As a highly commendable complement to the magnificent volume by M. Patillon and G. Bolognesi devoted to the Progymnasmata of Aelius Theon in the Collection des Universités de France (Paris 1997), and in the same line of recovering less well-known rhetorical texts, such as Ars Rhetorica by Apsines (Paris 2001) or the Anonymous Seguerianus (Paris 2005), in editions that meet the current demands for quality, this volume has now appeared, again at the hand of the great specialist M. Patillon. It is devoted to the Progymnasmata of Aphthonius and Pseudo-Hermogenes and preceded by the anonymous Preamble to Rhetoric.

A general introduction, which on this occasion exceeds the works contained in the volume to refer to an entire «corpus of doctrine for the teaching of rhetoric», as the title of the first of its two parts reads, precedes the three texts, accompanied by their translation and notes, in turn preceded by their respective introductions and at the end followed by a common section of complementary notes, as is the norm in this collection.

This general introduction gives an account of the set of works contained in this corpus, brought together at the end of the 5th century and which, besides the pieces edited in this volume, comprises, to begin with, the two important treatises of Hermogenes that have been preserved (De statibus and De ideis) plus two others that have been incorrectly attributed to him (De inventione and De metodo sollertiae), according to the proposal made by Patillon himself. He explains the reasons for editing the set (its historical existence and the mutual complementarity of the pieces comprising it), the organization of the project, supposedly analogous to the one conceived some three centuries before by Hermogenes based on the inventory of the elements of discourse and the theory of their correct use, and the composition of the corpus, based on a nucleus of works that are the Progymnasmata of Aphthonius plus the four works by Hermogenes mentioned above. This nucleus would have been completed by the compiler of the corpus with a set of up to twelve pieces addressed to clarifying the doctrine and whose presence in the archetype of the corpus would in part be ensured by their relative dispersal among the representative testimonies and in part supported by the examination of their transmission.

According to this, the transmission of the block of texts on De ideis, with particular attention to the period between the appearance of the works and their entry into the corpus and to judge by the type of connections between several of the texts, would imply that they may not be the work of one writer, but rather four, these materials having been collected unevenly by the archetypes of our testimonies. From the information relating to the transmission of De inventione, P. believes he can distinguish the following consecutive events: around the first half of the 3rd century the treatise was written and De stat. and De id. were edited jointly; in the middle of the 5th century a corpus considered to be by Hermogenes and composed at least of De stat., De inv. and De id. was published; a commen-

---

tary on *De inv.* was written; *De id.* was published with the chapters disordered and *De id.* was published with new complements. The transmission of *De stat.* is the one most commented upon of the five principal treatises of the corpus, as early as the 3rd century and often polemically. It should thus not be surprising that a part of this material figures in our testimonies. Although P. recognizes that the transmission of *De method. soll.* requires a detailed study, for the time being he surmises that this treatise has been joined to the one formed by *De stat.*, *De inv.* and *De id.* by the person responsible for the corpus, and once it was made the users would not have wanted that treatise to remain without its commentary. Once the doctrinal corpus considered Hermogenean was made up, it is assumed that the same teacher who had compiled the four treatises, two of them authentic and two spurious, completed this nucleus by placing before it some prolegomena and a treatise on *Progymnasmata*, the one by Aphthonius, followed by two texts.

