of Athenian law, continues in fourth century forensic discourse. Finally the other major interest of Antiphon is «truth and its relation to words and deeds» (176). The surviving fragments of 'Truth' only hint at what form the discussion might have taken but they at least suggest that though «truth lies in the correspondence of word and deed, correspondence does not yield a single, unequivocal truth» (176). A discussion of the relation between words and deeds and truth can also be found in the Tetralogies and in the forensic speeches. In this case the line of continuity drawn by G. seems clearer.

In the end G. concludes that the main influence of sophistic thinking was not on later thinkers but on the new genre of public discourse, forensic oratory. And in that Antiphon «deserves more credit than he has received as the pivotal figure between the intellectual achievements of fifth-century sophists and fourth-century politicians and logographers» (182). This may be true but to make his case more convincing, G.’s conclusion needs to explore this point more fully than he has, offering more parallels between Antiphon’s works and later fourth-century oratory. This may be the only weakness in an otherwise highly accessible treatment of Antiphon.

University of Winnipeg

Craig Cooper


This is how a former editor of Nicander put it: «Some day, it may be, a better Greek scholar and more skilful emendator than I will summon to his aid from among scientists familiar with the Levant a botanist, a herbalist, a herpetologist, and an entomologist, empanel for consultations a small body of medical men who have practised in the Near East, and produce an annotated text and translation of Nicander». Gow ([1951], 95) was well aware of the severe requirements to do the job properly – and he was right in everything except that it took a smaller number of people.

The history of the editions of Nicander of Colophon is quite straightforward and, until recently, frustrating. The first edition worth speaking of was that of


1 'de Corcyre' consistently in the Les Belles Lettres site by confusion with the late 15th cent. periiegete Nicander of Corcyra who was edited for the Les Belles Lettres by J.-A. de Foucault in 1962.
Otto Schneider (1856), necessitated by the discovery of the most ancient, if lacunose, direct witness of the text, the Paris. suppl. gr. 247 (II; T ap. Jacques, whom I reluctantly follow henceforth). After a gap of almost a hundred years A. S. F. Gwof and A. F. Schofield published a «first-aid» edition (G–S, Preface xi) which made use of two scanty papyrus fragments unknown to Schneider and advanced a fair number of emendations, but one that relied on Schneider’s apparatus and reproduced its errors. Ignazio Cazzaniga never published his edition of Nicander which was apparently far advanced at the time of his death, although his approach can largely be reconstructed from his extensive publications. Recently, Konstantinos Oikonomakos put out an edition of the Alexipharmaka (Athens 2002) based on a fresh and thorough collation of the manuscripts along with a volume of Prolegomena; another edition has been announced by Alain Touwaide ([1998], 152 n. 3 fin.).

J.-M. Jacques has now produced the second of a long-awaited three volume project: the first will contain a general introduction (including a discussion of the who is who question) and the testimonies, the third the Alexipharmaka and indexes. After a lengthy introduction (CCVIII pp.) J. produces the most reliable text of the Theriaca available, equipped with a triple apparatus (loci similes, testimonia, apparatus criticus preceded by a note on the manuscript sources) and a double commentary (linguistic and technical). A translation in French faces the Greek. The book concludes with an edition of the iological fragments predating Nicander, which are essential to the understanding of the poem. Readers familiar with the G–S edition can not but acknowledge that the volume constitutes a considerable and in certain aspects definitive progress in editing and comprehending Nicander. The wealth of information it contains will become fully useful when the project is completed and the indexes are published. Part of the introduction and of the technical commentary makes use of the author’s thesis ‘Nicandre de Colophon, contribution à l’étude des rapports entre la poésie et la science à l’époque hellénistique’ (Paris 1986).3

The ‘Notice’ falls into three sections. In the first the Theriaca are treated as scientific poetry. Here J. eradicates long-standing misapprehensions stemming in Schneider and then reproduced innumerable times. By placing the poems into their historical context the author stresses the liaison of royal courts and the so-called ἐθνικὸς. This makes N.’s theme look less obtrusive than modern readers usually think.4 A detailed analysis of the evidence (XLIXf.) proves that Schneider’s view that Apollodorus ‘iologorum dux’ was the principal source of N.3 is

