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. periegete 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. Gow 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 (loqui 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 1980).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 9νη αξηστιον. This makes N.’s theme look less obtrusive than modern readers usually think. A detailed analysis of the evidence (XLIXi) proves that Schneider’s view that Apollodorus ‘iologorum dux’ was the principal source of N. 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-Kathiramby, 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. Toohy, Epic Lessons, London/New York 1996, 66.
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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, Nicandrian 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 δοκιμασθηκός (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: δὲ σωκράτης: ... πρὸς θωρακίαν τῶν ἄγριων καὶ ωφέλειαν ἐξεύρησεν writes Euteneius in his hypothesis (1. 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. (XCIIf.) 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 «disclaimed 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 ἐμφερέστα (p. 86, 13 [c]), in 184 it lends support to Morel’s μφατός, recorded neither in OSchn. nor in G–S, against ὁ’s μφατός and Τ’s μφάτος. Similarly, Τ’s τραμπέλιο (τραμπελεῖον., Eut.) in 873, accepted by Gow cl. Theoc. 1. 29, can safely be laid to rest because, among other reasons, it is unknown to technical literature. And 417 (chelydrus) εἰς μύρας ὑφήτα δήμιος ὁμώς becomes meaningful from Philumenos 25: «Il semble qu’il s’agisse de la mouche chaloptère 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, LXXVII., 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 ἱππαργης (345–353) should cite the name of its πρῶτος εὐφής (E. Lobel, ClQu 22, 1928, 114); p. CXL (and note on 248): βαφθοῦντο in HE 3028 is from Philetas of Samos; p. CXXIV: juxtaposed prosodic variations of the ὁος/ἥος 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 princes (Hollos [1990], 20 [e], 21 [h]) as well as Bullough’s refinement (ClQu 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 -σ or -ς elsewhere making position in arsis, J. CXXVIII) or two consonants (e.g. 147 ους, 279, αλ. χριστός, 128 θυρίζω, 716 γοος, 811 οικεῖος, 820 ξύλος (1357 η θήρ is an echo of Call. ΗυAp. 100). Noteworthy is also his tendency to end lines with a series of cohering monosyllables, 57 οὐκι ἐκ τοι νοτίωτός, 236 ὅ ... εἰς τὸ μέν ποιοῦ, 820. In 157 three successive dactyls have word-end at the princes and in the narrative 359–359 nine out of eleven lines have feminine caesura as against the 50–50 overall figure; p. CXXVII(a): J. cites Ther. 457 as the single violation of Naucke’s law. «The only other [sc. than Ther. 457] violation of Naucke’s law in Nicander is fr. 81. 3° Hollis (1990), 21 n. 40; CXXXI Plutarch’s commentary on N. (frs. 113–115 Sandb.) can be paralleled not only with his extensive commentary on Hesiod’s Works and Days’ (fr. 102), but also with his Αρίττου Ἀριστοτέλους (fr. 13–20). Apparently, he was primarily interested in the subject matter, De aud. poet. 165); p. CXXXVIII: the change of siglum from Ἡ 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 -εν, -ον, sim. sounds), enjambment (82–83 οἶνον / ... ἀνωτέρους, 191–193 λαγγα / ... ὅποτα / ... / πάντα etc.), ‘golden’ verses (102, 201, 671), versus tetracoli such as 66, 62, 100, 123, etc. or 434–435 where two successive tetracoli are separated by ἤ (in general, approximately 1/25 in N., like 1/27 in Aratus, see Hopkinson on Call. ΗυDem. 87), γυνώνια (for example, 44 λοιπάκες 42 δαξίβλεξ 44 ἱσσάθετα, 214 δούλος ... ὅποτα 215 πτίσσαν, confused word-order (247–248, 664–665, 830–832): 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 δε- 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 13th 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 Therica 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 OSchn.’s conjecture δέ (; τι) is actually transmitted by L. At 484 the codices read θάνατος τ’ ἐγέρε, not τ’ ἐγέρε (Gow). At 642 N. takes up Antimachean τόπος (fr. 135 Mat.): this is not OSchn.’s correction but the idiosyncratic reading of T (τοπος). At 820 JGSchn.’s conjecture άυπνος is actually transmitted by O.

In ‘Avant-propos’ IX J. evokes Apollo: ‘Fasse Apollon que ... j’aie, dans les divers cas où il est legitime 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 : λίθωις τε τω: the same variation in Od. 23. 193) καὶ ἐρυθας, apparently missing Dionysius Bassaricus’ direct imitation in ἑκ. 243 Livrea λίθας τε καὶ ἐρυθας 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 βλασφημον ... άμα, or 802 κακολαίδης : κακολαίδης 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 ἔλησινων (Ω: crucis adponit et ἔκκολομαν conciser Jacques) ἐξίσῳ ἔτος by wriggling in the sand1 is, of course, possible, cf. 204, ll. 21. 318–319 μην εὐτύχους / εἰλίπο

---


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
missing.

