

Pandion and his sons. (§vi) Finally he considers the routes by which these passages from *Ath. Pol.* found their way to the *scholia vetera*: where there is an overlap with Hesychius, he suggests Didymus' *Lexis Komike* as a source; where passages from other classical texts have been combined with passages from *Ath. Pol.*, they will have been put together by one or another of the Alexandrian commentators; the reference to *Ath. Pol.* 34.1 in schol. *Ran.* 1532 will have come from a catalogue of *komodoumenoi*; passages on law-court procedure may have been put together by Callistratus.

After a primary and a supplementary bibliography (at a point where the casual user might not easily find them), M. devotes the remainder of the book to studying one by one his nineteen citations of *Ath. Pol.*, giving in each case the text and a translation of the scholium, the context of the lemma to which the scholium is attached, and a discussion of the use made of *Ath. Pol.* in the scholium. I note just a few points.

19.3 (schol. *Lys.* 666): M. argues that *Ath. Pol.*'s text was ὑπὸ Πάριον, which was then corrupted in different ways. That is one of the two possibilities which I considered in my *Commentary*: the other, R's περὶ, he persuades me is one of the corruptions.

19.6 (schol. *Vesp.* 502): M. is prepared to believe that *Ath. Pol.* gave the total length of the tyranny as 49 years. I still prefer 36, as the total of the actual periods of tyranny in *Ath. Pol.*'s scheme.

27.3, 28.3 (schol. *Vesp.* 684): M. may be right to detect a confusion between jury pay and the *diobelia*, but the 3 obols come not from 27.3 but from 62.2.

34.1 (schol. *Ran.* 1532): against my view that *Ath. Pol.* has misdated the Spartan peace offer and the frustration of it by Cleophon which in fact followed the battle of Cyzicus, M. doubts whether Aristophanes would have alluded at the end of the *Frogs* to an episode that took place so long before (and wonders if with Salviat we should regard the passage as an addition made for the second performance of the play)—but, if Cleophon was continuously opposed to the ending of the war without a decisive Athenian victory, I think Aristophanes himself need not have been alluding to any one episode.

42.2 (schol. *Vesp.* 378): M. wonders if the original comment which is the source of the scholium distinguished between fifth- and fourth-century practice in the *dokimasia* of eighteen-year-olds.

65.2 (schol. *Plut.* 278): this scholium is important for reconstructing the fragmentary text of *Ath. Pol.*, and M. insists that we should use the best text, reading σύμβολον δημόσιον rather than δημοσίᾳ—but the change does not eliminate my puzzlement as to why this out of the various objects mentioned in connection with law-court procedure should be specially labelled 'public'.

This is a learned and a meticulous piece of work, which usefully clarifies the employment of *Ath. Pol.* by commentators on Aristophanes.

University of Durham

P. J. RHODES

M. MUND-DOPCHIE: *La fortune du 'Périple d'Hannon' à la Renaissance et au XVIIe siècle: Continuité et rupture dans la transmission d'un savoir géographique.* (Collection d'Études Classiques, 8.) Pp. viii + 178. Namur: Société des Études Classiques, 1995. Paper, Belg. frs. 1300. ISBN: 2-87037-214-4.

This fascinating study traces the use of Hanno's *Periplus* from early citations in antiquity through to the seventeenth century. The received Greek text is derived from *Palatinus Graecus* 398, though the original, presumably in Punic, was apparently hung in the temple of Baal ('Kronos') at Carthage. Although the authenticity of the text is mentioned (see pp. 81–4), this volume concentrates on the way that Hanno's work has been cited and used in subsequent centuries. The first two chapters form a prolegomena to the book, and provide a survey of ancient citations of or familiarity with Hanno's work. These include [Aristotle] (*De mir. ausc.*), Pomponius Mela, and Pliny. Similar citations continued into late antiquity and through the Middle Ages. The transmission of these texts from antiquity is also briefly considered.

