

# The Classical Review

VOLUME 54 NO. 1

2004

## SNOW ON CITHAERON

G. W. MOST (ed.): *Commentaries—Kommentare*. (Aporemata: Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte, Band 4.) Pp. 468. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 3-525-25903-4.

R. K. GIBSON, C. S. KRAUS (edd.): *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*. (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 232.) Pp. 427. Leiden: Brill, 2002. Cased. ISBN: 90-04-12153-6.

‘What would a commentary look like that took account of more sophisticated models of how language and meaning work, an edition that eschewed the rhetoric of certain, authorial, regulated meaning as its prime criterion? Is the commentary form as practised by classical scholars integrally related to a discredited linguistics?’ So asks Simon Goldhill in the earlier of these volumes (p. 409), and no question raised in either is more fundamental.

He has just been discussing a commentary on *Exodus* that uses a passage of Jeremiah ‘in a sense the complete opposite of its original context’:

the words have been renewed, changed—while still appealing to the authority of tradition . . . A verse is impoverished in meaning if it is read only once and in its place. This form of exegesis of an authoritative text depends on a quite different ideology of language or construction of how meaning works—where meaning is . . . Daniel Boyarin [earlier in the volume] has gone on to explore the way that such reading practices depend on a set of conceptualizations of meaning, money, exchange, and the very materiality of language.

Four questions for one or other of them: might the commentator not have forgotten the original context? How does saying that the verse is used in opposite senses differ from twice employing the rhetoric of certain meaning? Does the sense in the commentary enrich the sense in Jeremiah? Has the commentator’s ideology of language remained undiscredited, so that the next commentator on Hesiod or Sidonius should consider adopting it?

In Boyarin’s article, midrash, a type of reading that some Jewish readers of the Bible practised between the second and the fifth century, ‘is to be seen . . . as a token of what commentary might look like in a world without Logos’, and indeed did look like in a particular set of historical circumstances. He first has to show that midrash counts as commentary and not, for instance, as preaching; I remember hearing a preacher gloss ‘thou shalt not covet’ by making each letter of ‘covet’ the initial of a word on which further edification could be hung—not a promising strategy for a commentator.

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

Whether his demonstration succeeds I cannot judge. He then argues that a ‘platonic revolution in consciousness’, which he does not ascribe to Plato himself, led to ‘the idea that meaning is abstractable from the matter of text, that the words are bodies and the meanings souls’; and he connects the absence of this idea from midrash with the absence of money from a barter economy. After discussing a midrashic gloss on *Exodus*, he says that the methods of midrash were applied not only to religious texts but also to contracts, though ‘this requires further elaboration’. Ancient historians, he reports, have objected that money was not absent from the economy in question, but he offers evidence that midrash was produced ‘within a discourse which understood itself to be a non-monetary economy’. What is his evidence, however, for grounding the whole of Western linguistics in a Greek distinction between body and soul? Heinrich von Staden in the later volume (p. 109 n. 1) mentions cuneiform commentaries of the seventh and perhaps the eighth century B.C. on medical, astrological, and physiognomic texts, but does not reveal whether they were produced in a world without Logos.

If, then, something has been proved about language or meaning from which it follows that commentary on classical texts should either change or stop, neither Boyarin nor Goldhill has shown what it is. When Goldhill uses *τελείου* at *Agamemnon* 972 as an illustration of multiple meanings (a far better one than the passage of Jeremiah), nothing makes me feel that he and I have different theories of meaning, and anyone unnerved by his forceful question at that point, ‘if meaning is context specific, what are the limits and boundaries of context?’, should hesitate to charge him with espousing a different theory of meaning. Concern for context also drives his assault on ‘cf.’, shorthand that creates resemblances by paring down context; but his discussion of the reference to Th. 7.69.2 in Hutchinson’s commentary on *Septem* 16 did not convey to me, for all the sophistication of Th. 7.69.2, why his analysis of it belongs in a commentary on *Septem* 16.

