkeit ist aber nur teilweise charakteristisch für die Arbeit. Ansprechend ist das häufig umgängliche, lockere Englisch, gewürzt mit einigen plastischen Formulierungen (genannt sei die Kapitel-Überschrift 'Condiments and the art of cooking' (56)).


Salzburg

Christian Wagner

\footnote{A. Henrichs, in J. Bremmer (ed.), Interpretations of Greek Mythology. London and Sydney 1987, 247.}


Conon's Diegeseis are a collection of fifty stories of extremely miscellaneous content, which were dedicated to king Archelaos Philopatris of Cappadocia some time around the turn of the era, and survive in the epitome made by Photius in the ninth century. Why should we care about them? For the same reasons as we should care about Parthenius' Ἐρωταί Παθήματα or Antoninus Liberalis' Metamorphoses (their closest parallels), about the Bibliothèke, or about the imperial collections of entertaining anecdotes and historical miscellanies: as works of antiquarian mythography, significant not only as works of literature, but also, modestly, as documents of intellectual history. Conon is crammed with foundation myths and aetiologies: for their originators this was not mere antiquarianism, but a way of making sense of the world, of explaining ritual practices, constructing genealogies and asserting kinship between communities. A collector like Conon, on the other hand, sweeps together foundation myths with (quasi-) historical anecdote, paradoxaogrophy, fables, and parables, each item served up without context, as if for a reader's momentary diversion. Henrichs, whose four high-powered pages were among the most important contributions to the study of this 'extremely obscure' mythographer in recent years, wrote that he was 'only one example of the many unfinished tasks in the field of Greek mythography that are still waiting for their heroes'.\footnote{Thus it misses R. L. Fowler, Early Greek Mythography (Oxford 2000). My 'Parthenius of Nicaea' (Oxford 1999) is cited sporadically.} Have the Diegeseis found theirs in Brown?

His book is described as «a revised version of a work that was accepted as a dissertation in 1998 by the Philosophisch-historische Fakultät of the Universität Bern», and inspection suggests that it has been revised (patchily) to take into account works published in 1999 but no further.\footnote{It consists of 46 pages of introduction, then just over 300 pages of text,}"
translators, and commentary; there is a bibliography of works cited by author’s name and date (not a comprehensive bibliography of all works cited); and indices verborum, locorum, and a general index (the great majority of which is taken up with proper names; thus one draws a blank with ‘papyri’). The introduction considers the date of the collection; its contents and character; and the stages of its transmission. What we have is Photius’ epitome, and inferences can be made about the original from what is known of Photius’ excerpting method (pp. 35–9), fortified by the evidence of POxy 3648 F 1–2 col. ii that overlaps with no. 46. Photius tended to summarise obscure works at greater length, and if the original Conon was not much longer than the epitome, one might envisage it as a ἐποίημα, as Parthenius implies of his own work (Ep. Πατρ. Praef.). On p. 12, however, B. seems to suggest that it may have been, not a ἐποίημα, but already a ‘polished and rhetorically expanded’ version of rough notes. In that case, we would have to envisage a very complicated process, with ‘original’ (whatever that was) – ἐποίημα – Conon’s expansion – and finally Photius’ abbreviation (and maybe, p. 12 also seems to imply, further stages of contamination along the way, for ‘it was not uncommon in Byzantine times for compilers to blend materials of different origins that had been epitomized with varying degrees of precision’).

