

me as more convincing (note the instructive note explaining the choice of *hoc* in 76).

As for the commentary, it seems (as one would expect) to be designed for the student rather than for the professional Ovidian scholar, although even the latter will want to keep this volume as close to hand as possible. The notes, clearly designed for explaining things rather than for supplying the reader with an exhaustive modern bibliography on each point, seem to cover all aspects, these including the motives of the speakers (note, e.g., the explanation, on line 230, of the fact that Ulysses names Agamemnon, rather than himself, as the person who recalled the fleeing Greeks to assembly, this having aroused suspicion among some critics), and the net is cast wide (note, at line 250, readers who need to be told that a triumph was "an exclusively Roman institution"; the same readers are, however, expected to make sense of "enjambement", on lines 35–9 or why *dimittite* in line 226 would be inferior "in sense and rhythm"). I thought the commentary extremely helpful and illuminating (note, for instance, the many interesting observations on Ulysses' argumentation, e.g., at line 359), and I also liked the many happy turns of phrase (e.g., Ulysses "a spineless coward", p. 93; "Ulysses' shady operations", lines 105–6; "Ajax' indignation had left him no time to pay formal tribute to Achilles", lines 128–30). There are very few things I miss here (although there could possibly have been a note, e.g., on *dubitabilis* in line 21), and so I must conclude by once again stressing the admirable qualities of this book.

Olli Salomies

*Augustine and the Disciplines. From Cassiciacum to Confessions.* Edited by KARLA POLLMANN and MARK VESSEY. Oxford University Press, New York 2005. ISBN 0-19-927485-1 (hb). XI, 258 pp. GBP 45.

This book has its origins in a conference on 'Augustine and the Disciplines' held at Villanova University, Pennsylvania, 9–11 November 2000. It contains eight articles dealing with the role of the Liberal Arts in Augustine's theory of education. Augustine composed a series of pedagogical works soon after his conversion when he had retired to the country estate of Cassiciacum outside Milan in 386. At the time, he was heavily influenced by Neoplatonism, which is strongly felt in his philosophical dialogue *De ordine*. Here Augustine presents a unified theory of education based on the Platonic idea of ascent. The seven Liberal Arts, which have been invented by Reason, form a series of steps by which one can ascend from the level of corporeal things to higher, incorporeal realities. In his later works, e.g., *Retractationes* and *Confessiones*, Augustine was more skeptical of the importance of secular arts in Christian education and even regreted his early works. The present volume addresses many important questions concerning Augustine's relationship to secular studies and the change that is supposed to have taken place in his attitude to them in the course of his works.

In the introduction, Mark Vessey offers a valuable survey of the state of scholarship which was long dominated by two influential works of H.-I. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (1938) and *History of Education in Antiquity* (1948). Marrou maintained that the canonical scheme of the seven Liberal Arts, which appeared in Augustine's early philosophical dialogues, had already been standard practice

in Graeco-Roman culture for several centuries. The scholarly consensus was radically called into question by Ilsetraut Hadot (*Arts libéraux et philosophie dans la pensée antique*, 1984), who claimed that the Liberal Arts took a canonical form only in Late Antiquity, in the works of Augustine and Martianus Capella. She traced the development of this educational scheme back to Middle Platonism, and showed that the number and the nature of the Liberal Arts varied considerably from one author to another until Late Antiquity. She argued that the immediate source for *De ordine* was probably a (lost) work of Porphyry rather than Varro's *Disciplinarum libri novem*, as had been maintained by Marrou and others.

Danuta Shanzer challenges Hadot's position in what proves to be the most ambitious article of this volume. She restores the link between the Varronian encyclopaedia and Augustine's theory of the Liberal Arts by claiming that the ascent motif is not necessarily Neoplatonic; it could be Platonic and thus already present in Varro's *Disciplinarum libri*. Shanzer presents evidence to the effect that the personified Muses in Martianus Capella's *De Nuptiis* could also be Varronian. As a matter of fact, Shanzer pays a great deal of attention to the personified Muses in her argumentation, depending on new evidence from Gallic fifth century authors. I can readily accept her claims concerning the ascent motif and the Varronian inspiration for the Muses, but the problem of the originality or otherwise of Augustine's educational theory is not exhausted by these arguments. The stimulus for presenting the various disciplines as personified Muses could easily go back to Varro, but how about the theory as a whole? Do the contents of the manuals in *De ordine* and *De nuptiis* (and in Augustine's pedagogical manuals) represent the first-century BC scholarship? This is a complex question to which only partial or hypothetical answers can be given.

Let us take dialectic as an example. Many of the articles in this volume touch upon the importance of dialectic in Augustine's theory of learning and biblical exegesis, but Augustine's handbook on dialectic, *De dialectica*, is not even referred to once in this volume. (Practically once the same is true of Augustine's grammar, *Ars pro fratrum mediocritate breviata*). In *De ordine*, dialectic is praised as the discipline of disciplines, which renders all the other disciplines scientific. The importance assigned to dialectic in Augustine's theory of the Liberal Arts is quite unique considering what we know of the Liberal Arts before Augustine. At this point, we must attribute major originality to Augustine, assume a recent Neoplatonic source for *De ordine* in accordance with Hadot, or advance a new hypothesis. I am convinced by Shanzer that *De ordine* must not be dissociated from Varro's Muses as strictly as Hadot does, but for me, Hadot's hypothesis of *De ordine*'s Neoplatonic source still holds a great deal of value.

Augustine's views on secular education – the Liberal Arts – and biblical exegesis became enormously influential in the Middle Ages. I appreciate that we now have this collection of articles, with several valuable contributions, which addresses important questions pertaining to Augustine's pedagogy and its development. It is my sincere hope that this volume will inspire further colloquia and interdisciplinary studies into Augustine's pedagogical work and their sources as well as their influence on medieval cultural life.

*Anneli Luhtala*