Though the later volume was conceived before the earlier was published, and apparently before the conference that led to the earlier took place, contributors to the later often refer to the earlier, and Christopher Rowe casts his piece as a rejoinder to Goldhill’s remarks on multiple meanings and to Don Fowler’s concluding epigram (p. 442), ‘the task of commentary is to multiply problems, not to solve them’. In philosophical texts, Rowe argues, multiple meanings are a nuisance, and multiple interpretations of sentences in Plato and Aristotle result either from mistakes of interpretation or from inexplicitness in the text. He guards himself against arbitrarily calling Plato and Aristotle philosophers, or making the contention true by his definition of ‘philosophical’. In a footnote he says this:

I here pass over the possibility, often floated, of ‘alternative rationalities’, not because I deny the possibility of such things, but because they seem irrelevant to the handling of texts plainly written from the standpoint of a non-alternative rationality—indeed, in Aristotle’s case, written by one of the very people responsible for its systematization [i.e. in the *Organon*]. (p. 304 n. 28)

Presumably his alternative rationalities are Goldhill’s different ideologies of language and meaning; but the reason he gives for passing over them, that his authors did not adopt them, prompts a question not articulated by Goldhill: should commentators adopt the rationality of their author? Andrew Laird in the later volume (p. 199) cites a passage of Bakhtin that gives a firm answer: ‘no’.

None of the views that I have been examining so far concern only commentary

among the various forms of interpretation. Indeed, one aim of the earlier volume is to blur the boundaries between commentary and other forms, as when the editor points out that some poems (great poems? learned poems?) ‘can in certain cases profitably be understood as poetic commentaries on the works of their models, in which they deal with problems in the texts they read by offering solutions in the texts they write’ (p. xiii); Charles Martindale, *Redeeming the Text* (Cambridge, 1993) 43–8, gives as an example Dante’s reading of *Aeneid* 6. Another way in which it does so is to include pieces on the interpretation of art. That of Luca Giuliani, ‘Winckelmanns Laokoon. Von der befristeten Eigenmächtigkeit des Kommentars’, struck me as the most distinguished piece in either volume (at least if his argument is new, as a glance at R. Brilliant’s recent book *My Laocoön* suggests it is), but ‘Kommentar’ in the subtitle is not commentary in the narrower sense. The subtitle refers to the section in which he argues that between 1755 and about 1770 Winckelmann’s remarks on the Vatican Laocoon supplanted the original not just for his readers but even for visitors to Rome, because it was inaccessible. Classical literature includes many comments on works lost to us, but only Willard McCarty in the later volume (p. 363 n. 5) mentions an extant commentary on a lost work: ‘John Philoponus’s sixth-century Greek commentary on Aristotle’s *De Intellectu* (a lost portion of the *De Anima*), itself lost and translated into Latin by William de Moerbeke’ (add Asconius on mostly lost speeches of Cicero’s). Few classicists will be in two minds about whether to pass comments on classical texts, but for scholarly or professional reasons they may well be in two minds about whether to pass them in a commentary.

To take professional reasons first, Elaine Fantham in the later volume (p. 418) outlines one that may scare recruits to research: ‘a commentary won’t get you a job’. What distinguishes commentary from other forms of interpretation is that commentators aim at offering help not only on questions that have occurred to them about the work but also on any that may occur to other readers. Inevitably, therefore, they set out with no particular ideas about much of their material, and so appointments committees may suspect them of lacking either originality or direction. If the commentary has already been written, however, suspicion is inadequate; and if not, can bright and knowledgeable people really not be trusted, when they tread new ground, to raise new questions, spot new connexions, or come up with new ideas? Scholars in Britain who already have a job now face a problem that lurks in a footnote of Rhiannon Ash’s: ‘Wiseman . . . concludes his review of Oakley’s commentary as follows: “It is a melancholy thought that it will probably be the last such commentary ever to be written in this country now that the Higher Education Funding Council’s five-yearly research assessments effectively discourage long-term projects”’ (p. 270 n. 4).

Scholarly reservations, on which the professional reservations to some extent rest, are more complex, even without objections as fundamental as Goldhill’s.

One common these days is that many things in commentaries are boring, the more so the further they move from literary criticism. I do not know how many readers of the later volume will agree with Johnson, Porson, and Stephanie West (pp. 36–7), that users of commentaries can be left to do their own literary criticism, but certainly it is not the overriding interest of all classicists or even of all classicists who work on literature, and not all literary critics pick out the same elements of a text. The very people who protest about dross in commentaries are probably crusaders for inter-disciplinarity.