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 ob-
servations mainly to J.’s literary commentary:

59 polulogrefos: abs. hapax. Other absolute hapaxes not noted in the commentary are
310 poluostróboiv, 94° neorvúch. 116 In support of ἀνδρέας’ ἱππεῦ: (όν ἀν- T : -τις ἱππ- ὧς: ‘inflects on’) add Alex. 187 ἤμερης φαλλον ἱππεῦ. 212 ἄγετος J. refers to ‘Call. fr. 805, Nonn. [Dion.] 37. 68σ’. In fact, this is a Homeric hapax (ll. 18.519, see Leumann, Hom. Worter, 72), a Thessalian gloss according to Demosth. Bith. FGrH 699 F 10 (dialect
in N., J. XCVII). Call. employs this form in Hyph. 72; fr. 805 is inc. auct. (correct in
app. crit. 123). 223 ἀλατρῷ a reference to Call. SH 259, 23 (177, 23 Pf.) is surprisingly missing. μονος: ‘premiere occurrence chez N.’ is curious: LSJ Suppl. cite Aesch. fr. 78a. 29 Ract. 348 ὀ νῦν ... ἄποντις: J. cites Apoll. Rhod. 1.88 but cf. already Od. 16.120. 418 ἐπὶ πτηχι: cf. also, ‘Simon.’ PGE 688 Δύναμος ... ἐπὶ πτηχι. 508 παντοκάφως: -

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 (ζορχεῖ ... κέχαγε) ἐνοθήκας = «pour son odeur forte» which is exactly the meaning; in 127 κεφαλημένη ὄψης = «saoule de la nourriture forestière» («sated with the forest» G–S); in 187 οὖτ’ ἐπὶ δέχεται φαετίνης = «nulle trace de morsure n’apparaît»; in 720 τὸν δ’ ἐφεξῆς ῆπτ’ ... = «mais, au fond de leur orbite, les yeux ...». In the compressed 325 οὐκ ὄψεις ἑπτεῖτεν ἄνεμον = «car c’est tortueusement qu’il tend son extrémité comme le reste de son corps»; similarly, in 756–757 τοῦ μὲν ὄψεις ἑμπώγιον ἄρτι πηγὶ δέχεται χόρτον / φλέστηνα = «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 περὶ means ‘tout le corps’, not «exceedingly» (G–S p. 173); in 338 κρυώθη = ‘le cardia’ of the stomach as in 731 and, of course, Alex. 21, not ‘heart’; in 509 ἐπικατέστησε correctly rendered «à mentionner spécialement», as in LSJ Suppl. s.v. (2), not «let ... be commended». However, in 316 περὶ γῆρας ἀποτίευσε may not mean «la vieillesse presse» 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 σώκρατη περὶ σκυλῶν ἀποτίευσε and περὶ means ‘all around (their body)’ in Ther. 137 περὶ γῆρας ἀμέρας and 392. J. cites Il. 4. 321, 8. 103: in the first passage there is good evidence for ἀπότιευ, but we can not know what N. read; in neither passage περὶ; in 491 προξεύοντα = (on nomme) J., with the remark ‘interprétation inévitable, quoique sans parallèle’, «men call» G–S) perhaps means ‘men distinguish as’; in 504 (ἐνθετε δὲ χρυσότητα) καὶ κανείναι 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 528 (παντὶ γὰρ ἀορίστος ἄττω) τὸ μὲν (παντίκες ἐπικατούν) does not mean ‘aussi’, but modo homericus (Monro, Hom. Gr., 232) ‘wherefore’, as all ancient authorities understood it, Schol. b (200. 11 Crugn.) διὰ τούτῳ Καὶ διὰ τὸ τούτῳ Κ., Eut. 29. 9 Pastor. παντίκες, διότι ἄνεμον ἐπικατεύτησε as well as Carm. herb. GDRK 64. 120–121 κελλέρωσε παντίκες, ἐπεὶ ἐν ο-α-ν’ ... / ... παντὶ, cf. 1Antim. fr. 15 Mat., 4Arat. 27. In 693 ὄφω βίος is translated «de sel divin» («with holy salts» G–S). ‘Bright, shining’ might be more appropriate, as when ὀξύς applies to the sea (Cauliff, Lexicon Hom., 96 s.v. 2a). Salt water was dried up in the sun, Alex. 516; In 782 βοσκάτα (νηπίν) is rendered as «bien nourri» (cf. Od. 17. 558 γατεύτα βοσκάτα), but δὲ γέρω in the next verse suggests ‘greedy’ as is probably the meaning of Alex. 228 βοσκάτας χειρός (LSJ Suppl., correcting LSJ ‘feeding, fed’ after Gow (1911), 99). The Schol. provide both explanations, βοσκάτερην Κ ... ἄφησεν βιτ. (Descript.); in 828 βοσκάτος χειρός (LSJ Suppl., correcting LSJ ‘feeding, fed’ after Gow (1911), 99). The Schol. provide both explanations, βοσκάτερην Κ ... ἄφησεν βιτ. (Descript.).

