nor in any other lesser ‘testimonium’, however, nor in the text-fragments, are we told anything substantive about the cause of the snake-bite which has poisoned both his body and mind so violently: was it a carelessness or a true offence in Chryse’s sanctuary when he guided the Greeks there, or a device of the gods both to punish that and still in the end to reward him with his delayed destiny at Troy? (Where are the gods in the play, except for Athena’s disguise of Odysseus and the very incomplete allusions to the prophecies of Helenus?) How was Philoctetes’ bitterness and stubbornness shaped by Euripides, so that he resisted the Trojans and then struggled against the revealed Odysseus’ ‘forcible persuasion’? These aspects of the play remain beyond conjecture.

‘Art and iconography’: M. gives these matters the most thorough possible discussion, whether as potential evidence for reconstruction or in their own right; this is the major theme of ‘Beiträge’ Kap. 4, 6–8, S. 71–97, 112–201, which treat respectively an Etruscan mirror from Castro, Etruscan funeral urns, the ‘Hoby’ cup, and a sarcophagus from Hever Castle, and of the methodological survey in Kap. 9, S. 202–10, ‘Der Philoktet des Euripides als Problem der ikonographischen Deutung. Umstrittenes, Unsicheres, Falsches’. ‘Beiträge’ has numerous photographs; they are supplemented by line-drawings in TuF, where M. both lists artistic representations among the ‘testimonia’ and fragments, and evaluates them in the commentary. Literary ‘reception’ also gets unprecedented space: everywhere in ‘Beiträge’, but especially Kap. 11, S. 258–308 ‘Philoktet in Rom’; and in TuF S. 72–82 M. gives the useful summary ‘Rezeption und Nachwirkung in der Antike’.

Lastly: I emphasize the astonishing thoroughness and acuity with which over many years M. has correlated all hard or potential evidence, verbal and material, and analysed other scholars’ ideas. He has constructed a plausible dramatic structure and continuum, especially of the play’s beginning. These two volumes are a remarkable resource, provided the user of TuF distinguishes between what is attested and what is speculative, and treats the latter with caution (especially M.’s own ‘supplements’, his S 1–36). The volumes inform about much more than the unique problems of Euripides’ ‘Philoktetes’ and the techniques (and duties) of a reconstructor approaching this or any other fragmentary play, for they illuminate too the tracing of a mythological tradition and its literary use.

Oxford

Christopher Collard


When Denis Knoepfler and Marcel Piérart invited scholars from several countries to the Colloquium ‘Éditer, traduire, commenter Pausanias en l’an 2000’, at the Universities of Neuchâtel and Friburg in 1998,¹ much work had already been done on that invaluable testimony of late Antiquity, and great expectations had

¹ Proceedings published under the same title three years later (Genève 2001).
been aroused by the publication of the first volumes with new translations and commentaries in two deservedly famous series, the Valla and the Budé.¹

As a matter of fact, one century of continued progress in archaeology had elapsed and claimed for the two great commentaries of Hitzig-Blümner and Frazer² to be replaced. The relevance of inscriptions and coins had already been demonstrated, most of all by Chr. Habicht.³ On the other side, the much vexed question of Pausanias’ value as a historian had been revised thanks to the publication of vol. XLIV of the Entretiens Hardt.⁴ Scholars also have now at their disposal an Index Verborum by V. Pirenne and G. Purnelle.⁵

Last, not least, a much better knowledge of the MSS. of Pausanias and their interrelation has been gained thanks to the work of Aubrey Diller.⁶ Some progress has also been achieved due to continued research made in MSS. containing only fragments, some of them apparently descending from another archetype. Most of them were written down in the fourteenth century, and are therefore older than the lost exemplar owned by Niccolò Niccoli Florentinus. Among these, pride of place must be given to Vat. Gr. 2236 and Na. II.2.32, which though already known to scholars,⁷ had not yet been subjected to a complete examination. As to the first mentioned item, Casevitz [C.], the editor of the book under review, published an important paper in 1979,⁸ showing that, although it contains only the beginning of Book III until 2.6, this is enough to demonstrate that it should henceforward be placed among the primary MSS. derived from Niccolò Niccoli’s lost copy. A few years later, F. Williams⁹ rightly claimed to have discovered a new branch of the text tradition, not only «older, by roughly 100 years, than the earliest MSS. of the complete text of Pausanias» but also offering better readings in passages from most of the Periegesis. At the same time, he collated Na with other miscellaneous MSS. and with the entries in the Suda and Planudes, and tried to reconstruct what he called ‘the Neapolitan collection’, comprising also Pal. 129, Darmstadt 2773 and Paris. suppl. Gr. 1194.

