

*Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century: The Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai*. Introduction, Translation and Commentary. Edited by *Averil Cameron* and *Judith Herrin*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, vol. 10. E.J. Brill, Leiden 1984. XII, 291 p. Hfl. 110.-.

This curious and intriguing writing 'Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai' (lit. 'Brief historical notes'), as it is entitled in the only extant manuscript, poses to the scholarship a great variety of problems ranging from the deciphering of its anomalous Greek to the questions of date, authorship and purpose. Although the text has been available since the 1901 Teubner edition by Th. Preger, it is not until now, after the publication of the present volume, that it can be properly understood and studied for further purposes. The new presentation of the Parastaseis results from team work, A. Cameron and J. Herrin being responsible for the final version. The authors have printed Preger's Greek text, but they discuss and suggest alternative readings at many points. The highest value of the book lies in the introduction where all the relevant issues are discussed in a clear and concise manner, in the translation, which makes the difficult text understandable, and in the detailed commentary. The authors conclude that the Parastaseis is not the work of a single author but has been compiled by several men who were interested in understanding the gradually forgotten meaning of the pagan remains of Constantinople (the statues above all) and that the extant text is perhaps incomplete, which explains a great number of its inconsistencies. It goes without saying that the importance of the text to the knowledge of the early 8th century topography of Constantinople is considerable not to mention its evidence for lost sculptural and architectural works.

My only criticism concerns the commentary, which is mainly historical, placing the emphasis on political history rather than art history and religious history. A comparison with the same kind of material concerning medieval Rome would also have been profitable. I do not mean texts like the 'Notitia ecclesiarum urbis Romae', which is mentioned in the introduction (p. 29 n. 71) and is left aside as not having any points of contact with the Parastaseis, but the text called 'Mirabilia urbis Romae', which, I admit, derives from the 12th century, but surely contains a good deal of earlier material and shares some features with the Parastaseis. E.g. through the Mirabilia and some other Roman material a parallel to the references to the ritual sacrifices of young maidens to a dragon (chaps. 22, 85) could have been traced. These passages may be valuable also from the religio-historical point of view (for details, see my article 'La sopravvivenza dei culti pagani e la topografia cristiana dell'area di Giuturna e delle adiacenze' to be published in *Lav.Stud. Arch., Sopr.Arch. di Roma*).

The attitude of the writers of the Parastaseis to the pagan statuary is remarkable, revealing the fear seemingly felt for its hidden powers. The statues are assumed to be capable of yielding prophecies and, on the other hand, exercising malevolent influences. I would suggest that this is not a purely Byzantine feature deriving from the contrast between pagan and Christian religion, but that it has its roots deep in late antique philosophical speculation. The allegorical interpretation of cult statues was developed by the Stoics and in the Chaldaean Oracles (2nd cent. A.D.), and especially in Neoplatonism

we find theurgical practices: the manipulation of statues by magical means in order to make them utter prophecies and become animated by the divinity in question. Against this background it may appear more understandable that the compilers of the *Parastaseis* regarded their activity in explaining the meaning of the statues as the practice of philosophy.

*Jaakko Aronen*

*Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium.* Post W. Morel novis curis adhibitis edidit Carolus Buechner. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana., BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1982. XIV, 219 S. M 60.-.

Die vorliegende Ausgabe ist eine Nachfolgerin von Willy Morels gleichnamiger Fragmentensammlung aus dem Jahre 1927, unsere Standardausgabe bis heute. Es stellte sich aber bald heraus, dass Morels Ausgabe durchaus ungenügend war, u.a. hat er sein Corpus, wie es noch bei Baehrens stand, drastisch reduziert. Und zwei tiefschürfende Besprechungen von Housman (CR 1928, 77–79) und Knoche (Gnomon 1928, 687–697) haben sofort zahllose Schwächen der Morelschen Ausgabe zutage gefördert. Büchner hat diese Ausgabe auf das laufende bringen wollen, ohne an ihrer Substanz zu viel zu ändern. Es sei vorweg betont, dass auch Büchners Ausgabe durchaus ungenügend ist. Diese Art von Edieren war wohl dem kürzlich verstorbenen Freiburger Philologen nicht kongenial, dessen Stärke mehr auf dem Gebiet grosser literarischer Synthesen als in minutiöser philologischer Arbeit lag. Zum einen ignoriert Büchner Housmans Besprechung und andere seiner Beiträge, die für die Bearbeitung dieser Ausgabe nützlich gewesen wären. Zum zweiten hat er nicht genügend die Vorgängerin von Morel, die Ausgabe von Baehrens vom Jahre 1886, berücksichtigt, die, trotz ihrer grossen Schwächen, viel wichtiges, bei Morel fehlendes Material enthält. Zum dritten hat Büchner mehrere wichtige neuere Beiträge nicht konsultiert, ganz davon zu schweigen, dass er manche falsche Lesarten und andere zu beseitigende Materialien eingeführt hat.

Büchners Ausgabe hat schon mehrere kritische Stellungnahmen und Beiträge hervorgebracht; ich erwähne die drei ausführlichsten mir bekannten: E. Courtney, BICS 31 (1984) 131–136; V. Tandoi (Hrsg.), *Disiecti membra poetae. Studi di poesia latina in frammenti I*, Foggia 1984; A. Traina, Riv.fil. 1985, 96–119. Da der mir zur Verfügung stehende Raum keine ausführliche Besprechung erlaubt, begnüge ich mit einigen Anmerkungen.

Büchner ist nicht immer konsequent in der Aufnahme von Fragmenten. Er schaltet mehreres aus, was Morel aufgenommen hat, zumeist wohl mit Recht; doch verwundert die Auslassung der "Templi Tarracinensis (nicht Tarraconensis!) inscriptio" (p. 40 Morel), und zwar ohne Begründung (Hinweis auf Morel auf S. 52), aber warum? Weil es