The second half of the general introduction is devoted to elucidating the traits of kinship existing between the testimonies. Although the restoration of the archetype of the corpus is facilitated by the large number of testimonies, as well as by the abundant indirect tradition for some of the treatises, the view of tradition is, nevertheless, inexact, to begin with because there have been numerous copies of the testimonies. A *stemma* of the most important groups comprises: an archetype represented by two families of testimonies, x and y, of which x offered the sequence of the main texts of the corpus and comprises two testimonies dated in the 10th century (Parisinus gr. 3032 (Ph) and Vaticanus gr. 104 (Vb)), another dated between the 10th and 11th centuries (Parisinus gr. 2943 (Py)), another dated in the 11th century (Vaticanus gr. 105 (Vk)) and another dated in the 14th century (Vaticanus gr. 1022 (Vt)). The *stemma* of the y family comprises: a hyparchetype made up of two manuscripts of the 11th century closely related to each other and to the archetype Vaticanus gr. 130, and the Ms. of Basilea gr. F. IV 19 (70); a hyparchetype made up of three testimonies from the 13th century (Vaticanus gr. 103 (Vd), Vaticanus gr. 106 (Ve) and Ambrosianus gr. 670 (Ad)) related to a partial testimony from the 13th century, Escuraliensis gr. 170, plus a testimony from the end of the 10th century (Parisinus gr. 2983 (Pg)); and a hyparchetype of great complexity and interest, marked out by three original corpora and witnessed by three main manuscripts: Vaticanus gr. 107 (Va), of the 12th century, Parisinus gr. 1983 (Pa), of the 10th and 11th centuries and Parisinus gr. 2977 (Pc), from the 11th century. In the 13th century, Maximus Planudes, based on Pa with alterations, wrote a more condensed doctrinal *summa* for teaching rhetoric that was highly successful to judge by the amount of copies. There are also four testimonies that have a contaminated text: Ambrosianus gr. 523, from the 10th century; Laurentianus plut. 60.15, from the 11th century; Monacensis gr. 327, dated between the 13th and 14th centuries; Ms. from the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid 4579, of the 12th century and restored in the 15th century.

From the review of the testimonies P. deduces that the corpus has seen very numerous and different editions, such that each of the texts poses specific editing problems, as can be seen in that of each one of the three texts that follow, whose presentation fits the characteristic schema of the collection. An *Added note* with clarifications of the composition of the Vat. gr 105, which we would expect
to find in this section, appears on pages 207–208 (one of which was left blank due to a typographical error) at the end of the edition of Ps. Hermogenes.

The introduction to the first of the three works edited, the anonymous *Preamble to Rhetoric*, deals with the following aspects: form, place and date, contents, dissemination and prior editions. The first section begins by locating the form adopted by this preamble, with its ten questions, as the oldest and most complex of the ones adopted by the prolegomena genre. Since the most ancient author cited in the preamble is not Hermogenes but rather Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the esteem of the former having overtaken that of the latter beginning in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, the inspiration of the piece seems to be older, towards the 2nd century, and originating in Athens; its author, however, is thought to be a pagan who lived at the latest in the 5th century in a region located to the east of Sicily and belonging to the Roman Empire. Since the contents of the text is a general introduction to rhetoric and the author’s attitude is described as that of a pedagogue of modest ambitions, the editor proposes to consider its contribution. In the first place he highlights its playful aspect, for attributing rhetoric with a divine origin, for the place conceded to the imagination, for the presence of etiological tales, sophisms, etymological games, with which the students could see language used as artifice in practice. Although its contents resort to a common theoretical background, from Isocrates to Gorgias and from Caecilius of Caleacte to Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, this does not mean that there is no room for innovation, as for example in the form adopted by the theory of the modes of rhetorical reading.

The *Preamble* was widely disseminated as part of the corpus and in its parallel posterity, and we can summarise the relationship among its testimonies in a *stemma* on which the present edition is based, principally on eight manuscripts from between the 10th and the 12th centuries, most of them already pointed out. Of these, Py represents a branch of the text tradition parallel to that represented by the entire tradition of the corpus, and the text of the latter in this section is given by the concordance between Ph (and/or Vt, of the 14th century) and y. Two branches of the text tradition, in particular the one transmitted by Ph, offer their own readings as opposed to those of the archetype, which, with no critical value for the establishment of the text of the latter, are collected in a separate apparatus throughout the edition.

The last section of the introduction briefly reviews the three prior editions of the text at the hands of B. de Montfaucon (Paris 1715), Ch. Walz (Stuttgart-Tübingen 1832–36) and H. Rabe (Stuttgart-Leipzig 1931), the last one based almost on the same manuscripts as the present work and modestly described by P. as «an excellent work... (from which) the text of the present edition differs little», and recapitulates the acronyms of the codices, although we do not understand why for some he refers the reader to the list given at the beginning of the introduction and for some he gives their meaning again here.