¹ By that time the Valla had published the first five volumes: Book I by Domenico Musti and Luigi Beschi (1982); Books II, III and IV by Domenico Musti and Marco Torelli (1991, 1991); Book V by Gianfranco Maddoli and Vincenzo Saladino (1995). On the Budé, which started later (1992), see this journal, infra p. 115 n. 6.
⁴ Genève 1996.
⁷ The first notice about Na II.2.32 had been given by Foerster in 1909.
Meanwhile, the already mentioned Colloquium in Neuchâtel and Friburg having taken place,1 scholars gained access to new developments of research conducted in different areas. Manuscript tradition and textual criticism were the subject of the first three papers, the very first one, by J. Irigoin, bearing the significant title ‘Les manuscrits de Pausanias, quarante ans après. Hommage à la mémoire d’Aubrey Diller’.2 Among other subjects, Irigoin deals with the possibility of Fa, not Fb (now F), being a primary Ms., as Diller, followed by the new editors and against Spiro, had suggested.3 Irigoin’s arguments find support, as he himself acknowledges, on historical rather than on philological or palaeographical data.

There is in the first series of the Proceedings, besides my own,4 a very important contribution by C., foreseeing the possibility of new data to arise out of a careful and complete study of new fragments and scholia.5 Leaving aside the many valuable archaeological and historical contributions to the same volume, let us emphasize that C. was already extraordinarily well equipped for preparing the critical edition of Pausanias he has been publishing with others in the Bude.6

In the present volume C. makes use of the principles mentioned above, quoting, for instance, a few scholia, though some of them just confirm the tradition, like συντόθθον <πν> (VII.2.7); on the other side, Ἀτάρνετας (VII.2.11), who now receives support from ΣβΠ, had been known as an emendation since Musurus, whose name ought also to be referred to.7

Another interesting example of the usefulness of scholia occurs in VII.22.1, where editors used to read πόλεις τελεύτης, according to L, where VP have πόλεις τελεύτης and F πόλει στελεύνης. Now, as C. points out, p. 195, the reading of L is seen to be in agreement with the scholia of VFP, περὶ Φυσίν πόλας.

C. also avoids adopting sigla like β for the consensus of VFP8 certainly in order to discard the idea that these codices are the only representatives of the oldest tradition, which has been superseded by discoveries made either by himself or by Williams (mentioned above). We cannot deny this is a possible solution, though only further research can prove it.

C. proposes several emendations suo Marte, some of which may command assent, some not.

---

1 This journal, supra, p. 113 n. 1.
2 P. 9–24.
5 ‘Sur les scholies à Pausanias et les fragments de Pausanias’, p. 33–42, where, as to the scholia, he points out (p. 33, n. 1) that no further work had been done on them since the publication of Hermes 29, 1894, 143–248, containing papers by F. Spiro, R. Reitzenstein and U. von Wilmowski-Moellendorff.
7 Let us remember that one of the advantages of some Mss. containing only excerpts, like Na, is to give support to modern emendations. See Williams (quoted above, p. 114 n. 9), p. 205.
8 For Book VII, L and M do not come into consideration.
For example, in VII.2.11, where the text says that an inlet of the river Maeander had turned into a lake by blocking up its entrance with mud, the reader is confronted with the unusual explanation ως δὲ ένοςης το τυφόρ καί ουδέτε ην θάλασσα. LSJ single out this example s.v. νοστέω as meaning 'the water became drinkable', which seems rather awkward. Sylburg suggested ένοςης, which could mean 'became unhealthy'. C. puts a negative before the verb and changes the following text, καί ουδέτε ην θάλασσα, into οδίδ ἦν έτι θάλασσα. Then in his commentary, p. 110–111 (which makes no mention of LSJ’s entry), he discusses several emendations which have been proposed up to now and argues for the inclusion of a negative, so that the meaning of the verb in such a context may become quite understandable. Nevertheless, it remains difficult to account for the ensuing disappearance of a negative coordination, as he himself acknowledges.

The same happens in VII.27.9, this time concerning a grove in Mysaeum, which is described as containing many trees, δένδρα ὁμοία τα πάντα. Such text did not look satisfactory to Schubart-Waltz, who proposed to add έμοητ after δένδρα, while Hitzig conjectured a lacuna, though adducing as parallels to his predecessors’ emendation I.21.7 and II. 24.6, to which C. now adds VIII.35.8 and particularly IX.24.4. Hitzig’s examples seem rather convincing and the two further instances given by C. do no more than confirm the probability of έμοητ being a common attribute of trees growing in a sacred wood. Nevertheless, although C.’s emendation is palaeographically much easier (ὁμοία instead of ὁμοίας), it does not seem to give, as he argues, ‘ein sens original sattzissantes’.

