illustre ed è bibliograficamente aggiornato, nei limiti del possibile per un argomento così vasto e così dibattuto; è al corrente dei problemi testuali relativi ad essi, e in un caso al recensore pare che abbia apportato un contributo di qualche peso per lo stabilimento di un testo controverso. La complessità delle analisi e delle argomentazioni con cui il lettore deve confrontarsi può lasciare aperti alcuni interrogativi, ma non è dubbio che esso complessivamente debba essere considerato un lavoro più che apprezzabile.

Bologna

Vittorio Citti


In 1988 the reviewer, with Dr D.C. Innes, published an apparatus criticus without a text;¹ twenty years on, Michael Weißenberger has published a text without an apparatus criticus. The text is that of an important and lengthy collection of treatments of controversia themes by an apparently fourth-century rhetorician, a corpus which has largely been ignored even by scholars interested in this somewhat remote area. That neglect was for a long time the result, in large part, of the appalling state of the text, which in Walz’s Rhetores Graeci viii (1835) was hardly more intelligible than it had been in the Aldine of 1508. In producing our own volume, we were well aware that we were only going part of the way towards remedying this sad state of affairs. One of our reviewers justly remarked that what was needed was «a completely new text, ... arranged in such a way that the reader can easily grasp the subdivisions within each διαίρεσις» (I. Rutherford in ClRev 40, 1990, 22). Meanwhile the «philologi Britannici», however «optime meritī», had, Weißenberger says, left readers sunk in deep water, for the result of their labours has been «ut Sopatri lectori duo nunc semper in manibus libros esse necesse sit oculique huc illuc assidue distracti citissime defatigentur» (p. 7). This calamitas (as Weißenberger dubs it) has been remedied to the extent that we now have, thanks to his labours, a proper text² (numbered declamations equipped with numbered sections),³ followed into the bargain by a German translation. It is only fair to say, however, that anyone who wishes to work in any detail on this intriguing text needs now to have not just two but three books to hand: Walz (Wa), Innes-Winterbottom (IW), and Weißenberger (We). As the reviewer has found, the absence in We’s text of frequent marginal indication of Wa’s page and line numbers makes this juggling act the more frustrating; and it does not help that the book refuses to open flat. Further, all that appears below We’s text is a

¹ Doreen Innes and Michael Winterbottom, Sopatros the Rhetor, BICS 48 (1988). Dr Innes kindly commented on a draft of this review.
² Two kinds of type (not quite as different as one might like) distinguish Sopatros’ own remarks from the ‘fair-copy’ extracts.
³ The numbering is by paragraphs, and they are sometimes very long (e.g. in No. 22). It would have much aided reference to the translation (would that it were en face!) if quite short subsections had been introduced within the longer paragraphs.
register of the places where he has added his own conjectures to a text conflated from Wa and IW. Only by constantly consulting Wa and IW can the reader tell what elements in the conflation are due to Walz, what to manuscripts unknown to Walz, and what to conjecture. The ordinary reader (if such a one ever strays this way) will be enormously grateful for what Weißenberger has done; but he (or she) must be warned that the text is a construction whose underpinning has to be (painfully) looked for elsewhere.

«Restat, ut contendam affirmemque hanc editionem nulla codicum perscrutacione confectam ideoque criticam, quam dicunt, neque esse neque haberi debere» (8). Such a critical edition would not be an insuperable task, and it should be encouraged by the Bibliotheca Teubneriana, which at one time was undertaking the revision of Walz. It might rest virtuously on MSS U and C alone, though U is hard to deal with (see IW vii with n. 1). Meanwhile, one wonders if We’s text could be displayed on TLG, with Walz’s page numbers added.

Readers need all the help they can get with this text, and We gives it in various forms. First of course by the translation, the first complete one in any language, and to be turned to constantly and rewardingly. But we are also given: an Introduction (251–67) explaining with exemplary lucidity the stasis system employed by Sopatros and the ways in which it modifies that of Hermogenes, and summarising what can be said about the author and the circumstances of composition; notes on the translation, quite full on the ‘historical’ declamations (to which most readers may indeed be attracted) but scanty elsewhere; a very helpful Glossary (531–42); an Index Nominum (247–50); and at the end a Gesamtschau of the declamations, grouped, as Sopatros arranged them, by the staseis they illustrate. The whole adds up to a very considerable achievement, for which students of ancient rhetoric will be warmly grateful.

The text is naturally what cost We most effort. He has made numerous emendations. Some are obviously right (and IW should have made some of them already), others likely or possible. Many others are violent changes, but it is quite understandable that We wished to print a text he could translate (he almost never employs the obelus). I make some comments (selected from many).

Sopatros employs (accentual) rhythm, especially in the declamation extracts (IW 12, with n. 25), and one should not lightly propose changes that do not take this into account. One instance out of many: We deletes the article in 4, 6, 8 (26, 18–19 Wa) ἐπ’ ἐρημίας τὰ χρήματα.

---

1 In those places, and those alone, he registers the readings recommended by IW and/or, though without detail (under the siglum ‘IW*’), those reported by them from the manuscripts they employed.

2 The manuscript we called C is not a Bodleian MS, as We states (7); it belongs to, and is currently kept in, the library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

3 We mentions one or two versions of individual declamations. He does not know of D.A. Russell, The initiate and the dream: a lesson in declamation from Sopatros, Topoi, Suppl. 7 (2006), 41–52, from a master hand.

