kind of drama to assist the polis through rough times: "...what it would mean under circumstances in which the city's survival depended upon warlike heroism, upon manliness in the traditional sense." (pp. 120–21). In the Frogs, it becomes clear that this is not the case, but instead the society needs quite traditional values, as presented by Aeschylus. Euripides, who was an indispensable help for Dicaeopolis in the Acharnians, and who manages to save himself in the Thesmophoriazousai loses out to Aeschylus, who upholds martial heroism. And this is the case, although Aristophanes himself is shown closer to Euripides than Aeschylus, as N. states in the conclusion of his study.

In the concluding chapters, N. compares the Platonic Socrates and criticism of poetry with Aristophanes (rather strangely, since the Clouds is excluded from the previous discussion), and he decides that Aristophanes anticipates the Platonic criticisms. The role of drama is not to teach actual means of ruling but to point out the correct guidelines to a just and righteous goal.

The ideas and views in this book are sometimes refreshing and interesting – I especially liked the treatment of the Acharnians with the discussion of the justice and justification of democracy and the pondering of the meaning of the frogs in the Frogs. On the other hand I found the book very difficult to read and some of the conclusions remain rather obscure and, frankly, unoriginal (but then, everybody knows, how difficult it is to say something genuinely "novel" about ancient literature).

Another problem is that, after reading the book twice, it remained unclear to me, what really was the focus of the study. I think it is self-evident that Aristophanes also depended on tragedy and that he had a political agenda, so it is not difficult to become convinced of the results of the study. But then again, it must be stated that the author is a scholar of political science, which makes his approach somewhat divergent from that of a philologist.

Tiina Purola

...
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edition is spoken of with approval (p. x, and cf. e.g. xxxix; on the other hand, note p. xxxv, on Clark ignoring ms. i). As for the ms. tradition, the bottom line of the exposition presented here does not seem to be too much at variance with that by M.D. Reeve and R.H. Rouse in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), Texts and Transmission (1983) 62ff., but it is good to have the details set out in depth. Moreover, there is the spectacular fact that there are now, in addition to the mss., also four (or rather three, see p. xi) papyri, mentioned only in passing in Texts.

The textual history of the Catilinarians is fairly complicated, there being contamination between the mss. belonging to the three classes of mss, α, β and γ (cf. the stemmata on pp. xxxiv, xxxviii and xlv). In any case, it seems clear that this division into classes goes back all the way to (late) antiquity (e.g., p. xl). However, it can be established that they all have a common archetype Ω (p. xlvi); it seems remarkable that the same also goes for the important papyrus B(arinonensis) which covers much of bk. i and all of bk. ii (p. xlvii).

This may well furnish the explanation for the fact that, in the end, the constitution of the text here does not differ so much from that of Clark. Let me note here some of the divergencies which I observed. First of all, it seems that Maslowski has, in some cases, given preference to readings dominating in β and γ over those in α (but note the constant presence of contamination). This seems to be more or less the case at least in 1. 9 (nostro in numero; better than in nostro); 1. 12 (Italian denique totam; good); 1. 16 (quotiens vero; better than without vero); 1. 16 (hoc tibi); 1. 19 (qui instead of quia; clearly preferable); 1. 30 (auctoritatem seculi); 3. 3 (exponam breviter, Quirites); 3. 17 (tanta in [instead of in tota; clearly preferable, as tanta adds force to the comparison with in privata domo … inventa atque deprehensa). I should say that in all these passages M. has improved upon his predecessor. – The Barcelona papyrus is the source of the following divergencies: 2. 3 (rei p. utilitas, this word not appearing in the mss.; because of the parallel with huius imperi severitas, the addition is clearly more than useful; note also that r. p. u. comes only after h. i. s.); 2. 8 (ne in uno quidem angulo replacing ne ullo quidem in angulo [but I liked the collocation of in before angulo]); 2. 25 (equitibus Romanis populo Romano replacing equitibus Romanis, only B having Romano; surely a mention of the Roman people is of the essence here); 2. 20 (raedis which has some attractions beside lecticus [also in β γ] taking the place of praedius).