1 ‘Müstergültig’ for W. Kroll, RE XVII.1 (1936), 265, but «this scholar’s work upon Nicander can hardly be considered equal to his work upon Callimachus» for Lloyd-Jones (1954), 233.
3 «Preliminary studies indicate that ... [it] will be of high quality» H. Lloyd-Jones, StudIt 3rd ser. 2, 1984, 54 = Acad. Pap. II, 233; «Jacques’ awaited study ... will be fundamental» Davies-Kathirithamby, Greek Insects, London 1986, 15 n. 49.
4 However, even in modern times, «little books on dangerous snakes and spiders ... do a roaring trade in Australian popular book-stores» according to P. Toohey, Epic Lessons, London/New York 1996, 66.
an erratic simplification which led to unfortunate hyperboles. The non-iological references to an Apollodorus in the scholia are hardly attributable to Apollodorus the iologist. Here, at long last, Nicandran scholarship reaches the conclusion that Aratean scholarship had reached before Hipparchus (and rediscovered recently) concerning Aratus’ dependence on ‘Eudoxus’. Another misapprehension relates to N.’s alleged ignorance of the material he treats in his iological poems. Again, Cicero’s pronunciation on N.’s Georgica (De orat. 1. 69 hominem ab agro remotissimum) with which Schneider’s edition opens (p. 1), exercised a misleading influence on Schneider and ensuing scholarship. To the dilemma ‘poet or medic’ J. replies ‘both poet and medic’, as the ποιητής (Athen. 2. 126b) that N. was. Related to this is the perception that N.’s receipts have no practical value because they do not always prescribe dosages and because they employ language obscuring rather than facilitating comprehension of the content. With regards to the first objection J. points out (LVIII.) the liberty with which ancient iologists (and medics) treat dosages, leaving these to the authority of the medic bound to use the receipt. I would add that even if N.’s assurance that his poem will be useful and those heeding it will be well served (Ther. 45.) is a generic convention, ancient readers never doubted the practical usefulness of his poems: ὁ δὲ σωτός ... τρόχος σωτηρίαν τῶν ἁθρούσων καὶ ωφέλειαν ἔξευρη τῷ writes Euteneius in his hypothesis (3, 13 Paph.), Besides, scientific accuracy may account for the fact that it was the Theriaca, not poetry by e.g. Numenius or Petrichus that proved most influential. As for the second, J. (XCIII.) reminds of the Peripatetic doctrine (taken up by Callimachus and co) of the employment of glosses in epic and the oracular character of works of similar nature (e.g. Andromachus’ Galene). I would add that abnormal language is another means of avoiding falsification of the prescriptions (which might be one of the ends to which the poem owes its genesis, cf. Galen 14.113 K.) and that terminology or vocabulary from the Hippocratic corpus or iological literature looks less weird to the specialist to whom the work is primarily addressed. Another delusion concerns the (non existent for Schneider) influence of the poem on technical literature, which J. shows to be a matter of fact (LXII.).

One of the scholars responsible for the most widely used edition of N. had openly «disclaim[ed] any competence to deal with the scientific questions involved» in editing and interpreting N. (Gow [1951], 96). J.s’ acquaintance with technical literature proves beneficial in various ways:

In 79 it helps secure the correct reading ἐμφραχάς (p. 86, 15 [c]), in 184 it lends support to Morel’s νυσάτος, recorded neither in Oschn. nor in G–S, against ο’s νυσάτος and Τ’s μυσάτος. Similarly, Τ’s τηλεμάχος (; τηλεμάχος ὁ, Eut.) in 873, accepted by Gow cl. Theoc. 3. 29, can safely be laid to rest because, among other reasons, it is unknown to technical literature. And 417 (cheleodus) έξι μύσαντα ώριμον becomes meaningful from Philumenos 25: «Il semble qu’il s’agisse ... de la mouche chalcoptère qui se loge dans les écailles ... du Chélydre, et le tue»; contrast G–S, Schol. ad loc.