That VII.11.8 is a locus desperatus, nobody doubts, since έσωτερον does not make sense. In my own edition I followed Kuhn’s emendation, γρόνος. C. discusses the main corrections and tentatively suggests οὐδενί σύν νόει (p. 146–7), which is not impossible.

Further on, in VII. 17.10, δαίμονα διπλά έχοντα σιδηρότα, τα μὲν ὀνόμα το ἔδε αὐτὸς γιγανιμές. Siebelis’ elimination of αὐτὸς seems to me the easiest way to restore symmetry. Several other corrections have already been proposed. Now C. presents a new one, which consists of replacing αὐτὸς with αὐτό, the pronoun being supposedly a misreading of the circumflex, and gives as possible parallels to δε αὐτό II.29.2, IX.29.1 and X.12.3, though the two last instances come, as he himself says (p. 162), from quotations. On the other hand, in II.29.2 the context points to successive generations.

An unnecessary emendation is έγγεντο (VII.12.9) instead of έγγεντο VF έγγεντο P. Even without looking for parallels in other works of Pausanias, Book VII provides enough of them, for out of three occurrences either in the singular or in the plural. The Mss. reading is έγγεντο or έγγεντο (C. has έγγεντο in VII.15.10 without explanation).

On the contrary, the accentuation of Δεξιόμενός (VII.18.1) has now been shown to be preserved in V, so that the testimony of R Πα Vb is no longer needed.

Leaving other examples aside special mention must be made of the famous statement about the so-called Peisistratian recension (VII.26.13), which, as anyone knows, was first attested by Cicero, De oratore 3.157. Since Wolf and others, this has been a cornerstone for Analysts and almost every scholar concerned with the Homeric Poems. As to the passage in Pausanias, it states that Peisistratus έτι ην Κάρπες δεσποτήματα τε καὶ ἀλλάγος μην ομοίως μὴροξεί. In this sentence, Schubart-Waltz first inserted άλλα before ἀλλάγος, following the example given by Schaefer, Demosth. Leptin. p. 505, 13. This has been accepted by editors up to now. C. prefers to leave the text untouched, believing, as he says, that the Periegetes only intended to state that the Poems were transmitted else-

---

1 Although he only says qui primus Homeri libros confusos antea sic disposuisse dictatur ut nunc habemus. M. West in: Latacz (ed.), Homeri Ilias. Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena (München und Leipzig 2000), 29, n. 4, estimates that Ps.–Plato, Hipparchos 228 b still seems to be «das noch am meisten präzise und vertrauenswürdige unter den vielen Zeugnissen über eine ‘Peisistratische Rezension’ Homers».

2 Up to 1952, the paper by R. Merkelbach, ‘Die peisistratische Redaktion der homeri schen Gedichte’; RhM 95, 23-47 (also quoted by West) gives a full account of testimonies and interpretations.

3 Including M. Moggi, whose edition of Book VII was simultaneous with that of C.
where, and not only in Athens. But ἄλλα καὶ ἄλλης τοῦ reinforces the idea of the plurality of versions, and the parallel from Sophocles, O.C. 45, given by C. himself, is a good one.

A revised text with some good emendations of its own would be enough to commend this new volume. But it also provides a clear, readable translation by C. and Lafond [L.], based on the draft left by J. Pouilloux. Both editors have also to be congratulated on having provided a small list of equivalences for political terms.

L., who has joined the team of scholars working on the Budé Pausanias, is also responsible for a detailed commentary and for the prefatory ‘Notice’ dealing with problems of composition and sources of the book and with its approach to history, geography and religion, whereas C. writes about Mss. tradition.

In the field of archaeology much work is being carried out at the moment, particularly in the province of Achaea, where the Austrian Archaeological Institute and the Centre for Greco-Roman Antiquity of the National Research Centre have been conducting important excavations. L. has concerned himself in his publications not only with this ever increasing material but also with religious and geographical questions. The present commentary shows how familiar he is with the many problems he has to deal with.

More than a half of Book VII (one of the few which may be approximately dated, owing to the well-known reference to the construction of the Odeion of Herodes Atticus in Athens) is about History. In his ‘Notice’, L. succeeds in tracing its sources, not only Greek but Latin as well, and he feels equally well at home in an area which he proposes to call ‘une lecture historique du paysage’. He pays due attention to epigraphy and its relevance for emendations of the text (for instance in VII.5.3, p. 123), and is well informed about coins and about the results of recent excavations, such as the ones at the sanctuary of Tyche in Aigeira (VII.26.8, p. 236). His commentaries on Pausanias’ many descriptions of statues of gods and the meaning of their attributes are usually well documented.