B. sees the intellectual context of the work as that of ‘third-century Alexandrian antiquarianism’ (p. 11), his account of which is taken from Fraser’s ‘Prolemaic Alexandria’ (pp. 11, 17, 19, 23). It could have been better documented1 and more fully discussed. The real political and diplomatic significance that κτίσεις and genealogies could bear, beyond antiquarianism, is barely registered.2 He could have made much more comparative use of Parthenius, not only for the stories’ distribution in time and place (pp. 10–11),3 but also for their miscellaneous character,4 motifs, and sources (Conon has a lot more from Callimachus, and the contrast deserved mention5); and in general to help focus the question: what were such collections for? B. does not believe that the Diegeseis were intended as raw material for other writers, for one can hardly ‘imagine an elegist, for example, who would take as his subject Tāle 35, about a dishonest banker’ (p. 11). But then, despite the professed aim of the Εὐρωτικὰ Ποθηματα, it is hard to imagine e.g. no. 8 (about the summary justice inflicted on a faithless Greek woman by a Gaul) under the pen of Cornelius Gallus, either; one can raise the problem (cf. ‘Parthenius’, 320) without solving it. He is reluctant to identify the readership of the Diegeseis with that of prose summaries of drama, ‘written to enable those incapable or unwilling to read the originals to absorb Greek culture in a painless way’; but is that view of dramatic diegeseis, which were composed by Peripatetic-

---

1 e.g. with E. Gabba, ‘True and False History in Classical Antiquity’, JRS 71, 1981, 50–62. 'Parthenius', 219–22, could have been cited for Peripatetic Εὐρωτικά.
3 He notes the dominant interest in Asia Minor (pp. 9, 12), and has a section on specifically Trojan myths (pp. 26–7). The interest in oracle centres in Asia Minor (nos. 6, 33, and 44) was also worth discussing.
4 Conon has two stories that explain proverbs (nos. 28, 34); Parthenius does not include this type. Conon also has a specimen of myth burlesque (see p. 241; this is interesting, and deserved more prominence).
5 Noted on pp. 15, 339; but there might have been more. Conon has Callimachus’ Argonautic stories, nos. 41 (Cyzicus), 49 (Anaphe); 11 (the Lindian sacrifice); 19 (Linus). B. notes on p. 339 that Conon may have used Callimachus’ work on islands for the rising of Anaphe from the sea, which is interesting in the light of P. Ceccarelli, ‘I Nesiotika’, ASNP 19, 1989, 903–15, who on 924–6, includes Conon among writers of νησιωτικά.
tics such as Dicaearchus, and can be seen as representatives of an established semi-scholarly sub-genre, quite right? One reason for the work’s lack of popularity in antiquity was «certainly» its lack of organisation (p. 9), a plausible enough guess, but what sort of readership are we to envisage for any of the lost ἀντικείμενα of the Hellenistic period, or for works like Aelian’s Varia Historia? What ordering principles might an ancient readership expect, or lack of them tolerate?

The method, in the introduction and throughout the commentary, is rather to take hold of a fact and to buttress it with other facts; and where facts are not to be had, to go to the nearest item that will yield facts, as in the case of Conon himself, about whom nothing is known, so that instead we are given a minute account of the ruling dynasty in Cappadocia at the turn of the era (pp. 1–4). B.’s subject-matter is local history, as transmitted by mythography, and the subject-matter and method reminded me of Moses Finley’s famous (notorious?) discussion of another sort of local history, modern ‘pseudo-histories of ancient cities or regions in which every statement . . . or calculation to be found in an ancient text . . . finds a place’, a procedure characterised as «Tell all you know about X». Finley’s target was Fraser’s ‘Ptolemaic Alexandria’ (much used by B.), as a «paragon of erudite scholarship», but (for Finley) representative of an approach which fails to ask the searching, analytical questions that would make truest sense of its subject-matter. I am not suggesting that B. fails to ask the right questions; but there is something of ‘tell all you know about X’ which means that the book is well wadded with vastly erudite material (and a lot of repetition), yet often fails to foreground what is most important. It is admirably learned and full of industry and diligence; and criticism should be constructive. So if B. is ever in the position of writing another literary commentary, I hope he will consider my comments in the spirit in which they are intended.