1 J. Martin, Aratos, Phénomènes i, Paris 1998, LXXXVII., raising the possibility that ‘Eudoxus’ follows Aratus.
Then the Theriaca are discussed as a work of poetry. For J. N.’s surviving poems (like Aratus’ Phaenomena, cf. E. J. Kennedy, ClRev n.s. 29, 1979, 71–73) belong to a distinct literary genre, the scientific poetry; poetry that is which develops point by point its specific theme and keeps faithful to its prosaic sources. The mythological, paradoxographic and geographical references are part of poetic embellishment. Particularities in the language and style of Nicander, his models, imitators and metrical practices receive detailed treatment. Some individual points can always be raised:

P. LVIII (superstitions), LXXXVIII (paradoxes): a good discussion on the evidence of N.’s fragments in P. M. C. Forbes Irving, Metamorphosis in Greek Myth, Oxford 1991, 28f.; p. LXXI: J. justifiably does not mention all that has been written on N., but a discussion on the acrostichic sphyragis (345–353) should cite the name of its πρῶτος εὐφυής Ε. Lobel, CILQu 22, 1928, 114); p. CXL (and note on 248): βασιλέως in HE 3028 is from Philetas of Samos; p. CXXIV: juxtaposed prosodic variations of the ιοκος ιοκος type have been studied by N. Hopkinson, Glotta 66, 1982, 162; p. CXXV: N.’s metre is Callimachean, but some Callimachean niceties are not discussed, such as the avoidance of spondaic words immediately after the masculine caesura when there is no bucolic diaeresis or that words of the shape – – and – – – seldom end the fifth princeps (Hollis [1992], 20, 21 [h]) as well as Bullough’s refinement (CIIQu n.s. 20, 1970, 258–268, including data on N.); p. CXXVI: P. Maas ap. RE XVIIA (1936), 261 observed that N. only once places a monosyllable in a sedes different than the last. I would add that N. displays a tendency to fortify the vowel by both sides with a double (as such I consider single – or σ/–ς elsewhere making position in arsis, J. CXXIIIIP. or two consonants (e.g. 147 ὀϑόνια, 279, αἰ. χαιρετέα, 128 θοῖς, θίνες, 811 οἰκίας, 820 ζηλούς) (357-η θός is an echo of Call. Ἅρωπ. 100). Noteworthy is also his tendency to end lines with a series of cohering monosyllables, 57 ἀργόν δὲ παῦει, 236 ἤ δ’ ἐπὶ οἱ οἰκίας, 617 τῆς δὲ τὸ μὲν ποιεῖν, 820. In 157 three successive dactyls have word-end at the princeps and in the narrative 39–319 nine out of eleven lines have feminine caesura as against the 50–319 overall figure; p. CXXVII(a): J. cites Ther. 347 as the single violation of Naecke’s law. «The only other [sc. than Ther. 457] violation of Naecke’s law in Nicander is fr. 813 3ο Hollis (1990), 31 n. 40; CXXXI Plutarch’s commentary on N. (frr. 113–115 Sandb.) can be paralleled not only with his extensive commentary on Hesiod’s ‘Works and Days’ (fr. 102), but also with his Αἰτία τῶν ἀρχιτέκτων Διομήτευν (frr. 13–20). Apparently, he was primarily interested in the subject matter, De monn. 165); p. CXXXVIII: the choice of siglum from Η to Τ for the Paris, suppl. gr. 247 is unhelpful, especially when it rests on inadequate grounds; CL: Mertens – Pack no 1326 date Π (P. Oxy. 3851) to the 2nd or 3rd cent.

