the commentator faces a text which opens up in a number of challenging directions, and a translator, in turn, faces a task that is far from simple.

The editor and translator of this volume, Dirk Baltzly, has done a meticulous job. The translation is trustworthy, and for the benefit of the reader, most of the technical terminology is given in Greek in parentheses. In line with this, there is a detailed English-Greek glossary and an index of Greek terms. The introduction is relatively long, 30 pages, and starts by situating the text within the overall *skopos* of Proclus' commentary, the ten gifts of the demiurge to the created "god", the visible cosmos. Although the gifts are already enumerated in an earlier book of the commentary (II.5,17–31), Baltzly shows how they guide and sometimes govern the way Proclus proceeds in his exposition later in his work, and particularly in the section considered in this volume. Having done that, Baltzly tackles, head on, some of the most difficult aspects of the commentary. These include, importantly, the ways in which Proclus understands and develops Plato's view of proportions, and the question of how the world's body contributes to the divinity of the visible cosmos.

This is, on all accounts, a very useful and well-executed volume. But it must also be said that it is rather critical in tone. As he openly admits in the acknowledgements, Baltzly has no interest in the rich ontology of Proclus, and does not fancy "a pint at a celestial pub" with the author of the commentary. This approach is both sensible and possibly problematic. Baltzly does not work from inside a Neoplatonic framework, taking for granted – as you sometimes see done – the peculiarities of its framework. On the contrary, he is ready, and even eager, to question them. This gives the reader a truly distanced and philosophical way into the text. This distance, however, cannot but guide what the editor considers as valuable in the commentary. Balancing this view will be left for Proclus researchers to come, who now have at their disposal an admirably reliable and handy tool.

*Pauliina Remes*


The last few decades have witnessed an astonishing growth in interest in the poetry of the Hellenistic period. Not a very long time ago, this age was not seldom characterized as an insipid transitional phase between the towering achievements of Classical Greek and Roman literature even in textbooks of considerable prestige. Today, an impressive amount of work is being published on Callimachus and other superstars of Hellenistic literature as well as on somewhat hazier yet not lesser figures like Euphorion (for example, Acosta-Hughes – Cusset, *Euphorion. Oeuvre poétique et autres fragments*, Paris 2012). Lightfoot's excellent collection provides a chronologically and geographically diverse "selection" (p. VII) of five authors not belonging to the heavyweights of Hellenistic literature. Many of the poems in this book appear translated into English for the first time. As this *Hellenistic Collection* is published in the series of the Loeb Classical Library, one assumes that the book is intended not only for scholars familiar with the quirks of Hellenistic poetry but also for a broader audience. This, of course, raises concerns because of the erudite
and difficult nature of the poems. First, who could read, for instance, Euphorion without an extensive commentary and, secondly, could the required explanatory notes be provided given the space restrictions of the Loeb series? A successful predecessor might be C. A. Trypanis's 1958 Loeb edition of the fragments of Callimachus, which is, although understandably outdated, a very useful tool.

In the brief Introduction, Lightfoot first informs the readers that she intended to produce readable translations and a reasonable amount of annotation (p. VIII). She has furthermore rearranged the fragments according to her own judgement: the sections on Philitas, Euphorion and Parthenius contain a helpful comparative numeration of other editions. Lightfoot also illustrates the contents of her book mainly in light of four important themes, namely, elegy, catalogue poetry, the sense of literary history and scholarship. The Introduction ends with a general bibliography, which is surprisingly short and therefore omits a few key contributions: A. W. Bulloch's 1985 article 'Hellenistic Poetry' is a particularly notable omission. However, each section is preceded by a short author-specific bibliography of "editions" and "criticism". Lightfoot also instructs the reader to consult the indispensable online Hellenistic Bibliography maintained by Martine Cuypers.

*Hellenistic Collection* starts with the original ποιητής ὄμα καὶ κριτικός, Philitas of Cos. Quintilian (*inst.* 10,1,58) famously ranked Philitas second only to Callimachus in elegiac poets but he is equally known for his scholarly work Ἀτακτον γλῶσσα, a glossary of arcane terms. He was also a tutor of Ptolemy II Philadelphus. Therefore it is deeply regrettable that we possess only scattered fragments of his oeuvre: the longest continuous fragment is merely four lines long. However, from these verses we can at least partially infer the pre-Callimachean characteristics of Hellenistic poetry; the few fragments from the elegiac poem Δημήτηρ are particularly illuminating. Lightfoot acknowledges that in Callimachean and Aratean aesthetics there could be at least a partial allusion to Philitas' supposed thinness (λεπτός), which was either physical or metaphorical (p. 5).