The central part of the book is occupied by the *Progynasmata* of Aphthonius. The introduction to the edition and translation of the text – which we shall review at the end together with the one preceding it and the one following it, given their common characteristics – occupies more than 60 pages and is divided into three sections, although it is the second of these that takes the lion’s share:
'Aphthonius and his work. Essay on dating', 'Comparative Theories of Aphthonius and Pseudo-Hermogenes' and 'The manuscript tradition and the editions'.

According to the first section, the title of sophistès given to Aphthonius by the Suda and by most of the manuscripts of his work, as well as the tone of a letter addressed to him by Libanius, make it likely that Aphthonius was the latter's disciple, and like him from Antioch in Syria, based on the indebtedness of Aphthonius' treatise to the exercises attributed to Libanius. P. assumes that, in the last quarter of the 4th century, Aphthonius taught and wrote texts related to his teaching, among them the Progymnasmata. The second section begins by tracing a brief panorama of the production of progymnasmatic theory, beginning with the four treatises preserved (those by Théon and Nicolaos, besides the two included here) from between the 1st and 2nd centuries and the 5th century, although its beginnings can be traced back to the 1st century B.C. (according to P.' Théon VIII–XVI, although there are papyri texts from the Hellenistic age with exercises of this type that lead us to think that the theory may have been implemented earlier). Théon is especially valued as a representative of the theory in its beginnings (as opposed to M. Heath's proposal in GRBS 43 (2002/3), 139–160), Nicolaos gives an illustration of the subsequent evolution of the discipline, and the teachings of Pseudo-Hermogenes and Aphthonius distance themselves those of Théon to become closer to each other. A very detailed picture of the traits of the contents of these two treatises gives us an idea of the many points of affinity between them, as well as their divergences. These points are later broken down throughout the forty pages of the explanation of each one of the progmnamsmata, an essential part of the teaching programme of a long period of Greek tradition that pursued three essential objectives: the acquisition of oral and written discourse, the acquisition of culture linked to readings and literary models, and the learning of oratory discourse and its genres and parts, while at the same time trying to transmit moral values. The explanations that P. offers for each of the successive progmnamsmata are not in any way redundant with respect to their subsequent translation, but rather their function is to summarise something that we are missing in the succinct theory of each of the exercises, which is the role of the teacher in their practice. In reference to the 'parallel' (parallèle, a term that seems rather inappropriate for the translation of synkrisis or comparatio), it is said that, apart from its possible use in the commonplace or encomium, it can give rise to a complete confrontation of two objects considered under different aspects, prolong the training in the amplificatio and thus it is useful as preparation for rhetoric, which is why it entered the progmnamsmata programme early on. However, it is surprising that no mention is made of the important role played by this exercise in the education of the future writer; without going any further we can recall Plutarch's Parallel Lives. A reference to this same aspect is also missing in relation to the exercises that come later and that begin with nothing less than the ethopoeia and the ekphrasis, both so widespread in literature; of the four it is said that they approach particular aspects of political discourse and are counterpoised to the former ones in that they are designed to develop the parts of legal discourse and in one case (that of the encomium) of the epideictic,

although it is true that later, when dealing with each of these exercises, he defines them as essentially literary and cites Theon's theory which confirms it.

The third section of this introduction begins by pointing out the particular status of Aphthonius' treatise, owing to its pedagogical success, in the set of manuscripts that transmit it together with other pieces of the corpus, an interest that is demonstrated by the hundred some testimonia that transmit it separately beginning in the 14th century and confirmed by the hundreds of editions printed in the 16th and 17th centuries. Starting with the idea that when a rhetor decided to copy a corpus, he was already familiar with Aphthonius' text as a student and perhaps as a teacher, in a tradition that may have been different from that of the copy model, P. tries to explain certain coincidences and divergences among the testimonia and how the editing principles suggested by the *stemma* should not be applied without precaution. He then points out the indirect tradition of the treatise, identifying it in the first place with its commentators (John of Sardis, first half of the 9th century; Doxapates, 11th century), and among the many editions of the text he highlights the following ones: the *ed. princeps* (Venice 1508), that by Walz (Stuttgart-Tübingen 1832–36), that by Spengel (Lipsiae 1835–56) and that by Rabe (Lipsiae 1926), the first critical edition properly speaking.

