

element (oratory), and *illa* to mark the textually closer referent (history). However, the table that she produces (p. 167) has the situation reversed, so that as the attributes of oratory appear those that Pliny links with *illa* (= history in the majority opinion).

Chapter 5 ("Overcoming Ciceronian anxieties: Pliny's *niche/nike* in literary history") is about Pliny's relationship to the towering figure of Cicero. In Marchesi's reading, Pliny tries to convince his readers that at least in one respect, that of publishing a well-edited and -arranged collection of epistles, he is the superior of the two. Part of this argument is based on a rather speculative interpretation of letters 9,2 (to Sabinus) and 2,2 (to Paulinus). According to Marchesi (p. 229ff), the recipient of letter 9,2 (Sabinus) would have read letter 2,2 (to Paulinus) in its published form, then written to Pliny using phrases and lines of thought from this letter, and finally received the letter 9,2 from Pliny as a response with again the same themes and vocabulary (the wish of receiving long letters, the mutual affection that causes the absence of such letters to be considered an offense and the futility of any excuses for not writing). This is supposed to underline the fact that Pliny's epistles circulated in published form, and thus lifted him above Cicero as a person publishing an epistolographical corpus.

Assessing the process of identifying allusions is difficult in the absence of criteria as to what constitutes an allusion and what does not. Therefore, the acceptability of the proposed instances of intertextuality depends ultimately on the reader's willingness to believe the author's literary reconstruction, and less on anything that would come even close to such concepts as argument, or even less, proof. Allusions differ as to their status. Some are well established and have been acknowledged for a long time, while others are new ones suggested by the author. Certainly, there can be no doubt that intertextuality played a substantial role in Pliny's literary technique, as this volume among others shows. But proving the reconstruction of Pliny's presumed line of thought behind the allusion is a different thing from simply recognizing the intertext, and one where this study does not quite succeed. Usually the invited reading departs too far from what actually stands in the text to be plausible (as in the passage on hunting and writing in letter 5,8, in Marchesi's treatment turned into an argument about the state of oratory, or in the alleged recycling of fairly commonplace epistolary motives in letters 9,2 and 2,2). Furthermore, at times the author seems determined to read in the text the exact opposite of what Pliny actually writes (on oratory and history [p. 169], and the parodic interpretation of 7,4 [p. 78ff]). To scholars working on intertextuality this book undoubtedly has much to offer, but its argument is on most occasions too tenuous to be of much interest to the general reader.

*Hilla Halla-aho*

DAVID RUHNKENIUS: *Elogium Tiberii Hemsterhusii*. Edidit H. NIKITINSKI. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. K. G. Saur Verlag, Monachii et Lipsiae 2006. ISBN 978-3-598-71322-4. IX, 41 pp. EUR 32.

David Ruhnken, origine Ruhneken, latine Ruhnkenius (1723-1798) Pomeria oriundus, Lugduni Batavorum studiis grammaticis duce Tiberio Hemsterhusio imbutus verus Batavus fit et ad altissimum gradum Parnassi ascendit. Fit princeps criticorum, quam nobilem dignitatem servare scit, praecessor philologorum Germanorum aetatis aureae motus neohumanistici, qui a Friderico Augusto Wolff initium cepit. Quod ei philologia fuit, apparet ex eo quod ei praestantissimus

usus linguae Latinae idem ac ipsa scientia valebat. Scripta ab eodem edita tamen, quamvis sint angustis limitibus, nulla reprehensione digna. Ita hymnus Homericus Cereris, Timaei lexicon, Rutilius Lupus; minus bene cessit historia critica oratorum Graecorum.

Tiberius Hemsterhusius ab amicis et discipulis ut perfectus magister philologiae adoratus est. Ei Ruhnkenius elogium celeberrimum dixit, quod nunc Helgus (Oleg) Nikitinski, de studiis neolatinis iam optime meritis, novis curis in Bibliotheca Teubneriana edidit. *Elogium Tiberii Hemsterhusii* criticae artis exemplum splendidum, quod ad vitam disciplinamque Hemsterhusii illustrandas praesertim, ad historiam litterarum et humanitatem eorum temporum in universum quam maxime confert; porro latinitatis monumentum aere perennius evasisse inter omnes constat.

Nikitinski in textu constituendo duarum *Elogii* editionum rationem habuit, cum ceterae ad rem nihil fere afferant: editionis primae a. 1768, et editionis secundae "castigatoris" a. 1789. Idem, ut ii, qui ante eum scripserunt, iusta de causa textum secundae editionis religiose dat, additis in apparatu critico lectionibus primae. Insuper in bibliotheca universitatis Leidensis incidit in exemplar primae *Elogii* editionis cum adnotationibus manu ipsius Ruhnkenii scriptis (in apparatu critico R insignivit). R intermedium *Elogii* statum repraesentare par est cum editore iudicare.

His fundamentis usus Nikitinski optimam editionem criticam produxit, quam omnibus, qui rebus philologicis et humanioribus saeculi XVIII student, ex imo corde commendamus.

Heikki Solin

RICHARD HUNTER: *Critical Moments in Classical Literature: Studies in the Ancient View of Literature and Its Uses*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge – New York 2009. ISBN 978-0-521-51985-4. VII, 217 pp. GBP 50, USD 95, EUR 56.20.

In the Introduction of this stimulating book, Hunter states that he will investigate "how themes and ideas constantly reappear over time and in different genres" and discuss "antiquity's concern with what literature was for, what its 'uses' were" (p. 8). Indeed, *Critical Moments in Classical Literature* offers an erudite, yet somewhat disjointed, survey on the literary criticism of the ancients from one of the most prominent modern scholars of Greek and Latin literature. The book is divided into six chapters, which respectively explore a single key text, ranging chronologically from Aristophanes to Plutarch. As Hunter admits, the choice of texts discussed is "in part almost inevitable" (p. 8); I doubt if it would be even possible to write a book on this subject without including, say, *The Frogs* or *On the Sublime*. Nevertheless, the inclusion of Euripides' *Cyclops* is certainly a pleasant surprise.

The front cover of the book features a photo of triennial Cambridge Greek Play production of Aristophanes' *Frogs* from 1947 and, not surprisingly, Chapter 1 starts with a discussion on this quintessential text of ancient literary criticism. Hunter draws multiple distinctions between Aeschylus and Euripides by focusing, for instance, on their different choral techniques, but also accentuates Aristophanes' reliance on Plato. Equally, along with Homer (and perhaps with Euripides), Plato lurks in the background of almost every chapter of Hunter's book. The section entitled "Classical Tragedy" contains, in my opinion, a discussion of particular interest; in this section, Hunter elegantly elaborates Dio Chrysostom's thoughts on how to enjoy the classical playwrights.