Alexander of Aetolia, one of the tragic πλείον ὡς, was born in the backwaters of Pleuron but pursued a literary and scholarly career in Antigonid Pella and later in Ptolemaic Alexandria where he was employed by Ptolemy II Philadelphus to correct the texts of tragedy. Being a true poeta doctus, his output was rather varied: along with the scholarly works, he wrote tragedies, possibly satyr dramas and, in addition, all kinds of poetry ranging from hexameter to scurrilous verse similar to that of Sotades. Consequently, according to Lightfoot, generic diversity and literariness characterise the poetry of Alexander (p. 102). The longest and best preserved fragment of Alexander is included in its entirety only in the section on Parthenius' Ἐρωτικά παθήματα (ΙΔ.), which tells the story about the sad fate of Antheus.

Hermesianax of Colophon is the writer of Λεόντιον, which is the longest continuous fragment in the *Hellenistic Collection*, yet the section on him is the shortest in the book, only 41 pages. In the end, one wonders how essential the section on Hermesianax is, even though Lightfoot argues that Λεόντιον's "literary-historical interest is considerable" (p. 149). Λεόντιον, named after Hermesianax's lover, is a whimsical catalogue of more or less fictional love-affairs; for instance, Alcaeus and Anacreon are Sappho's rival suitors, and Homer travels to Ithaca because of his affair with Penelope. Lightfoot has included in the *dubie tributa* section a captivating curse poem where the speaker threatens to tattoo his victim with the images of famous punishments.
The real treat in this collection is, in my opinion, the section on Euphorion of Chalcis, whose legacy on the Latin poetae novi is famously portrayed in Tusc. 3,45, where Cicero defends Ennius from the scorn of the cantores Euphorionis. Euphorion's poetry possesses some qualities which many will undoubtedly find more or less excruciating: he is more often than not excessively obscure. Nimis etiam obscurus Euphorio, wrote Cicero (div. 2,133), perhaps not without good reason. Euphorion was a head librarian in Antioch, the capital of the Seleucid kingdom. Time has not been kind to his prose works and we know only the titles of some of his work. However, we possess a considerable amount of his verse: of the 662 pages of Hellenistic Collection, Euphorion governs as much as 277 pages. Lightfoot concludes that Euphorion is stylistically close to Lycophron or Nicander (pp. 195–6); Euphorion is subsequently the most opaque poet in this collection and poses a great challenge to the translator. Lightfoot manages to handle this tough task in a laudable manner. However, at times I felt I needed more guidance to navigate through Euphorion's cryptic fragments. For instance, Euphorion fr. 26, a long piece from the Θρῶξ, is a bewildering experience even with Lightfoot's commentary.

The section on Parthenius owes much to Lightfoot's 1999 monograph Parthenius of Nicaeae. Parthenius' Suda entry suggests that he was captured by some Cinna during the Mithridatic War and then brought to Rome, but eventually freed διὰ τὴν παίδευσιν. Temporally Parthenius belongs to the Roman era: he was apparently Virgil's grammaticus in Greek (Macroob. Sat. 5,17,18). Sadly, Parthenius' poetry is preserved in a very fragmentary state, yet one can still identify traces of refinement from his verse and understand his popularity in Antiquity. The section on Parthenius ends with Ἐρωτικὰ παθήματα, 36 short stories of a more or less lugubrious nature, dedicated to the Roman poet Cornelius Gallus. Many of these stories are a pleasure to read, especially after reading through the difficult fragments of Hellenistic Collection.

In conclusion, Lightfoot's Hellenistic Collection is the most valuable aid for a student of Hellenistic literature. I noticed only a few slips in Lightfoot's book. P. XVIII reads Martin instead of Martine. Alexander of Aetolia fr. 12 leaves καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Ἀἰτωλός ποιητῆς untranslated, the same passage is however translated fully in Euphorion fr. 80.

Iiro Laukola


Animal rights in ancient times, surely not? Is not the concept itself entirely modern? As the engagingly titled compilation of Plutarch's texts on animals ("Animal Rights and Vegetarianism") makes plain to Swedish readers, the topic of animal rights is indeed an ancient one – probably as ancient as our history of sharing our lives with other species.

The present volume is comprised of four animal related texts by Plutarch, together with their Swedish translations by Prof. Emer. Sven-Tage Teodorsson (according to their fixed Latin titles: De sollertia animalium, Bruta ratione uti, De esu carnium I–II, and De amore prolis; and in their Greek form, which I shall use hereafter: Πότερα τῶν ζῴων φρονιμῶτερα, τὰ χερσαία ἢ τὰ ἔννοδρα; Περὶ τοῦ τὰ ἄλωγα λόγῳ χρήσθαι οἱ Γρύλλος; Περὶ σαρκοφαγίας; and Περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰ ἔγγονα φιλοστοργίας). Contrary to what the translator suggests in his foreword,