A drawback of commentaries repeatedly alleged in both volumes is atomization, or in Goldhill’s word, ‘morselization’; but I rate the human intellect higher than that. If I

decide to visit Durham by way of Wisbech, Lincoln Cathedral, and Swaledale, not even spending three days in Wisbech need mean that I have forgotten my destination or my route. What anyway of all those articles on an unnoticed allusion in Propertius or the rôle of Haemon in *Antigone*? No atomization there? Contributors also mention the ‘hit-and-run’ user as though no one ever used an article or a discursive book in that way. References like ‘Sabbadini, *cit.*’ have wasted me more time as a hit-and-run user of articles than of any commentary: where on earth in the previous fifty-nine footnotes, most of them long, was he first cited? Christina Kraus argues that atomization encourages tralatician lemmata, but her illustration from commentaries on Livy (pp. 11–13) is unconvincing, and again there is no shortage of tralatician scholarship, attributed or not, either in the body of commentaries or outside them.

As for the notion that there is something peculiarly authoritarian about a commentary quite apart from the more or less authoritarian voice of any commentator, I have never grasped it. True, *ἀτρία ἐλομένου* is an unhelpful admonition to anyone who has no choice or no rational means of choosing; but devoid of authority, life would take a lot longer to live. When a sign in front of me points left and says ‘A1101 Wisbech’, should I fume about authority and turn right? I also need convincing that the format of a commentary has implications for the relative authority of text and commentary. As Felix Budelmann in the later volume remarks of text surrounded on the same page by commentary, ‘the metaphor of the centre controlling the margins can be countered by that of the margins closing in on the centre’ (p. 145). Filling the margins with one commentary rather than another certainly amounts to a relative evaluation of commentaries, but what the commentary does to the text surely depends on whether the reader dips into it for help or swallows it whole to avoid heresy. Format alone cannot dictate one use rather than the other, though traditions of format doubtless exert influence.

Precisely by offering as much as they do, commentators more than other interpreters lay themselves open to complaints about what they fail to offer. Their besetting sin, Kenney has remarked, is leaving the reader in the lurch (Kraus, p. 5 n. 17), by which reviewers often mean leaving other readers in the lurch. Goldhill complains that Hutchinson’s note on *Septem* 16 says nothing about autochthony or about *μητρὶ* on the lips of someone whose mother was also his grandmother, and already in 1743 a translator of Vegetius had this to say about 4.9.5: ‘Stewechius [1585], qui explique avec tant de prolixité tous les endroits qui sont clairs comme le jour, passe à côté de celui-ci sans y toucher’. Commentators can protect themselves to some extent against such complaints by presenting their commentary as a complement to others already written or not yet written, as Irene de Jong did by calling narratological her commentary on the *Odyssey*, which she draws on in the later volume; but Rhiannon Ash in the later volume left it unclear to me whether by calling her commentary on *Histories 2* historiographical she will be circumscribing her aims or just reacting to historical commentaries. If certain kinds of question are excluded, certain kinds of answer may be too (about the tenses, for instance, in *Od.* 7.84–132), but that already happens in some full commentaries; for examples see especially Stephanie West’s piece in the later volume. Such classical commentaries of novel format as the contributors mention—those of Williams on *Odes* 3, Taplin in *Stagecraft*, and Laird and Kahane on the prologue to *The Golden Ass* (a commissioned *variorum*)—have a circumscribed aim or limited extent.

On behalf of commentary as a form, several contributors reply that far from being flawed or outdated it has come into its own in the electronic age. The reason is simple: information about so much can now be found on the internet that users treat it as a

*variorum* commentary on the world. What the internet can do for commentaries is discussed at the end of each volume, the traditional place for mopping up or signalling the way forward. To the earlier volume Don Fowler contributes a typically engaging piece. Words might be electronically tagged with their frequency, he suggests, as an aid to judging stylistic register, and notes provided with visual and aural links. McCarty in the later volume supplies an illustration, that a commentary on *Bacchae* 661–2 might be linked to a visual clip of snow on Cithaeron (no bad image, come to think of it, for commentaries on texts—not always there, sometimes an enhancement of detail, sometimes a transformation of the scene); but about computers more points of substance are made in the later volume by Susan Stephens in a page and a half (pp. 85–7) and by Elaine Fantham in a paragraph (pp. 418–19) than McCarty makes in the thirty-nine opaque and meandering pages of ‘Commentary in an Electronic Age?’, though one of his variations on ‘space forbids’ yields another polar error for Oakley’s note on Livy 7.26.9, ‘space prevents me from little more than gesturing toward . . .’ (p. 388). Fantham’s last point is particularly telling: a commentator who publishes electronically ‘will be expected to devote any free time to incessant update; thus the old book will never be done and the new book never started’.

