

and influential poems, such as the *Aves Frisiae*, would do more to revive the reputation of the amiably erudite Dr Heerkens than another uninviting monograph.

*Sarah Lawrence College*

JAMES HOROWITZ  
[jhorowitz@sarahlawrence.edu](mailto:jhorowitz@sarahlawrence.edu)

## MANUSCRIPT ILLUSTRATIONS

CLARIDGE (A.), HERKLOTZ (I.) *Classical Manuscript Illustrations*. (The Paper Museum of Cassiano dal Pozzo Series A: Antiquities and Architecture 6.) Pp. viii+413, b/w & colour ills. London: The Royal Collection in association with Harvey Miller Publishers, 2012. Cased, €141. ISBN: 978-1-905375-76-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X14000201

The Paper Museum ('Museo Cartaceo') is a collection of thousands of watercolours, drawings and prints, assembled in the seventeenth century by the Roman collector Cassiano dal Pozzo. It represents perhaps the most significant attempt before the age of photography to document ancient art and culture. The collection was sold by Cassiano's heirs to Pope Clement XI in the early eighteenth century, acquired by King George III in 1762 and transferred in 1834 to the Royal Library at Windsor Castle. The catalogue of this huge visual encyclopaedia has been in the course of publication since 1993 in 36 volumes, divided into three series: Antiquities and Architecture, Natural History and Prints.

The 160 drawings catalogued in this sixth volume of Series A are taken from five ancient manuscripts, among the oldest surviving Latin codices: the famous Vatican Virgil from c. A.D. 400 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3225), the Roman Virgil from the late fifth or sixth century (BAV, Vat. lat. 3867), the Vatican Terence from c. A.D. 825 (BAV, Vat. lat. 3868), the Palatine Agrimensores (BAV, Pal. lat. 1564) and a now lost Carolingian copy of the Calendar of the year 354. They were copied for Cassiano between 1632 and 1634.

Introductory essays by C. about Series A and Classical manuscript illustrations, and the Paper Museum in general, are followed by a short description of the five manuscripts (with some nice reproductions from the original manuscripts) and their history down to Cassiano's day. All the drawings are reproduced as full-page colour plates, with detailed descriptions, transcriptions and translations of the texts and a commentary on the iconographical content.

Most interesting is H.'s chapter, 'Late Antique Manuscripts in Early Modern Study: Critics, Antiquaries and the History of Art', which focuses on the two Virgil manuscripts and the Terence, which enjoyed a common fortune. H. illustrates how interest in these manuscripts changed over time, mirroring 'a certain shift in scholarly preoccupations that may be understood as reflecting the general transformations of intellectual paradigms' (p. 52). Humanists looked at these manuscripts from a philological and palaeographical viewpoint, exploiting them for *variae lectiones* and comparing their capital letters to the ones found in antique inscriptions. It is no coincidence that these manuscripts figured prominently in Mabillon's pioneering *De re diplomatica* (1681). For a long time, philologists debated the precise age of these manuscripts, but merely on palaeographical grounds, since they had no interest in the splendid miniatures which decorate them. The discovery of the miniatures was the work of antiquaries like Fulvio Orsini and indeed Cassiano dal

Pozzo, whose collection of drawings was used by many seventeenth-century scholars in their antiquarian publications. They tried to reconstruct ancient civilisation, customs and institutions, for which the study of material culture was indispensable. Pre-eminence was given to the analysis of costume, which was considered a reflection of social identity (as it was in the seventeenth century). The Paper Museum was therefore conceived as a *corpus antiquitatum*, covering all aspects of ancient life. It often illustrates both Cassiano's obsession with taxonomy and his copyists' tendency to 'improve' the images and impose a classical canon on them. Unlike textual critics, antiquarian scholars were not particularly interested in dating the manuscripts, given their view of antiquity as static. Only in the late eighteenth century did the first glimmerings of an art-historical point of view manifest themselves, emancipating the history of art from the history of documentation, especially in Séroux d'Agincourt's *Histoire de l'art*.

It is quite reasonable that the authors have not aimed this volume primarily at a readership of Latinists. It is more regrettable, though, that they appear not to have called on any Latinist in its preparation, as no occasion for gaffes seems to have been missed.