The style of N. deliberately aims at causing shock and awe to the reader. «Il y aurait encore beaucoup à dire» writes J. in his discussion of the subject (CV). Here is a sample of what he could mean:

Sonority (38 resounds 17, 204, in 713 all words end in -ευ, -ον sim. sounds), enchantment (82–83 οὐδενό / ... ξυνύμιζε, 191–193 λαυγά / ... ὠς /... πάντες etc.), ‘golden’ verses (102, 201, 671), versus tetradoli such as 60, 62, 100, 123, etc. or 434–435 where two successive tetracoli are separated by ᾅ (in general, approximately 1/25 in N., like 1/27 in Aratus, see Hopkinson on Call. Ἀρωπ. 87), synonyms (tor example, 41 ὄροι ὄροι διὸ διόπελος 44 ὄροι οι οῖ, 214 ὄροι, ὄρος 215 πτησιν), confused word-order (247–248, 664–665, 830–831: a Callimachean trait, Lapp, De Call. Cyr. tropis et figuris, Bonn 1965, 35–39) and his paratactic style (it would suffice to mention that in 719–733 no less than eighteen δέ-connected sentences are lined up). On syllepsis cf. Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 2a. 39 (Add. vol. II, 104).
The third part of the Introduction discusses the constitution of Nicander’s text. This relies on two different manuscript traditions, the first being represented by a single witness (T), the second by twenty two manuscripts (plus five codices descripti) all going back to an hyparchetype (ω), which may be dated to the 12th cent. J. classifies ω into three groups (a, b, c) plus two unclassified ‘scholarly’ manuscripts one of which (M) was partly written by Maximus Planudes at c. 1280. Oikonomakos (2002), 67 gives an elaborate stemma for the Alexipharmaca, but for the Theriaca J. (CXLVII) considers this «une tâche absolument vain». The value of the principal manuscript (T), has been a matter of debate. Otto Schneider, for whose edition T was collated by H. Keil (Schneider [1856], 212), made an overenthusiastic use of it ([1856], 215 «codices omnes liber Parisinus Π non solum vetustate, sed etiam virtute superat») reflected, if not with equal fervor, in G–S 9 and 12 («the text of ω is markedly inferior to that of Π»). Cazzaniga reacted to the overrating of T and Touwaide wholesale condemned it as a paleobyzantine meta-text fraud with glosses which have crept into the text.¹ J. (CXXXVII–CXLVI) takes a moderate line: his exhaustive examination of this highly idiosyncratic manuscript confirms its credentials for the constitution of the text. Oikonomakos (2002), 68 draws similar conclusions for the Alexipharmaca.

This fresh attention to the manuscripts makes it possible to distinguish in a reliable fashion between manuscript authority and emendation. A few examples must suffice to make the point:

At 72 OSchm.’s conjecture δὲ (; τι) is actually transmitted by L. At 484 the codices read φίλα τέ έρει, not τ ν τέ έρει (Gow). At 642 N. takes up Antimachean τάχισσα (fr. 155 Mat.): this is not OSchm.'s correction but the idiosyncratic reading of T (τάχισσα). At 820 JGSchn.’s conjecture τάχισσα is actually transmitted by O.

In ‘Avant-propos’ IX J. evokes Apollo: ‘Fasse Apollon que ... j’aie, dans les divers cas où il est légitime de balancer entre plusieurs solutions, choisi chaque fois la bonne!’. Clearly the god has performed his duty with admirable diligence. There are a few cases in the constitution of the text where I disagree and a single one where I think that the god dormitavit:

At 150 J. prints λίθοις τε (Τ: λίθασι τε ο: the same variation in Od. 23, 193) καὶ ἑρμικας, apparently missing Dionysius Bassaricus’ direct imitation in fr. 243 Livrea λίθασι τε καὶ ἑρμικας which secures ω’s reading. For other imitations of N. in Dionysius see Livrea, Dionysii Bassaricon ..., Rome 1973, 15.