See, for instance, his discussion about Apollo wearing sandals, with one foot standing upon the skull of an ox (VII.20.3–5, p. 185), where he refers to similar representations in the LIMC and suggests that comparison with coins described by P. Zanker, Augustus und die Macht der Bilder (München 1997) may indicate that such representations belong to the Roman period. Not so well informed does he appear to be in his discussion on the colossal head of Zeus at Aigeira (VII.25.9, p. 223–4, and VII.26.4, p. 231–3). Although he mentions the paper by B. Madigan, Hesperia 60, 1991, 501–510, without subscribing to his interpretation, he fails to refer to A. Stewart, Greek Sculpture (New Haven 1991), I, 221, and R. R. Smith, Hellenistic Sculpture. A Handbook (London 1991), 240, both of whom definitely ascribe the work to Eukleides of Athens.

A rich bibliography, a useful summary of Book VII and an ‘index siglorum’ (in which the reader will note the absence of the list of editions, for which he is advised to turn to Book I), maps, plans and indexes are a valuable complement to this volume.

In conclusion, this is an important addition to the Budé Pausanias, deserving to be recommended to students of late Antiquity, the more so as Book VII contains, besides geographical, religious and historical information, many hints about the authors’ attitude towards life and love in general (VII.19.3) and towards the Ro-
man conquerors and their behaviour to Greece in particular (the sentence of Vespasian in VII. 17.4 being an unforgettable one).

Coimbra

*M. Helena Rocha-Pereira*


Fra gli scarsi resti dei componimenti poetici in saturni le iscrizioni ci permettono di conoscere alcuni testi completi¹ e conservano anche i testi più lunghi (6 vv. di CSE 2 = CIL I’ 7 e CSE 3 = CIL I’ 8. 9; 8 vv. di CSE 4 = CIL I’ 10) e i più antichi, se è vero, come non credo ci sia motivo di dubitare, che l’elogium del figlio di Scipione Barbato (CSE 3) si può datare intorno al 230 a.C., cioè molto probabilmente prima dell’*Odusia* di Livio Andronico.² In più, i *tituli* in saturni si collocano in un arco cronologico abbastanza breve, ciò che ne fa dei documenti di straordinario interesse storico linguistico, oltre che letterario; e ancora, la presenza del ‘ciclo’ scipionico è di grande rilievo per ciò che riguarda l’ideologia aristocratica della media repubblica. Per questi e per altri motivi³ è di notevole importanza uno studio come quello di K., che, oltre a dare l’edizione critica delle iscrizioni, basata quasi integralmente su una nuova autopsia e accompagnata per ogni epigrafe da una fotografia (non sempre, purtroppo, di elevata qualità), fornisce un commento pressoché esaustivo da ogni possibile punto di vista.

La struttura del volume è semplice e chiara: nell’introduzione (pp. 13–23) sono rapidamente trattate le questioni relative alla ‘funzione delle iscrizioni’ (15–18) e al problema metrico del saturnio (18–23). Segue l’edizione e il commento di 16 iscrizioni, ordinate cronologicamente (23–197); otto di esse, il cui numero è preceduto da asterisco, sono considerate da K. ‘*Inschriften, deren Abfassung in Saturnischem Versmaß fraglich bzw. unwahrscheinlich ist*’ e sono in vario modo le più significative di queste categorie. Un breve paragrafo ‘*statistico*’ (199 s) sulle caratteristiche del saturnio precede tre appendici: la prima, su altre possibili tracce di poesia in saturni nelle iscrizioni (201–211), distingue varie tipologie, già rintracciabili nei *tutti* commentati, di testi che vanno considerati o composti in altro metro o commatici o prosastici. Per quanto breve, è importante perché vi sono segnalate pressoché tutte le iscrizioni per le quali è stata fatta l’ipotesi che fossero in saturni, in vari tempi e da vari studiosi (nel modo più largo da C. M. Zander). La seconda appendice (211–220) contiene un prudente e intelligente esame del *carmen aruale*; la terza (220–223) propone un breve commento dell’*elogium* di...

¹ L’unico di natura ‘letteraria’ è il cosiddetto auto epitafio di Nevio (ap. Gell. 1, 24, 2); è difficile dire se fosse una specie di epigramma monostico il verso dei Metelli contro lo stesso Nevio, *malum dabunt Metelli Naeuio poetae* (FPL p. 72 Bl), considerato il saturnio ‘modello’ da Cesio Basso, GLK VI 266, 7.


³ Ad es. le caratteristiche scrittore dei documenti, il fatto che siano rappresentativi della nascita dell’epigramma a Roma; che permettano un esame metrico per lo più libero da problemi critico-testuali (come non si verifica per i frammenti di tradizione indiretta); ecc.