Goldhill apart, the most ambitious plea for a change of policy on content and style comes from Laird in the later volume. Samples from the commentary on Virgil published in the early seventeenth century by Juan Luis de la Cerda, a Jesuit, suggest to him that commentators should not only engage more with ‘the contemporary cultural moment’, in ways that he does not specify, but also give their own writing a literary and more personal flavour. The literary flavour that he sees in la Cerda’s writing resides partly in two puns that he detects, *amnem* and *deletis* in a note on amnesia (not named) and Lethe, and partly in an anecdotal note on *Ecl.* 1.2 that he takes as an allusion to Plato and a cryptic programme for the commentary. Retreat from the contemporary cultural moment in medical commentaries is crisply diagnosed and dated by von Staden (pp. 125–6), but I am not sure whether he would like to reverse it; in the earlier volume, John Vallance’s piece on ‘non-submissive commentary’ makes the same point with less history and a dose of caricature.

So to the history of commentaries. Many contributors to both volumes explore it, with the difference that the earlier embraces non-classical commentaries. Once more, Goldhill is in the front line: ‘the theory of commentary and the history of commentary are deeply, mutually, and necessarily implicated [i.e. mutually implicated deeply and necessarily]—and play an integral role in what is an immensely important realignment in the politics and culture of education itself’. He illustrates the contention with an entertainingly circumstantial account of Headlam’s attack on two of Verrall’s Aeschylean commentaries (pp. 384–93). Any reader afraid that the other excursions into history will all echo Budelmann’s tune, ‘Tzetzes reminds us of the fact that many of our ideas about commentaries go back a long way’ (p. 161), will be heartened by their variety, and anyway it can be salutary to learn that something has been happening for longer than one thought. John Dillon in the earlier volume mentions that according to Proclus Plato’s *Philebus* lacks a framing narrative ‘because the primal Good, which is its subject, is unbounded, and has neither beginning nor end’ (p. 210 n. 11)—an interpretation that I should have put in the last forty years if I had met it with no name attached.

In the earlier volume, Ineke Sluiter argues that ancient Homeric commentators of a didactic bent created Homer in their own image, which tempts one to wonder how far learned poets are the creation of learned interpreters. Stefan Maul, in a model of exposition, discusses ‘Orthographie und Etymologie als hermeneutische Verfahren

babylonischer Gelehrter'. Rudolf Wagner, in 'Buddhist Commentaries on the Taoist Classic *Laozi*', examines 'the appropriation of a tradition through the commentarial appropriation of a text'; on the way he mentions something that will greatly interest historians of classical commentary, that Chinese commentaries up to the end of the second century A.D. were separate works but thereafter 'were inserted into the text to the point that canonical texts were by and large unavailable without commentary' (p. 106), though he does not connect the fact with either of two others that he puts in the same period, namely the collapse of the school structure and 'the rapid replacement of bamboo strips with writing paper' (pp. 116–17). Alexander Jones considers in an appendix whether subscriptions in commentaries by Theon and Eutocius are claiming that the commentator also edited the text.

John Henderson in the later volume meditates on education, not least his own, through R. G. Austin's commentaries, especially the one on *Pro Caelio* in its three versions. Even more unsettling than Susan Stephens when she skewers male commentators with Sappho's ὀλιζβ.δοκοις (or was it Alcaeus?), Albert Rijksbaron gives low marks to most of the numerous school commentaries on Xenophon's *Anabasis* for their explanations of the genitive and the tense in the opening words, Δαρείου καὶ Παρυσάτιδος γίγνονται παῖδες δύο. Incidentally, would you mention in your commentary on the *Anabasis* that it features in an opera, Janáček's *Cunning Little Vixen*? Fowler on this: 'parallels from modern literature, which were never common in the classical commentary . . . , may be rejected [by some users] as irrelevant, despite the modern revival and recontextualisation of reception studies' (p. 436).