What Henrichs desired was: «a comprehensive analysis which should pay equal attention to source criticism, narrative technique, mythology, religion and social history» (op. cit. pp. 246–7). What B. gives us is above all variants of the myths and stories in question, which he records remorselessly (especially genealogies: as an example take Phineus on pp. 275–6). He also considers the transmission of the stories, distinguishing the layers of the narratives where this is possible (cf. pp. 149–50, on Coroebus); Henrichs’ analysis of the Callisto myth (op. cit. pp. 254–67) was an exemplary demonstration of this method. The approach is neither ritualist (in the manner of Burkert), structural (or structuralist), formalist (à la Propp), or narra-

---

2 Compare the treatment of Alexander of Pherae on pp. 345–6.
3 Sometimes he seems to presuppose that a myth contains some reminiscence of a historical reality. On p. 17, colonisation myths are seen, not as autonomous stories with their own logic, but as potentially reflecting (albeit negatively) the circumstances that gave rise to the colony. The stories are often the peg for antiquarian comment; pp. 75–6, the history of the Chalcidic confederacy; pp. 255–6, a potted history of Ugarit (à propos of the Phoenician capital at Thbes); pp. 286–7, the origins of the Etruscans (à propos of the Tyrre-henian invasion of Cyzicus); p. 299, the Neolithic and Mycenaean trading relations of Melos.
5 There could have been more on the ritual τοιχωμένος in no. 49, pp. 341, 343: Henrichs singled this out for its interest and cited J. Rusten, HarvStud 51, 1977, 157–61.
6 Though he registers the contrast of bees swarming round honey and vultures descending on a corpse in no. 35, p. 245; this whole story is built round interesting dyads.
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tological. He often documents motifs and mythemes from Stith Thompson, but the
approach is not really folklorist either, and there is a lot that escapes him (which
closer acquaintance with Parthenius, or ‘Parthenius’, might have remedied). If it is
disencumbered by theory, that is fine by me; yet I missed a longer treatment of the
logic of the stories, the ‘grammar’ and structure of the myths (curious that most of
Parthenius’ are one-movement stories, whereas many of Conon’s are episodic); so
much more could have been extracted from the composition and elaboration of
mythical narrative than the paragraph on ‘mythical innovation’ on p. 14. The commentaries
do illustrate how they are so often composed by creative reassembly of older material, but it is typical of this book that the material is buried in individual
lemmata, rather than teased out in the separate introductions to the stories, let
alone as the subject for a wider-ranging analysis in the introduction as a whole. Too
much that is important is distributed across lemmata, not enough concentrated into
sequential discussion. It would have been more helpful to narrow the mesh of the
leemata, rather than teased out in the separate introductions to the stories, let
better), stance earlier on, consolidating discussions in one place (or cross-referencing them
better), and leaving the smaller, more pointillist detail to linear or word-for-word
commentary.

That said, linguistic comment is not B.’s strongest point. The whole section on
pp. 39–44 is deficient. It needs a more comparative focus to make it meaningful,
and again, Parthenius would have fitted the bill.

‘Parthenius’ is footnoted only for hiatus and prose rhythm (p. 40 n. 140), not for other
relevant comparisons such as hypertaxis versus parataxis, the difficulty of evaluating
‘poetical’ diction, parenthetical, the loose use of the genitive absolute, the indiscriminate use
of οὗ and ἐν with participles, and the distribution of direct and indirect speech. The assertions
in the complete paragraph on p. 42 are mostly taken over straight from S. Wahlgren’s
‘Sprachwandel im Griechisch der frühen römischen Kaiserzeit’. Göteborg 1995, 195–6, and
are meaningless without it (judicious footnoting of K.–B. and K.–G. would also have
helped). Only the comment on ὅς versus ὅν is explained; what, for example, is one to make
of a number of Hellenistic usages can be found in Konon, such as . . . ἄνευγγε; Wahlgren’s table also reveals that many of the features B. singles out are isolated cases; quantifi-
cation was necessary. The sentence on moods and tenses at the top of p.

(honey and corpses, honey and gold, ascent and descent, the ravine and the mountain peak
where the cult in question is situated).

