are *descripti*) are variable in textual extension, arrangement and single readings, justifying previous editors' choice (with the partial exception of Parrasio) to separate *De ratione metrorum* (pp. 5–30 = GL VI, 216–28), attributed to Maximus Victorinus, from *De finalibus* (pp. 31–64 = GL VI, 229–40), attributed to Metrorius (Maxim(in)us). In the manuscripts, including Neap. Lat. 2, *De ratione metrorum* is almost always followed by *De finalibus*, but the presence of a second *inscriptio*, transmitted in various forms (and wrongly relegated by Corazza to the apparatus on p. 31.1), suggests that the two texts were not considered as a single textbook but as a scholastic collection (see xliii). Besides, *De finalibus* offers a more detailed treatment of the final section of *De ratione metrorum* dealing with the final syllables only of the categories *nomen* and *verbum* (transmitted in alternative orders in the sub-families φ and τ).

Ten manuscripts preserve *De finalibus* alone, without *De ratione metrorum* and the marginally relevant chapter *de caesuris* (which is also preserved as an addendum to other treatises (xlii n. 5)). Shared variants (cxxxvii–cxl) distinguish this version α from the version β which is preserved after *De ratione metrorum*. Only Sang. 876 (eighth to ninth century) contains the introductory chapters about the classification of letters and syllables (31–5), but it separates them from the rest of the treatise by the *Ad Basilium amicum Sergii* (GL VI, 240. 11-242). On the other hand, *Ad Basilium* simply replaces such chapters in Pal. Lat. 1753 (eighth to ninth century), as well as in Par. Lat. 13205 (ninth century) in which *Ad Basilium* (broken up by GL VI, 241. 3) is however followed by the words SERVIVVS [sic] *AQUILINO SALVTEM* (p. cv). In Lev. 2. 1 (eighth century) and in Oxon. Magd. Coll. 64 (fourteenth century) *De finalibus* is inserted into the text of Book II of *Explanationes in Donatum* (see pp. cviff.); in Barcill. Ripol. 46 (ninth to tenth century) and Bern. 207 (eighth century) it is inserted into the middle of Book I of Donatus' *Ars maior*, between *De syllaba* and *De pedibus* (p. lxxxvii); in Oxon. Add. C 144 (eleventh century) it is divided up and included in the relevant sections throughout the *Ars minor* (p. cii). In the end, version α is preserved as an independent text only in Berol. Diez. B Sant. 66 and Par. Lat. 7530, both from the ninth century, as well as in Pal. Lat. 1753, Par. Lat. 13205 and Sang. 876, where introductory sections precede it; these appear to record the earliest stage of transmission, when notes on Donatus' *Artes* were gathered together to form a single independent treatise *De finalibus* (p. xlii). But, given the absence of shared errors, it is not necessary to conclude with C. that Sang. 876 acquired its chapters on letters and syllables from a manuscript of version β belonging to the branch γ, which preserves only the introductory chapters of *De finalibus* after *De ratione metrorum* (p. xlv n. 11). In the same way as texts such as *Ad Basilium* and the so-called *Regulae de finalibus* are preserved in Lav. 2.1 (Appendix I, 168–70), these chapters on letters and syllables must have circulated independently, as occurs in Neap. Lat. IV A 34, ff. 144r–v.

Following the *Commentarium*, Appendix I contains a critical edition of five shorter works. Four of these have already been edited by C. in F. Gasti (ed.), *Grammatica e grammatici latini* (2003), 93ff., but the prefatory letter of the fragmentary *De finalibus* of Coronatus and the *De finalibus syllabis omnium partium* were previously unedited. Appendix II contains *lectiones singulares* from the manuscripts of *De ratione metrorum* and *De finalibus* (183–218), a selection of frequent variants (219–23) and a list of differences from Keil's edition (224–31).

The edition shows diligence and critical judgement. There is a substantial bibliography (ix–xxxviii). The Introduction (xxxix–cxliii), in offering a reconstruction of the history of the text before the description of the manuscripts, unfortunately forces the reader to flick constantly between different sections.

Università degli Studi 'G. d'Annunzio' di Chieti-Pescara PAOLO D' ALESSANDRO
p.dalessandro@unich.it
doi:10.1017/S0075435813000749

P. JAMES, *OVID'S MYTH OF PYGMALION ON SCREEN — IN PURSUIT OF THE PERFECT WOMAN*. London and New York: Continuum, 2011. Pp. x + 231. ISBN 9781441184665. £60.00.