True, the transmitted text often inspires little confidence (for instance, 706 βλουρν ... αύμα, or 892 καιναλιδας : κυκαλιδας OSchn.) and corruption of various a type may be widespread. However, interventions in the text seem too bold when they rely only on parallels that may or may not relate to the point. Here is a selection of examples where I think that cleaning up operations are too thorough:

At 156 ἀλλαδόµενοι (Ω: cruces adponit et ἐξοψώνων conicerit Jacques) ἑρμικας by wriggling in the sand is, of course, possible, cf. 254, ll. 21. 318–319 μυ αυτων / ειλλων

J.'s technical commentary seems exhaustive and will become a sine qua non for any serious student of N. His literary commentary provides valuable material and opens up ways for future research. The following notes make scattered observations mainly to J.'s literary commentary:

59 πολυφρογενός: abs. hapax. Other absolute hapaxes not noted in the commentary are 310 πολύτροποιản, 940 νεαρόχρος. 116 In support of ανθρωπός: - ανθρώπου, ανθρώπον. 252 μέλαπος. J. refers to Call. fr. 805, Nonn. [Dion.] 37. 680. In fact, this is a Homeric hapax (Il. 8.15.39, see Leumann, Hom. Wörter, 72), a Thessalian gloss according to Demosth. Bith. FGrH 699 F 10 (dialect glosses in N.; J. XCVI). Call. employs this form in Hypp. 72; fr. 805 is inc. auct. (correct in app. crit. 123). 223 μέλαπος: a reference to Call. SH 259, 23 (177, 23 Pf.) is surprisingly missing. μέλαπος: 'première occurrence chez N.' is curious: LSJ Suppl. cite Aesch. fr. 78a. 29 Ract. 348 οὐ γὰρ ... άπονταν: J. cites Apoll. Rhod. 1.88 but cf. already Od. 16.120. 418 εν τοις ...: also, 'Simon.' PG 688 Δίονυς ... ὑπὸ τοις ... παραάδειξεν: - εισαγ. J. ill. Call. Hypp. 40, Carm. herb. 120, but cf. Dion. MM. MM 3. 51 (RV) παραάδειξεν. 3. 121 (RV) παραάδειξεν. 569 χρόνοι οὖν ὄντας, νέον (νέον Gow) δὲ ἄποντας [sc. χρόνος] ποιοῦ (ποιη Onch.; Ael. NA 5. 3) ἄπον τὸ τά ἐπιμεθυσκόντως καὶ οὕτω οἱ στάχ τινος ἐξαιτείας (and J.'s) text and interpretation. 593 πλησιάσασθαι: de πλησιάσασθαι. Jacques. Interestingly, Oikonomakos (2002), 196 omits away πλησιάσασθαι in Alex. 584. 617 εὔφρονες: add Leon. Tar. HE 2480 Εὐφρός εὔφρον ἔβλασσεν. But the sense is novel. 695 fest., EtG 1. 13: Μεσιάρδος for Μεσιάρδος also in EtG β 204 (EtM β 260), Epim. Hom. ξ. 45.53 Dyck and most probably in vita Arati iv (19. 8 Martin), cf. Schneider (1896), 11. 691 παραήλεξεν (J. :-εν T: παραήλεξεν) ἰδήν τι διάκρισιν τοις περὶ τὸν αὔριον τοῦτο. Apoll. Rhod. 1. 405 ἀλαζόνες ... καθότεραν ἀλαζόνες might lend colour to J.'s emendation. 862 ἀλεξάντος ... άποντας: the note on p. 242 is confusing. Hes. WD 464 is the locus classicus for ἀλεξάντος, but irrelevant to ἀποκεντ. Sophon PCG 165 and Euph. CA 137 (both quoted by the Schol.) relate to ἀποκεντούς but do not contain ἀλεξάντος. 865 οὐραδόμων: add its Dorian form in Theoc. 7. 138 οὐραδόμων. 912 πίνετε: for the middle Veitch, Greek Verbs ... , Oxford 1887, 538 cites also Hedly. HE 1837 διαπίστωμεν. 914 χρησιμού: «seul emploi connu de l'ind. pres.» J. (so LSJ) until EtM 814.12 s. χρησιμοῦ.