The introduction to the third of the three texts edited, the *Progymnasmata* by Ps. Hermogenes, is divided into four sections devoted, respectively, to: 'Author, date and contents', 'The manuscript tradition', 'The indirect tradition', 'Previous editions'. The first of these begins by clarifying how the treatise did not form part of the corpus and this offered it as a complement, the same as the compilations contained in the manuscripts Ph and Pg, from the end of the 10th century, and John of Sardis, some fifty years earlier; however, since the 6th century the *explicit* of Priscian's Latin version and the scholia attributed it to Hermogenes or to Libanius. The position favourable to Hermogenes, which P. considers suspect, would be explained by a tradition that holds him as the author of three treatises – *Progymnasmata, De statibus* and *De ideis* - and which can be found already in the prolegomena transmitted by Py, written more or less in the same era when our corpus was compiled. The attribution to Libanius is not surprising if we think of a continuity between this treatise, Libanius' practice and the treaty of his disciple Aphthonius, which, far from any attribution to the master, would point to the midpoint of the 4th century as the *terminus ante quem* of the treatise, and its quote of Elius Aristides would point to the middle of the 2nd century as the *terminus post quem*. After warning us how everything that was said about the clarity of the pedagogical programme contained in Aphthonius' related treatise can be applied here, P. points out how this other one is addressed to the students, which explains its search for clarity by means of examples, its eagerness to clarify the method, its insistence on practice, and its limiting itself to the essentials, without skimping on literary qualities when necessary.

According to the *stemma* designed by P., the manuscript tradition of the text comprises the following: the hyparchetype made up of Ph, Pg, both from the end of the 10th century, and the *deteriores*; the hyparchetype made up of Laurentianus, Plut. 60.27, from the 14th century, and Bourges 383 (322), from the 15th century; the Latin translation by Priscian, which gives access to the Greek text from the beginning of the 6th century and represents a separate branch of the
tradition, originally forming part of a school set of three works destined to collaborate in the Roman cultural renewal by means of the dissemination and application of the fundamentals of Greek rhetoric. With respect to the indirect tradition, if, as seems probable, the uses of the treatise in the commentaries on Aphthonius by John of Sardis have one same source, it could be thought, with P., that this one, as well as the one used by John Doxapatres in his commentary, represent traditions independent of the two archetypes indicated and of Priscian’s model. The previous editions are the following: the ed. princeps (by A. H. I. Heeren, Göttingen 1791–92), the London edition (published without the name of an author in ‘The Classical Journal’ of 1812–13), the edition by Walz, the one by Spengel and the one by Rabe (Lipsiae 1913), described as excellent and of decisive progress since it is based on the whole tradition and its main testimonies, differing from the present work only in the application of the editing principles.

The critical apparatus is restrained but sufficient. It is clear and easy to read, and, unlike that of Rabe, it is positive in the sense that it again expresses the text chosen and the lessons that diverge from the consensus of the tradition but which are possible and those about which the manuscripts are divided between two options. P.’s choice generally coincides with that of most of the codices, although on occasion he does not hesitate to side with a minority option or with one of Rabe’s conjectures (Preamble 3.36 διηνύσθω instead of δεικνύσθω, 4.1 ἐλέγομεν instead of ἐλέγχομεν) if it seems more intelligent. However, although he confesses that he follows Rabe closely, the latter is more conservative; once in a while P. makes a conjecture, often not at all preposterous (such as in the Preamble, 1.8 τίς ὑπὸ ὅρος, for whose justification, nonetheless, besides referring to 10.1 he could just as easily refer to 1.8–9 τί τὸ τέλος...τί τὸ ἔργον), sometimes more arguable (as in Preamble 2.14 τοῦτο...τῷ instead of τοῦτο...τὸ of the codices; Aphth. Progymn. 4.4 λαμπρὸτατος instead of -ον of the codices).

The translation is very precise, fitting and fluent and elegant enough to permit an autonomous reading, which is not to be underestimated in this type of pedagogical text that seeks to be clear and enjoyable at the same time.