There are two main parts to this study of Hanno. The first covers the early editions and translations. The first Greek text was edited by Sigismund Gelen and appeared in 1533 along with some other geographical works. This seems to have been based on the manuscript which was then in Basle (p. 33); the history of *Palatinus Graecus* 398 is documented, including its reintegration into the library in Heidelberg in 1816. It is not surprising that one of the earliest

translations of the *Periplus* was made in Venice and published by Giambattista Ramusio in 1550 as part of a volume of *Navigazioni et Viaggi* (p. 35). A French translation, published by Jean Temporal, appeared in 1556 within a volume on Africa (pp. 38–9); this was followed by a translation in Latin, published in Zurich in 1559 (p. 56). The first English translation, based on Ramusio, only appeared in 1625 and was associated with other ancient and biblical voyages (p. 43); and a reprint of the Latin translation was published in Oxford in 1698 by John Hudson as part of a volume of ancient geographers (pp. 50–1). The second main study covers the different ways in which Hanno's text was cited and considered in the Renaissance. These include specific word studies, a discussion of the marvels, as well as the relation of Hanno's voyage to a real topography.

One of the most interesting sections in the book concerns the way that Hanno became an emblem or a prototype in the age of the Great Discoveries; he is seen as one of the first in a long line of explorers who transmitted 'the flame of discovery' from generation to generation (p. 88). One of the earliest mentions in this regard was made by Nicolò Scillacio in 1494, himself influenced by Columbus's return from his second voyage (p. 88). Brief consideration is also given to the use of Hanno from the eighteenth century onwards. One of the most striking examples cited was the use by François-René de Chateaubriand in his attack on the French Republic, published in 1796. There he draws a parallel between two great commercial nations: for antiquity, Carthage, and for the present day, England. For Chateaubriand, the two great voyagers representing the furtherance of trade were Hanno and Captain James Cook (pp. 141–2).

Hanno continues to play a rôle in the way that the Phoenicians are viewed today. In a major 1988 Venice exhibition, the *Periplus* was discussed within the context of Phoenician seafaring and ancient views of the Phoenicians; Hanno's account may have even given rise to a forged Phoenician inscription near João Pessoa in northern Brazil which came to light in 1872 (S. Moscati, *The Phoenicians* [1988], pp. 558, 560, 570). This study of Hanno is a reminder that the classical world, as well as the Renaissance, gave rightful recognition to the achievements of the Phoenicians and Carthaginians, which have, perhaps, sometimes been given less than their true acknowledgement.

*University of Wales Swansea*

DAVID W. J. GILL

G. INDELLI, V. TSOUNA-MCKIRAHAN (edd., trans.): *[Philodemus]: [On Choices and Avoidances]*. (Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi ercolanesi diretta da Marcello Gigante, 15.) Pp. 248. Naples: Bibliopolis, 1995. ISBN: 88-7088-343-4.

The Herculaneum papyrus 1251 was first unrolled in 1808 to reveal twenty-three columns of text, the last fifth of the original roll, lacking title and author. Both the top and the bottom of each column had been destroyed. The contents revealed no clear order and were regarded as a miscellaneous collection of largely disjointed remarks. In addition to the surviving papyrus, now less readable than before, there are two apographs, published in 1811 and 1881. There have been several critical editions, the last of which was published by W. Schmid in 1939. Since then, however, a number of important advances have been made with regard to the text, its authorship and its interpretation. More recently Gigante has argued for the authorship of Philodemus rather than the previously canvassed Hermarchus or Epicurus himself. The present edition, besides taking all this more recent work into account, has the extra advantage of having two authors with complementary skills, I. providing the papyrological input and T. the philosophical expertise. Their partnership has been more than responsibility for particular sections of the finished work; it has been a fruitful interaction throughout the preparation of the volume.

They argue persuasively, on both philosophical and stylistic grounds, for Philodemus as author, and with considerable plausibility provide the title *On Choices and Avoidances*, a title mentioned by Philodemus himself in Herc. 1424, whilst the words *αἰρέσεις* and *φυγαί* occur several times in combination in the text of Herc. 1251. Indeed the topic of moral choices and avoidances is the prevailing theme of the fragment. The disjointed nature of the fragment is due not merely to the