Rijksbaron also mentions the switch in commentaries from Latin to the vernacular, which in Germany he connects with the educational reforms of Wilhelm von Humboldt; Andrew Dyck in the same volume touches on the matter in his piece on Cicero's philosophical works (p. 321). When were Greek texts first accompanied by Latin commentaries, and was the innovation debated? After studying medicine in Paris through the French Revolution, Adamantios Korais (Sandys III.361–4), 'the father of Modern Greek literature, whose advocacy of a revived classicism laid the intellectual foundations for the Greek struggle for independence' (*New Encyclopaedia Britannica*), contributed notes in Latin to a commentary on Xenocrates (Naples, 1794) and went on to publish in Paris editions of his own, with the notes first in French on Theophrastus's *Characters* and Hippocrates, then in largely classical Greek on other authors. The edition of Theophrastus (1799) opens with this address 'Aux Grecs libres de la mer ionienne':

Une grande nation, conduite par les lumières, et marchant sur les pas de vos ancêtres, vient de briser vos fers. Elle vous offre avec la liberté tous les moyens de devenir les émules, peut-être même les rivaux des anciens Grecs. Un de ces moyens est de vous familiariser avec la connoissance de la langue de ces derniers, et de celle que parlent vos libérateurs. L'une, qu'on peut à juste titre nommer la langue des Dieux, éclaira une grande partie de l'ancien continent. L'autre, appelée la langue de la Raison et de la Philosophie [so much for Logos], ne tardera point à instruire tout l'Univers. En vous offrant dans ces deux langues une partie de mes foibles travaux, loin de vouloir vous flatter par une dédicace banale, mon dessein est de vous rappeler ce que vos fûtes dans les beaux jours de notre commune Patrie, ce que vous pouvez redevenir pour votre propre bonheur et pour celui de nos frères, qui gémissent encore sous un sceptre de fer. Puisse votre exemple les consoler de leurs maux en offrant à leurs yeux mouillés de larmes la perspective d'un avenir plus heureux!

In the preface to his Heliodorus (1804) he says that Greeks need commentary in the language they think in, because other nations threw off the yoke of barbarism only

when οἱ κατ' ἀρχὰς ὀλίγοι λόγιοι ἀντῶν ἄνδρες took up the vernacular (p. 51); and he amusingly sketches the labour and artificiality of writing in a dead language (pp. 61–3). Through the editions that he produced from 1805 to 1814, most of them in what appeared of a *Βιβλιοθήκη Ἑλληνική*, runs a sequence of eight essays on the culture and language of Greece (the first seven usefully summarized in the eighth, pp. 1–6). Greek is also the language of the preface and notes in Courier's *Longus* (Rome, 1810).

There is much besides. If I have failed to mention Richard Hunter's piece in the later volume on giving a fair deal to anonymous works and works of disputed authorship, it is only because it did not fit into my train of thought, a measure of his talent for spotting a fresh angle; on Roy Gibson's piece see below. That I have ignored seven contributions to the earlier volume must be taken as a sign of my limitations (I did read them, twice). As most contributors to the later volume are practising commentators, it abounds in observations on what I will lump together as fine tuning, though in Goldhill's words 'I can see it must vex any editor' (p. 410); much of it has to do with catering for particular audiences, and it includes dilemmas as sharp as whether the introduction to a commentary in two volumes should be repeated in the second (p. 277).

On the whole, the atmosphere in both volumes is relaxed. Goldhill's 'fierce arena' of debate on the theory of commentary (p. 381, Kraus p. 9 n. 33) must be round the corner somewhere, though Susan Stephens in 'Commenting on Fragments' adopts a somewhat censorious tone. The scope of the earlier volume, and the fact that almost half of it is in German whereas the later is entirely in English, will probably win it fewer readers among anglophone classicists, a pity when it includes the most stimulating as well as the most distinguished piece and forms part of a project that Glenn Most devised with flair and has carried out with dispatch (*Collecting Fragments* and *Editing Texts* preceded, and *Historicization* and *Disciplining Classics* have followed). Christina Kraus writes a notably thoughtful, comprehensive, and well-documented introduction, so good that for the sake of the other contributors I recommend leaving it till last. Together, the volumes mine a rich vein. Though it has lain open since at least the early decades of print, when Calderini and other humanists that Carlo Dionisotti discussed in *I. M. U.* 11 (1968), 165–9 elevated *miscellanea* on the model of Gellius above the scholastic routine of largely pedestrian commentary, only in the last few years have concerted efforts been made to go deeper—a striking development in itself, but one that I leave for conferences on books on commentaries on texts.