In poems such as N.'s even readers well versed in epic poetry will often need the help of a translation. J.'s lucid rendition succeeds in making explicit what is
implicit in N. by adding a critical word or phrase. A few examples must suffice (italics mine):

In 41 (Ievòv πειρατα) δινόθην = "pour son odeur forte" which is exactly the meaning; in 127 καροθυμήσας ήλις = "soule de la nourriture forestière" (= sated with the forest) G–S; in 187 οὐτά ἐπὶ δέχεται φαίνεται = "nulle trace de morsure n’apparaît"; and 720 τὸ δ’ ἐνέβαλε ὄμως = "mais, au fond de leur orbite, les yeux ...". In the compressed 325 σώματι γεγονός προτέτανται άραν = "car c’est tortueusement qu’il tend son extrémité comme le reste de son corps"; similarly, in 756–757 τὸν μὲν ήμως ἐμφανίζειν υἱὸν πειρά μέλη θάνατον / νοσήματα = "Cette bête n’en a pas moins une morsure douloureuse, autour de laquelle se répandent toujours des pustules".

In other instances (e.g. 278–279) J. breaks up N.’s long paratactic structure and in at least three cases he grasps the Greek better than his English predecessors. However, in a handful of instances I think that his translation (i.e. interpretation) has erred:

In 173 πειρά means 'tout le corps', not «exceedingly» (G–S p. 173); in 338 κρυδήνη is 'le cardia' of the stomach as in 731 and, of course, Alex. 21, not 'hearts'; in 509 ενδέχεται is correctly rendered «est à mentionner spécialement», as in LSJ Suppl. s.v. (2), not «let ... be commended». However, in 316 πειρά γίγας ὀπάζει may not mean 'la vieillesse pressé' or «eld attends mortals» (G–S, following the Schol.), but 'encloses, surrounds' so as to make a pointed contrast with the slough of which the snakes get rid. That is the meaning in Alex. 270 σώματι πειρά, ενδέχεται and πειρά means 'all around (their body)' in Ther. 137 πειρά γίγας ἀμέρος and 392. J. cites II. 4. 321, 8. 103: in the first passage there is good evidence for ιδιότητες (cf. *Antim. fr. 15 Mat.); in 504 (πέτος δὲ χρυσότητα) φαίνεται is translated «ont l’aspect», as is usually the meaning of this verb in N., but the context rather suggests 'shine' (Williams on Call. HyAp. 9); in 508 (παντὶ γὰρ άμοικός ἐστι) τὸ μὲν (πανίστασιν ἐποιοῦν) does not mean 'aussi', but modo homericus (Monro, Hom. Gr., 232) 'wherefore', as all ancient authorities understood it, Schol. b (200. 11 Crum.) διὰ τοῦτο ᾿ᾲδι διὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ᾿Κ, Eut. 29. 9 Paph. πάνε σοιου, διὸς ἀμοίκον ἐπιμέρισε as well as *Carm. herb. GDRK 64. 120–121 καλέσανεν παννέσιν, ἐπεῖ ι-ο-νθ... / ... παντὶ, cf. *Antim. fr. 13 Mat., *Arat. 27. In 693 ἄμοικος διοικεῖ is translated «de sel divin» («with holy salts» G–S). 'Bright, shining' might be more appropriate, as when θόος applies to the sea (Casilifte, Lexicon Hom., 96 s.v. 28). Salt water was dried up in the sun, Alex. 516; In 782 βουκότα (ὑπόφην) is rendered as «bien nourris» (cf. Od. 17. 558 γενότα βουκότα), but δὲ γὰρ in the next verse suggests 'greedy' as is probably the meaning of Alex. 228 βουκότα τατι κυράς (LSJ Suppl., correcting LSJ 'feeding, fed' after Gow [1911], 99). The Schol. provide both explanations, βουκότατα τατι κ... ἀδραμένων bm.

An ancient joke (Diog. Laert. 9. 113) had it that when young Aratus asked his alleged teacher Timon of Phlius where is the most reliable text of Homer to be found, Timon retorted that he should take recourse at the ancient non revised copies. In terms of modern scholarship this policy looks as eccentric as Timon was.