4 An engaging feature of the notes is We’s willingness to answer Sopatros back, criticising his cogency and suggesting counter-arguments (thus nn. 105, 126, 132, 135, 158, 171, 185, 300, 304). That is in the spirit of the genre; Sopatros would have been delighted.
We is occasionally led astray by misunderstanding the reports of IW as to the crucial manuscript C. Thus: 15, 3, 18 (97, 4–5 Wa) C does not have ἀπῆλλαγμα or any equivalent verb; 13, 6, 2 (83, 13 Wa) it does not have διαφιάσει; 19, 6, 8 (109, 29 Wa) it reads ἔγνω; 29, 1, 5 (182, 27 Wa) it has καλολογήμα, not καλολογῶν. At 46, 1, 16 (268, 17 Wa) δὲ for γὰρ should be credited to C; so too the addition of ὅτι at 72, 9, 12 (355, 21 Wa). Some points of Greek usage: 1, 3, 46 (6, 10 Wa) ἴδε ὁλίγηπε is not a correct form. 1, 3, 55 (7, 7 Wa) For μᾶλλον + comparative see W. Schmid, Der Atticismus, Registerband (Stuttgart, 1897), 156. 3, 1, 7 (16, 17 Wa) For πλεονεκτεῖν + accusative see LSJ s.v. II. 2. 9, 1, 2 (35, 18 Wa) Is not διαφημίσεως (IW) a possible late form? 9, 1, 13 (55, 6 Wa) Is a genitive after παραλαμβάνειν without a preposition tolerable? See too the parallel passage cited by IW 1. 14, 4, 1–2 (94, 22–3 Wa) Cannot μῶθι stand imperatively? Cf. 1, 10, 12 (14, 12 Wa) οἴδωται (also emended). 20, 4, 36 (115, 2 Wa) Comparative for superlative, as e.g. at 20, 3, 12 (112, 17 Wa); see Schmid, Atticismus, Registerband, 24. 22, 8, 9 (137, 17 Wa) Perhaps rather ἡδονή. It certainly looks odd here alongside an aorist, but compare 22, 7, 39 (136, 30 Wa), also emended. 36, 6, 1 (222, 2–3 Wa) Here and elsewhere We emends a form of τίπτω, used in connection with ἀντίθεσις, to the normal ἐμπίπτω. It seems bad method to normalise so frequently; at least reference might have been made to IW on 52, 14 Wa. 48, 1, 15–16 (281, 15–16 Wa) We emends πότερον ... ἢ. But is this tolerable Greek (rather than εἴτε ... εἴτε)? 66, 5, 7 (330, 28 Wa) Is ἐπίτυχοι (as opposed to ἐπίτυχα) used like this? I contribute some new emendations sparked off by suggestions of We: 1, 5, 36–7 (9, 21–2 Wa) Rather than change to oratio obliqua read ἡ (ἐντύχει; 3, 4, 13 (31, 8 Wa) Rather πάντων μᾶλλον, as at 7, 5, 6–7 (46, 28 Wa), 22, 8, 9 (137, 17 Wa) Perhaps rather εἶπα should be replaced by εἰ. 22, 9, 8 (138, 2 Wa) Perhaps better delete αὕτη. 23, 9, 29–30 (161, 12–13 Wa) Perhaps punctuate as a question, 24, 3 # 19 (164, 16 Wa) Perhaps μηδεμίουθα; 24, 5, 15 (165, 26 Wa) The point of We’s μονήρη is unclear. Dr Innes suggests that the general sense requires something like ὥς ὁδος. 25, 5, 8 (169, 22 Wa) Deleting ὃ δὲ τὸν δυνατοῦν destrains the rhythm. Perhaps then read τὸν ὀργαστήριον just above; 43, 8, 16 (250, 27 Wa) Perhaps rather <ἐν> τῷ νόμῳ. 76, 5, 9–10 (368, 5 Wa) One might think rather of deleting ὃ ὀπλοστροφάμενος. Dr Innes remarks that the simple verb is regularly used in this declamation, and compares especially 7, 18 (370, 3 Wa), where our passage is picked up for rebuttal. She also points to another likely gloss just below, at 76, 6, 4–5 (368, 18 Wa), where either ὁ συγγένες or ὁ τῆς κόρης καθή should probably be deleted. I noticed very few misprints. But the omission of τοῦτον at 23, 4, 13 (151, 17 Wa) has led to an unnecessary change just before.

We remarks (267), of the footnotes to his translation: «Immer sind IW zu vergleichen, die in vieler Hinsicht reicheres Material bieten, aber beim Leser mehr Kenntnisse voraussetzen und deshalb geringeren Wert auf Erklärung legen.» Readers of We’s own monumental book will need to be pretty knowledgeable themselves; but they will be richly rewarded.

Oxford

Michael Winterbottom

1 At 46, 4, 14 (272, 7 Wa) the reading of MS U should have been mentioned.
2 Emendations should have been credited to IW at 46, 1, 9 (268, 9–10 Wa) and 70, 3, 4 (344, 20 Wa).
3 For another approach see D.M. Schenkeveld, Mnemosyne 44, 1991, 211.