1 E.g. in no. 3 he misses parallels for the motif of killing a kinsman or guest by mistaken
identity (p. 73; see ‘Parthenius’, 519, adding ‘Ep. Περθήρον 3.4–5; Ap. Rhod. 1.1225–62); in no.
4, on Olynthus’ death while hunting, there is no mention of Munitus’ death while hunting
in Olynthus (‘Ep. Περθήρον 16.4); in no. 19 (Linus), he remarks that ‘there seem to be no other
mythological characters who were killed by dogs under the same circumstances as Linos’
(p. 151): maybe not, but for the motif of dismemberment by dogs see ‘Parthenius’, 430,
433; in no. 31 (Procris) there is nothing on the motif of the enmy of species of bird
unconvinced that the combination of incest and metamorphosis (cf. pp. 59–60) points
to a Semitic origin for the story of Byblis; cf. Harpalyce (‘Ep. Περθήρον 13).

2 E.g. story no. 24 is more interested in the pre-Greek suffix -αυγγες and the correct
Latin names of the two varieties of narcissus than in the essay by E. Pellizer, Reflections,
echoes and amorous reciprocity. On reading the Narcissus story, in Bremmer (ed.), Inter-
pretations of Greek mythology, 147–20.

3 As with the discussion of Photius’ modus operandi on pp. 36–7, 47, 74, 351; or of the
implications of the term διήγημας on pp. 6–8 and 48.
been expanded to deal with the uses of historic present, imperfect, aorist, and perfect, and noted the presence or absence of the pluperfect (’Parthenius’, 276, 290–1). In the commentary, some uninteresting words are glossed (p. 233 καταλληλάται; p. 271 μὲν ἔτη; p. 292 φύλεται) and more interesting oddities or cruces insufficiently examined (e.g. in the problematic last sentence of 42, p. 292, what does ἐπὶ τὸν δόντα mean, and what does it go with?). Too often B. is content with inert reproduction of LSJ;4 more use of the TLG was needed, especially for investigating Photius’ own usage elsewhere.5

The text, however, is solid, and the critical apparatus – though, being positive, it is less streamlined than Jacoby’s – is much more informative than either his (’half-hearted’ was Henrichs’ comment on his edition) or Henry’s for Les Belles Lettres. B. adopts conjectures that Jacoby does not, and has one or two of his own (no. 10 Ἀνθέμιοντος for codd. Ἀνθέμιονος, no. 41 <πόλεως> or <κτισεως> in the title). He reports many more conjectures and the readings of the two veteres (including minor corrections). Jacoby used the collations of Martini, while B. has worked directly from microfilms of A and M. His labour inspires confidence, but since I do not have access to photographic reproductions of the manuscripts I cannot say for certain that where they differ (I do not have room for a list) it is B. who should be credited.

Space also precludes discussion of each story. Much of the commentary is devoted to the summary of variants, but there are also very interesting notes on individual curiosities (consider e.g. pp. 47–8 on βιβλαδάριον; 92 on blinding; 184–5 on the symbolic offer of earth and water to the colonist; it would have livened up the discussion of no. 22 to note that, although they can sense vibrations, snakes are in fact deaf). Greek and Latin are usually left untranslated – which is admirable, but overdone when a passage quoted in full in the introduction is dislimbed in the commentary, and individual sentences cited all over again to illustrate a particular detail.5 References are in the anxious, maximalist style of the doctoral thesis, and might have been slimmer (Strabo 6.3.2 C 278; ps.-Apollodorus 3.15.2 [12.2]; Hesychius s.v. Τενέδιον βέλος (Τ 473 iv 144 Schmidt)). As far as I can see, having gestured at ’Parthenius’ in the introduction,4 he takes no notice of it in his commentary. I hope this was not because he wanted to rush his manuscript into print and thought it too big a job to revise in the light of my book, for it would surely not have been an enormous task, but worth it at least for those stories that the collections have in common (nos. 2,1 10, 23, and supplementary detail in nos. 29 and 41; Εὐκ. Πεθ. 7 is also

1 e.g. p. 146 ἐμπειρίζων; p. 328 ἔξενισσων (items cited in the same order as LSJ); p. 316 παρενεγράφωσος; pp. 341–2 υπεραναιοισιν.