For a volume of just about six hundred pages the remaining misprints and errors of negligence are minimal. I quote these, as revised reprints are the norm with the Budé editions:


In the days, as it were, of fast-food scholarship there is a lot to appreciate in this volume and a lot that will last: foremost its scientific conscientiousness. J. spared no effort. His quotations of the largely unpublished EtG entries preserving N. comments as well as of the scholia rely on his own readings (p. XXI). Perhaps less judgement on the affinities and differences of EtG and the N.-scholia, which had to be suspended until proper publication of the EtG, can eventually be made.1 J. suggests numerous emendations and conjectures not only in N.’s text (see, for example, the appar. crit. in 328, 385, 410, 600, 617, 619, 618, 810, 812, 817 [wild], 869, 944) but in many others.

A palmary correction to Hsch. α 2626 is in test. 19f.: ταῦδέμευ (‘h. c. οὐδέμευ’ Latte, but ‘λεγε οὐδέμευ’ J.), EtG’s text is twice improved in a single entry (test. 262 s. φυσική), there are two conjectures in Philemonos on p. 136 (‘) and a correction on p. 170, line 2. There is an emendation in Eutecnius in test. 619, a conjecture in Menocrates SH 544. 1 in test. 708, a correction in Aelius Promotus on p. 211 (24). Future editors of these texts will have to take these into consideration. The Scholia (e.g. 750, 892, 933) and Eutecnius’ paraphrases (for instance, 278) are scrutinised as never before to extract variants. Keeping the optative in 131–132 tóσοι νηφίς / ομολόγον έχονεν ἐν τω (fort. 27: ἐξερήσις Τ [OShn.]: έχονεν τε Gow) shows thorough research and sound judgement explained on p. CIX.

1 Cf. Crugnola, Scholia ..., 31. A first attempt was made by A. Colonna, BPEC n.s. 4, 1956, 17–24. Similar questions arise, among others, between the EtG and the Scholia to Apoll. Rhod. (Wendel, Scholia in Apollonium ..., XIX) and Lycophron (E. Scheer, RhM 34. 1879, 450).
And the correction of τε into γε in 777 seems so patently obvious after someone has actually proposed it.

One would, nevertheless, prefer – on grounds of propriety – that comments such as those on Effe (LXVII n. 149) or Touwaide (CXXXIX n. 324)1 would be somehow differently formulated.

This new edition of Nicander lavishly lends the opportunity to rediscover an ingenious poet and provides a solid basis for further research. Our appetite has grown. We look forwards to the publication of the two volumes completing this project.

Rethymno

Konstantinos Spanoudakis


Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Poesie. 1.)


K. P. Kavafis ist ein Dichter mit tiefem, historischen Gefühl für die Kultur der Griechen jenseits der politischen Grenzen Griechenlands, für das Hellenentum. «Ich bin ... hellenisch (ἐλληνικός). Wohl gemerkt, nicht Hellene, auch nicht hellenisierend, sondern hellenisch», sagte er oftmals.4 Sein Hellenentum schließt das ganze hellenische Volk ein. Und es ist die Sprache, die diesem Hellenentum Kohärenz und Fortsetzung gibt. Die Sprache «nicht als tote, sondern als lebendige

1 «L’auteur de ce malheureux essai [i.e. Touwaide (1998)], truffé d’erreurs grossières, ne réussit qu’à montrer son ignorance de l’histoire des textes grecs, les lacunes de son information quant aux testimonia et aux parallèles scientifiques et poétiques de Nicandre, la méconnaissance de sa langue et de son style».
2 [Demetr.], De elocut. 222.
4 S. Sonia Ilinskaja, К. П. Калофитис. Οι δρόμοι προς τον ρεαλισμό στην ποίηση του 2000 αιώνα. Athen 19831, 226, vgl. auch G. Seferis, Δομάμε Α’, Athen 19741, 333.