

B. GENTILI, F. PERUSINO (edd.): *La colometria antica dei testi poetici greci*. Pp. 234. Pisa: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-190-6.

M. C. MARTINELLI: *Gli strumenti del poeta. Elementi di metrica greca*. Pp. ix + 321. Bologna: Cappelli editore, 1995. Paper, L. 42,000. ISBN: 88-379-0742-7.

The general aim of *La colometria antica*, which publishes essays from a 1997 conference, is to raise the stock of the lyric colometry presented by medieval and ancient MSS, metrical scholia, and treatises, on the grounds that the Alexandrian editors who first divided the texts into cola still knew quite a lot about the original musical and metrical contexts. We are used to thinking that modern metrics, in the wake of Böckh's edition of Pindar (1811–21), has broken completely with ancient theory; though we still use many of their terms for cola, our notions of how they go together is very different, and no modern metrician, any more than a modern grammarian, would defer to ancient dogma when our science dictates otherwise. In fact, the difference between the two is less than scholars' rhetoric has sometimes led us to believe; in practical terms, at least, when one gets down to specific analyses, the contributors to this volume repeatedly make the case, not that a new theory is required, but that the ancient colometry can be brought into line with modern theory given a little goodwill and flexibility in such things as responson or the conditions at period end. Yet though the antispasts' flippers will not flap again, traditional metricians will still balk at some of the analyses on offer. More than goodwill is required to follow, for example, F. Perusino (pp. 205ff.) in analysing three garden variety iambic tetrameters catalectic at Ar. *Lys.* 1316ff. as three times *ia reiz ithyph* (if not self-evident, the change of address supports the diagnosis). Traditional metricians will point out too that the MSS' colometry frequently ignores responson (as already in the papyrus of Sophocles' *Ichneutae*, not discussed in the book), is easily corrupted, and is often inconsistent. L. P. E. Parker, in a masterly discussion (*The Songs of Aristophanes* [Oxford, 1997], pp. 94ff.), reports Irigoin's finding that in the dactylo-epitrite poems of Pindar the Alexandrian editors failed to recognize 7% of Böckh's verse-ends, which are detected on the simple basis of recurring word-end, and in metres he classified as iambic for his purposes, they missed fully 21.6% of the verse-ends. 'Not particularly creditable', she remarks; as these verse-ends cannot all be argued away, the situation makes against, not for, the conclusion that the ancient editors had privileged access to the original colometry. Dogmatism either way is dangerous, however, as the evidence is sparse. Thomas Fleming's arguments in the first chapter that ancient music survived to Alexandria carry some weight, but on the crucial issue of how far the changes of the fourth century obscured metricians' understanding of the classical principles, he overestimates the strength of his case. (Fleming and E. Christian Kopff have explored this ground before; see *SIFC* 3.10 [1992], 758–70, and Fleming's piece in *GRBS* 16 [1975], 141–8.) As a small additional consideration I would note that the astrophonic composition of the 'New Music' would have desensitized people to responson and inclined them to break units down which we, after Böckh, have put back together; using cola *κατὰ στίχον* is more common in post-classical poetry. Thomas Cole's history of metre in *Epiploke* (Cambridge, MA, 1988), perhaps the most persuasive part of this challenging book (see *EMC/VCV* n.s. 10 [1991], 1ff.), should be consulted on this topic. Nonetheless, one can agree that when MSS, papyri, and metrical scholia agree on colometry, ancient wisdom lies behind it, and this book will make us ponder it a little more often. More Aristophanic papyri published recently in *POxy* LXVI add to the evidence. Noteworthy in this volume are A. Tessier's study of the work of Demetrius Triclinius; E. Marino's comparison of the musical papyrus of the *Orestes* with the medieval colometry (though the correspondence of some of the colometry with certain signs in the papyrus is not so very marvellous in a straightforward series of dochmiacs: cf. again the *Ichneutae* papyrus); and Kopff's re-examination after Diggle and West of Dale's canon that in lyric iambs resolution does not precede syncope: a useful contribution, but the rhetoric is misplaced.