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.

There is little reason to cite the Hom. Epimer. from Cramer’s Anecd. gr. ... oxon. (1835) when Dyck’s edition is at hand (1993; test. 188: AO 1. 332. 19 = 0 164 Dyck), Eratothenes Geogr. from Bernhardy (1822: «a pioneer work, now mainly of historical interest» Fraser, OCD, 554) instead of Berger (1880; p. 175, eleventh line from bottom: fr. LXXX Bern. = IIIB, 195 Berg.), Theon of Giese (1867) instead of Guhl (1969; test. 613: fr. 46 Giese = fr. 3 Guhl), Aristoph. Byz. from Nauck (1848) instead of Slater (1886; p. 208, on 752: fr. 90 N. = 345 S.), Moeris from Pierson (1759) instead of Hansen (1998; p. 251 [2]; p.
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:

P. XX n. 27: in ‘Hülsen RE s.v. Amerias 1827’ add the RE volume (L.2). Do the same for the DNP volume on p. 198, 3rd line from bottom (vol. 117); p. XVIII n. 206 fin.: In το φύτητα a misprint for το Φύτητα; CLXXXVII, last entry: for «Παπαθυμοσύνος» read Παπαθυμοσύνος (same mistake in Touwaide [1998], 177); CXCVII s. Soph. Aj: add ‘ed. G. Christodoulou’; note on 97: for ‘Notice p. 00’ read ‘Notice p. CXXVII’; p. 79 (4) note on 14: for ‘ἀπό χορυάζω’ read ἀπό χορυάζεις; ibid. 6th line from bottom: for ‘Callimaque 2. 265’ read Callimaq1e 3. 265’; note on 35: for ‘Call. fr. 54’ read ‘Call. fr. 614’ (quoted by Schol. Ther. 352: same mistake in Crugnola); app. crit. 104: the reader is referred to a «gall. add.» which is not; text. 129 fin.: for ‘Christodoulos’ read Christodoulou’; note on 156: for ‘Mirabilia (846β 14)’ read ‘M. (846 β 14)’; test. 157: for «Επιμηκύνσιον» read ‘Επιμηκύντιον’; note on 254: indent δὲ νοτον; p. 116, 6th line from bottom: for ‘v. 31 s.’ read ‘v. 316 s.’; note on 346f.: for ‘amplifications’ read ‘amplifications’; test. 367f.: for «EG» read ‘EG’ (correct in test. 412f.); p. 135, note on 436: for ‘cf. 244 et la n.» read ‘cf. 236 et la n.»; note on 437: for ‘homerique’ read ‘homerique’; note on 457: for ‘ἐποδραξίζει’ ter read ‘ἐποδραξάζει’; app. crit. 641: for ‘08’ read ‘06’. Misprints in the text such as 104, «πολυπτυχον καλέσταται» (πολυπτυχον τε καλέσταται Gow) or 928 ‘ὁ θυμούν ἀσκοδέτης’ (ὁ θυμούν, ἀσκοδέτας δὲ Gow) might indicate that the text was first printed as in G–S, on which basis corrections and alterations were brought about.

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 now 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, 658, 810, 812, 817 [wild], 869, 944) but in many others.

A palmary correction to Hsch. α. 2262 is in test. 197f.: τίνιδετι (‘h. e. αφθαρσία’ Latte, but ‘lege ανδεῖα J.’), EtG’s text is twice improved in a single entry (test. 262 s. ψυφοφωρία), there are two conjectures in Philumenos on p. 136 (c) and a correction on p. 170, line 1. 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 (2a). Future editors of these texts will have to take these into consideration. The Scholion (e.g. 750, 892, 933) and Eutecnius’ paraphrasis (for instance, 278) are scrutinised as never before to extract variants. Keeping the optative in 341–342 τὸ πόσον νησίς / ἀμφοτέρων ἐγερμένην (οὗ, fort. 31. : ἐκείνης T [OSchn.]: ἐκείνη τε Gow) shows thorough research and sound judgement explained on p. CIX.

---

1 Cf. Crugnola, Scholia ..., 31. A first attempt was made by A. Golonna, 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, 440).
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) 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


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 (ἐλλήνικος). Wohl gemerkt, nicht Hellene, auch nicht hellenisierend, sondern hellenisch», sagte er oftmals. 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.