Classical reception occupies an uneasy position at the start of the twenty-first century. It is still perceived as a subject for the élite — children who are not educated privately are lucky if they have access to Latin and Greek lessons — and yet the subject is enjoying an enormous revival in the public consciousness. This revival is being shaped to a large extent by the rôle that it is playing in popular culture. The different facets and implications of this 'democratic turn' are beginning to be the subject of academic study (note in particular the forthcoming volume

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435813000750 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hardwick and Harrison (eds), *Classics in the Modern World – a Democratic Turn?*). Paula James deftly negotiates her analysis of the reception of Pygmalion in screen versions of the myth, guiding us from films of the 1920s and 1930s, such as *Metropolis* (1927) and *A Star is Born* (1937) up to the recent cult television series *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (1997–2003) and films such as *Notting Hill* (1999) and *Miss Congeniality* (2000). J. combines considerable erudition about recent scholarship on Ovid's Pygmalion which is currently shaping our understanding of the myth, and about the various cultural influences which marked alternative versions of the myth for different generations. I particularly enjoyed her sensitive discussion of Burne-Jones' *Pygmalion and the Image* sequence and the ways in which these images are echoed and reflected in films from *My Fair Lady* (1964) to *SIMØNE* (2002). This is a study which is unusually wide-ranging, and which combines close and probing analyses of Ovid's text with a meticulous and detailed knowledge of a vast corpus of films. The book is enriched still further by J.'s lucid exposition of the cultural histories in which these different screen versions are embedded. And so we are led through a cultural history of the various different social issues which the Pygmalion myth addresses — what constitutes the 'perfect woman'? How does the image change at different times and in different societies? Who controls the fashioning of these images? What does this teach us about the dangers of fantasy, of misogyny? Underpinning the whole study is the issue of how myths survive and to whom they belong.

If I had a quibble it is that occasionally the tone of the book is a little too relaxed — there are a number of conversational asides in parentheses, and the identity of the perceived target audience appears to slip. And yet this is a book that seeks to embrace a wide audience in order to emphasize the abiding power of the classical tradition. J.'s refreshing accessibility is a large part of the book's charm and success. *Ovid's Myth of Pygmalion on Screen* is that rare phenomenon — a serious and important work of scholarship, which is great fun to read.

University of Exeter FIONA COX
F.M.Cox@exeter.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435813000750

C. KREBS, *A MOST DANGEROUS BOOK: TACITUS'* GERMANIA *FROM THE ROMAN EMPIRE TO THE THIRD REICH*. London: W.W.Norton & Co., 2011. Pp. 303, illus. ISBN 9780393062656. £18.99/US$25.95.

This fascinating new study by Christopher Krebs looks at the history of Tacitus' *Germania* from the author's own day to the end of the Second World War. Its introduction, eight chapters and epilogue span the entire history of the reception of this important work in a sensitive and perceptive fashion, concluding with a thoroughly engaging, albeit disturbing, exploration of how pervasive the *Germania* was in National Socialist ideology.

After an exciting introductory chapter recounting an attempt by the SS to acquire a manuscript copy of Tacitus' text, K. continues with a helpful exploration of the motives of the ancient author himself. Often lacking in works on classical reception, we are given a detailed grounding in the world in which Tacitus lived and wrote. K. asks the important question of why Tacitus wrote his *Germania* in the first place. Beyond conventional explanations he suggests some more unusual, yet wholly feasible, questions never asked by those that received Tacitus' text: 'Did Tacitus hope that his *Germania* would help to persuade the emperor to strike a blow against the Germanen?' (49).

After this begins a long and very well-informed account of the text through later ages. K.'s understanding and analysis of the process of historical reception is thoughtful and sophisticated. Early in his book he sums this up in an apt and insightful metaphor, recognizing that the reception of the *Germania* in itself involved parallel readings, often contemporary with one another, and that later receptions were often shaped by earlier ones. 'No tradition runs in a single stream. There are rills, runnels, and rivulets, making up different readings of the same text' (24). Later he applies his approach to the different periods he examines. Looking at the sixteenth century he asks, 'After all, who today would read Beowulf to learn about modern Scandinavia?' (83). He points out the often confused and confusing nature of reception, adding of this period: 'Three decades into the sixteenth century, in a circle of reference, the text that started the tradition is supported by the tradition' (128). Throughout his book and throughout the periods that he studies, K.'s narrative is continuously reflective, highlighting much of the irony and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435813000750 Published online by Cambridge University Press