Both volumes are well indexed, and in the later, after a general bibliography that oddly lists thirty-five authors from the first half of the alphabet and a mere six from the second, every piece has its own bibliography at the end; the footnotes in the later also give many cross-references, which the editors rather than the authors seem to have added. When I checked whether 'scholastic' in a quotation of Goldhill's from Headlam (p. 384) should have been 'scholiastic' (it should), I found six mistakes of less moment in twelve lines, but the standard of accuracy in both volumes seems high except in Laird's piece, which combines bibliographical sloppiness with faulty transcriptions and versions in translationese; one excerpt opens with absurd punctuation and ends with *iudicabatur* for *-bitur* (p. 188), the three words missing from another include an important *neque* before *prima* in the second line (p. 193), and someone who has published on Neo-Latin should not be serving up *insero* as *infero* (p. 183), much less *desinere* as *definere* (p. 189). It may have been the typesetter who in *historiis & fabulis* inserted *amp.* (p. 184 n. 32), an authorial instruction, I imagine, not to print *et*.

Susan Stephens urges that ‘presses considering the publication of commentaries, and subsequently the journals that review them, should select reviewers who do not themselves write commentaries . . . , hence are not part of the guild’ (p. 85). Like Hunter (p. 94 n. 9), I must declare a different interest, as an editor of Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries (the orange series). It accounts for my silence about Gibson’s piece on *Ars amatoria* 3 and may well disqualify me from reviewing books on commentaries. Too late. As for the ‘guild’, are there scholars who would not be seen dead in it, or is it just that *extra est quem nemo rogavit*?

I end with two commentators that I have a soft spot for, H. C. Goodhart on Thucydides 8 (London 1893) and Servius on Virgil. My school offered a Thucydides Prize, for which in my year the assignment was Book 8; I badly needed help, and Goodhart, by giving me that and much else, made me a fan of commentaries and of the *copia* that Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht extols in the tailpiece to the earlier volume. Servius I read stretches of when I had classical literature to teach after the distractions of history and philosophy; though I turned to him because he brings in a number of things otherwise unattested, it proved more important that very little escapes unlemmatized, so that he forced me to look at pretty well every word. Heartfelt thanks to these two members of the guild and to all others, past, present, and future.

*Pembroke College, Cambridge*

MICHAEL D. REEVE

## FORTY-EIGHT YEARS OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP

T. P. WISEMAN (ed.): *Classics in Progress. Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome*. Pp. xvi + 451, ill. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-726270-8.

Congratulations to the British Academy on its centenary, for which *Classics in Progress* forms part of the celebration. The seal of the British Academy on its flyleaf invites a serious look.

T. P. Wiseman begins the book’s short preface (pp. xiii–xvi) by looking back at *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship* (1954), a survey marking the ‘Jubilee meeting’ of the Classical Association (p. xiv). This collection, then, will also be a retrospective, as the title perhaps suggests. But W. does not explain the choice of topics for the book’s seventeen chapters (the number evidently deriving from that of the 1954 collection), nor their arrangement, and indeed says this is ‘a selection . . . deliberately eclectic’ (p. xiii); ‘deliberately loose’ (p. xvi).

The result is a sort of miscellany. Only three contributors provide a full retrospective of developments in a subfield since 1954: R. R. R. Smith (art history), Averil Cameron (late antiquity), and John K. Davies (Greek history). Paul Cartledge organizes a survey (Greek slavery) around a single major scholar per decade. Alan Bowman (Egypt) tours various research areas. These chapters, especially the first three, clearly belong in a collection like this.

Then a group of informal essays: Oliver Taplin on translations of Greek drama; Pat Easterling on lists and canon formation from antiquity to the present; Peter Parsons on the value of papyri; Michael Crawford on finding Diocletian’s edict on maximum prices. (A sample, from Crawford: ‘A spot of autopsy seemed called for . . . though if Joyce Reynolds and I had realised the privations involved, we might have had second