For example, p. 225 reproduces Denniston on progressive ἄλλα καί: Hippocratic usage is beside the point, and the TLG would have brought up Bibl. cod. 18 p. 8α σαρκις πος καὶ σάρης εἶναι δοκεῖ, ἄλλα καί τὸ Νευτορίου δόρυ... υπεραναίης, p. 251 deals with ἄλλα and the genitive, referring to Passow–Crönert (not, incidentally, in the bibliography or list of abbreviations), but not registering that e.g. at Bibl. cod. 63 p. 24a the oldest manuscript has ἄλλα τοῦ ὀκεαίου νυμφαμμόνος λαοῦ.

2 E.g. pp. 149–50, and 155 (Piussianas’ story of Pamathes); 261 and 264–5 (Stobaeus’ story of the dishonest banker); 294 (ps.-Aristotle on the pious Aetnaeans). Other repetitions which cross-reference could have obviated: 114–15 and 161 (Dardanus’ foundation of Dardania); 189 and 198 (the original home of the Doriens).

4 Though he has not even made very adequate use of it there; what of the discussion of the manchettes (p. 31)? I am not sure that it is putting it quite right to say that the discovery of the fragments of Euphorion’s Thrax «shook» a former «assumption» that the manchettes were «accurate».

5 So he has little to say about the minority tradition of Byblis’ wanderings (p. 63) and does not discuss the location of her spring and the ἔπηχόμενοι who name it (p. 64).
relevant to Conon 16, and (Eq. Πσθ. 13 to Conon 31). B. does not cite, and I have not seen, S. Allegri, Storia e leggenda locrese in Conone, RAAN 53, 1978, 91–103, for nos. 3, 5, 18; R. B. Egan, Aeneas at Aineia and Vergil’s Aeneid, Pacific Coast Philol. 9, 1974, 37–47, for no. 46 (cf. p. 314).

Energy and scrupulosity like this have a welcome place; if B. is undertaking post-doctoral work, though, he has to pay more attention to presentation and prioritisation, to making the whole more than the sum of its parts. The book is written mostly in an extremely neutral academic register, though passim there are curious lapses into colloquial abbreviation which shouldn’t be there, aren’t appropriate, and don’t sound right. Infelicities (p. 152 «an accompaniment of wails») are counterbalanced by their opposite: I was taken with the image (p. 9) of Conon’s hand-picked stories «like bright shells found on the shore».

All Souls College, Oxford

J. L. Lightfoot


Der kaiserzeitliche Stoiker Epiktet litt lange Zeit unter einer sehr ungleichmäßigen Verteilung des modernen Interesses: Während die meisten humanistisch Bildeten seinen Namen und den Titel nach oder gar aus eigener Lektüre das von Arrian zusammengestellte Handbüklein kannten, war der phrygische Sklave in der Forschung stets ein Stiefkind.1 Dies scheint sich erst seit dem letzten Jahrzehnt zu ändern.2 Gleichwohl kann Long, den Lesern dieser Zeitschrift durch zahlreiche Veröffentlichungen als ausgewiesener Forscher zur antiken Philosophie bekannt,3 das Fehlen einer aktuellen und umfassenden («comprehensive») Einführung zu Epiktet beklagen.4 Sein Versuch, diese Lücke zu schließen, scheint nun beide Ströme des Interesses an Epiktet zu berücksichtigen, den Fachmann wie das breite Publikum, und bietet in der Tat einen umfassenden Ansatz, der formale Gesichtspunkte mit einbezieht.5

---


3 Das Literaturverzeichnis des vorliegenden Werkes gibt einen eindrucksvollen Überblick über sein Schaffen (286 f).

4 ix.

5 Das vorliegende Werk soll nach L. ein Buch sein «that would offer a sufficiently in-depth treatment in a manner that would attract new readers to him [...]» (ix f) und «that presents Epictetus in the round as author, stylist, educator, and thinker» (2f).