Martinelli's handbook is distinguished by its lucid explanations, clear layout, and full bibliography on many points of detail; English-speaking scholars might wish to consult it particularly for the latter. Controversial passages are occasionally treated in footnotes, but the book's main purpose is to describe fully the fundamentals. A new term, 'blocco di sinafia', is used to distinguish from ordinary *brevis in longo* cases where a colon such as a glyconic (last element a

longum) ends with a closed syllable whose vowel is short (e.g. *-ev*); in such cases the closed nature of the syllable in a position not in metrical sandhi with what follows confers the necessary length.

*University of Bristol*

ROBERT L. FOWLER

CHRISTIANE REITZ (ed.): *Vom Text zum Buch*. (Subsidia Classica 3.) Pp. iii + 177, 17 pls. St Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae Verlag, 2000. Paper, DM 38. ISBN: 3-89590-095-8.

The editor won a prize for teaching and spent part of it on a conference about editing, held at Mannheim in 1999. Eight speakers and one non-speaker contribute pieces to this volume: Guido Schepens on fragments of Greek historians, Wolfgang Spickermann on the Roman inscriptions of Germany, Ulrich Eigler on differences in appearance between ancient and modern books, Stephen Harrison on Catullus, Kai Brodersen on the need for good translations and recognition for translators, Ralf Georg Bogner on the library catalogue of the seventeenth-century Lutheran theologian Johann Gerhard of Jena, Christoph Schäfer on the Lyon printer Sebastianus Gryphius, Luc Deitz on Neo-Latin texts, and Wolfgang Schibel on digitizing rare books. Harrison writes in English, the rest in German; Schepens, Harrison, and Deitz recycle earlier publications. Brodersen's theme, touched on so often in the other pieces that it becomes the main thread of the volume, was also aired months later at a separate event, and a report of the outcome is appended. Thirteen plates illustrate Eigler's piece, four Bogner's. There is an index of names.

Unlike the other contributors, Eigler and Schäfer present no project or programme. The only novelty in either piece is Schäfer's contention, advertised in his title, that printing saved from extinction a large proportion of the ancient texts that had survived to that point—an implausible contention that he does nothing to substantiate either in general or with reference to the oddly chosen example named in his subtitle, the five volumes that Gryphius printed in 1545–6 of Aristotle in Latin translation. More worrying than losses that never occurred is Spickermann's revelation that inscriptions at Saverne in Alsace have recently been damaged by quick-drying cement used in building operations.

From the other contributions, Spickermann's included, it emerges that different kinds of text pose different kinds of editorial problem; but the material discussed is so diverse, even without anything medieval or recent, that any other conclusion would have been surprising. A further consequence of the diversity will be that few scholars or students read more than two of the pieces. The parochialism of some contributors does not help; Bogner, for instance, says not a word about the long tradition of publishing medieval catalogues, which often give editors much the same trouble as Gerhard's catalogue has given him and his colleagues.

Anyone with a taste for controversy will enjoy both the pugnacity of Deitz and the cooler persuasiveness of Schepens, but the most challenging piece, even though it mainly concerns editing in the weak sense of reproducing, is Schibel's, which sets the economics of editing in a broader argument about academic publishing, library services, and access to information. He estimates that conventional reprints cost libraries twelve times as much as sets of electronic images made by scanning. For accurate entering of Latin texts in a data bank he weighs Latinists against cheap labour; even if the work of two ignorant typists given the same exemplar to copy is corrected by electronic comparison, errors that they both commit will remain, and so for the moment, at least in certain types of project, Latinists provide better service. Think twice, though, before planning to supplement your pension: the going rate at Mannheim is 15 DM an hour, and only for fast work.

*Pembroke College, Cambridge*

MICHAEL D. REEVE