Of the divergencies based on something else, I noted 1. 4 (verum tamen; the tamen seems to add some force); 1.16 (tamen … potes reintroduced into the text); 1. 27 (sic being added from Quintilian; but he may well be quoting from memory); 1. 31 (hic [most mss.] being reinstated, with a reference to good parallels); 2. 3 (clauses beginning with quam multos rearranged); 2. 5 (prae his copis); 2. 9 (esse fateatur removed; of the excellence of this, I am not sure); 2. 12 (quid ut replacing the conjecture quin ut); 2. 15 (levandae instead of relevandae; good); 2. 19 (magnam concordiam maxima in multitidne replacing Clark's magnam concordiam ordinum, maximam multitidinem which is lame and does not respect the "law of increasing members"; but I have the feeling that there is still work to be done on this passage); 3. 6 (educuntur; C. Cethegus [person introduced for the first time]); 3. 8 (discriptum; very good); 3. 12 (et vide quid instead of vide ecquid; but the er does not seem very desirable); 3. 25 (atque… omnes rehabilitated); 4. 2 (sella curulis put back in the text but placed before sedes honoris; but
isn't the result a bit too naïve to have been said in the senate? I think Muretus had good reasons for thinking that s. c. is a gloss); 4. 8 (now we have multos una dolores, etc.; but it is disturbing that the mss. have multas uno dolore); 4. 11 (vituperatione prohibebo; but the mss. point to some serious trouble); 4. 13 (cum ‹iure› avum; the addition seems indispensable); 4. 13 («minus» dropped); 4. 20 (esse iudico turpem; Clark had dropped esse, apparently because it appears in different collocations in the mss.).

In addition to the text, there are also great number of testimonia both to the speeches and to individual passages; these will be of great service to scholars. Of course, here and there one could add a testimonium or two; for instance, a passage from 1. 25 is quoted by Boethius (Comm. in Aristot. περὶ ἑρμ., ed. Meiser vol. ii p. 344), from 1. 27 by Augustine (H. Hagendahl, Augustine and the Latin Classics [1967] I 45), from 2. 11 by one of the Panegyrici (A. Klotz, RhM 66 [1911] 545). – At the end, there is an "Appendix orthographica"and an index of names. – In the whole volume, I observed only one misprint, 'testimonium' on p. xxxii.

This edition, based on very solid scholarship and criticism, will from now on no doubt be regarded as the standard edition. The editor must be congratulated upon his achievement.

Olli Salomies


Even those who do not specialize in Ovid or even in Roman poetry must have noticed that Ovid has been receiving a lot of scholarly attention in the last ten or fifteen years. This has clearly resulted in the upgrading of Ovid's status as a poet, previously thought of by many as an author mainly suited to being read in school as an introduction to 'serious' poetry and in need of being commented upon mainly on points of mythological prosopography. But in Ovidian scholarship, times have changed, and it is thus no wonder that one can now add this Companion to the monographs dedicated to Ovid in recent years. On the other hand, one may be a little surprised of the fact that the year 2002 produced not only one but two Companions to Ovid, for in addition to the Cambridge one there is now also Brill's Companion to Ovid, edited by B. W. Boyd and also published in 2002. (One is reminded of the fact that the Cambridge and Brill Companions to Virgil appeared almost simultaneously a few years ago.)

Now the term companion, used as here in reference to the study of an author, leads one to think of something to be placed on a somewhat higher level than what would be called an introduction. But in fact this volume has also been conceived as "an introduction to basic aspects of Ovid's works and their reception", as one reads in the Preface; on the first page of the volume, under the heading "The Cambridge Companion to Ovid", there is a somewhat modified version of this, for here one reads that this book is also designed as an "accessible handbook for the general reader who wishes to learn about Ovid". But in both places, higher aims are also announced.