The notes maintain the tone of sobriety and functionality that characterises the entire work, dealing mainly with textual issues, or else with the theory or history of rhetoric, and are roundly completed with the final fifty pages of complementary notes. The latter, along with the notes of the introductions, also echo most of the pertinent bibliography: it would be useful, however, for the norms of the collection to devote some pages to a bibliographical listing.

Apart from the minor points we have mentioned, there is little to object to regarding the painstaking presentation and execution of this first volume of the Corpus Rhetoricum that Prof. Patillon plans to edit. We can mention a few errors or errata – the omission of Report d’accusation on p. LXIII, créées p. 62, ETHOROIIA instead of HTHOROIIA p. 89, Litteratur p. 176, a few small mistakes in the use of Spanish: Bibliotheca real Monasterio...p. XLVI (sc. Real), Biblioteca nacional (sc. Nacional) p. LXXII, or the use of the acronym Sc to refer to a manuscript not from the Escorial but from the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid, Τεόν (instead of Teón) p. 49, or a small mistake in punctuation in the Greek text, p. 135: , Μόνη... – which do not at all detract from the exquisiteness of this useful reference work which is absolutely essential for any study about the im-
Fortson geht in diesem Buch mit einer neuen Methode an die metrischen und stilistischen Phänomene des plautinischen Korpus heran: Neben dem Instrumentarium der Klassischen Philologie bedient er sich insbesondere auch der Werkzeuge der Linguistik und der generativen Grammatik. Dazu sei gleich eingangs vermerkt, daß der Rezensent mit der Linguistik, vor allem aber mit der generativen Grammatik wenig vertraut ist, seine Besprechung also vornehmlich vom Standpunkt des Klassischen Philologen her erfolgen wird.

Ein dem Autor wohl bewußter Mangel des Buches, das sich vornehmlich mit metrischen Problemen befaßt, liegt darin, daß F. das neue Standardwerk Cesare Questas, La metrica di Plauto e di Terenzio (Urbino 2007), nicht mehr einarbeiten konnte, sich also auf die jetzt veraltete ‘Introduzione alla metrica di Plauto’ dieses bedeutenden Gelehrten stützen mußte. Der Rezensent berücksichtigt die von ihm behandelten metrischen Phänomene. Dabei beschränkt er sich klug, auf die jambischen Senare und die trochäischen Septenare, da die Gesangsverse z.B. bei Jambenkürzung (IK) anders zu beurteilen sind. Leider finden sich bei den diversen Skansionen immer wieder ärgere Mängel, eine Tatsache, die angesichts der Hilfe bedeutender Gelehrter (z.B. Lucio Ceccarellis) ein wenig verwundernd. Von einigen Fällen wird noch die Rede sein.

Im 1. Kapitel (Preliminaries, 1ff) postuliert F., daß die archaischen römischen Dichter im wesentlichen die griechische Metrik übernahmen und weniger auf der italischen Tradition aufbauten. Eine unbestreitbare These des Autors ist, daß sprachliche Eigenheiten der Umgangssprache seiner Zeit die Metrik des Plautus bestimmten, ‘the patterns of word - placement’ seien also ‘epiphenomenal, reflecting the allowable rhythms of natural speech’ (4). Das Sprachmaterial sei in ‘prosodic domains’ strukturiert, getrennt durch ‘prosodic breaks’ (5). Der kurze Abschnitt über die Überlieferung des Plautus (1ff) ist unbefriedigend: Den ambrosianischen Palimpsest datiert man jetzt ins 5. Jh., die Entzifferung durch W. Studemund ist die einzig maßgebliche, nicht die der Editoren der Großen Teubneredition. Die Codices Palatini stammen von einem gleichzeitigen

2 Gelegentlich schleicht sich ein jambischer Septenar ein, ohne daß dies extra vermerkt würde (z.B. S. 224f)
3 Diese hat aber vor allem beim versus quadratus einen unlegibaren Einfluß. Auch die Strukturierung der Verse κατὰ πόδα statt κατὰ μέτρον dürfte auf italischen Einfluß zurückgehen (ganz anders aber F.).