When C. wrongly calls the use of *pingi* in *pingi curavit* ungrammatical (p. 20) and H. prints awkward renderings of the few Latin quotations translated in his chapter – for example, the models 'not yet lacking the majesty of the early Empire' for *nihilque in iis exhibetur quod primam Romani imperii majestatem non redoleat* (p. 60; and in n. 98 on p. 87 *con teguntur* should be one word) – this is just a prelude to the disaster awaiting the reader in the pages about the Roman calendar of 354 (pp. 94–126). The non-existent *gabet* (for *habet*) transcribed on p. 112 is no mere keyboard slip, as the illustration on p. 97 has an *h* that might indeed be taken for a *g* – as happens in seventeenth-century handwriting – and on p. 124 *quamius* should be *quam vis*. More problematic methodologically is C.'s decision, while offering an allegedly diplomatic transcription of the verses that accompany the illustrations of the months in Cassiano's calendar model, to quote the English translation by M.R. Salzman (*On Roman Time: the Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity* [1990]), which is based on a thoroughly emended version of these corruptly transmitted verses. On p. 122, for instance, C. prints *Devotusque satis incola Memphi deis* and then adopts Salzman's rendering 'your', which reflects Shackleton Bailey's emendation *tuis* for *satis* (as printed by Salzman). Elsewhere Salzman's translation is more explicitly adapted, but not improved: on p. 118, for *Captivam filo gaudens religasse lacertam* we read 'he rejoices at the lizard, held captive on a string (trans. adapted from Salzman, p. 103)', whose 'he rejoices at having tied up the lizard' did make sense. On p. 332, (*Judex de finibus et controversiis refert*), *de quibus consulendus est imperator, ut iis decidendis eius iussa sequatur* is translated 'about which the emperor is consulted, so that he can decide about them and his judgment may follow'. In point of fact, the judge should consult the emperor, so that in his ruling he may follow the latter's orders.

Finally, one can only be appalled at the comedy of errors on display in the transcription of the 'Outline plan for an edition of the Vatican Virgil with its miniatures' from Vat. lat. 10486 on pp. 373–80. Besides a myriad of obvious typographical errors (*quea* for *quae*; *littoral* for *littora*; *innuptaeque* for *innuptaeque* on p. 373 alone), this edition strangely combines a superfluous use of '[sic]' next to forms that are perfectly acceptable in humanist Latin (*fenilia*, *premia*, *caetera*, *exequitur*, *peana*, *extantem*) with 'transcriptions' of non-existent words that do call for a [sic]. The reproduction on p. 374 of the folium transcribed on p. 373 shows that this edition's *pontis stat in agmine castics* in the manuscript reads *positis stat in agmine castris*, as it should – all these lines are easy to check in Virgil – and that *peragros* is *per agros*, while *reginis* is *regnis*. No manuscript facsimile of the remaining six pages is provided, yet unchallenged readings such as *siut*, *mavibus*, *imode*

*pectore, sommus, iumdudum, nnumen, sabctae, gravatyum, bultus* and *nuque* speak for themselves. And why not resolve abbreviations like *qd*, *a.io* and *p.terea*?

Maybe the editors of a book about Latin manuscripts that ships at over a hundred pounds should not have skimmed on the modest expenditure of hiring someone with the necessary skills to avoid such an editorial nightmare. In the end, however, the neglect of basic philological and palaeographical concerns exhibited here might in itself be considered a most telling, yet unintended, instance of the shift in scholarly preoccupations that these beautifully illustrated ancient manuscripts have undergone through the centuries.

*University of Leuven*

JEROEN DE KEYSER  
[jeroen.dekeyser@arts.kuleuven.be](mailto:jeroen.dekeyser@arts.kuleuven.be)

## JUSTIFYING PRIVATE PROPERTY

GARNSEY (P.) *Penser la propriété. De l'Antiquité jusqu'à l'ère des révolutions*. Translated by Alexandre Hasnaoui. (Histoire 118.) pp. 366. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2013 (originally published as *Thinking about Property. From Antiquity to the Age of Revolution*, 2007). Paper, €26.90. ISBN: 978-2-251-38118-3.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X14000833

This book represents an updated and slightly revised translation of G.'s 2007 monograph *Thinking about Property*. The revisions can mostly be found in the notes to Chapters 7 and 8. This is a rich book covering a great amount of ground on a highly important topic; and while it suffers from overlaps and repetitions, it is a very welcome and sophisticated contribution to the history of political thought.

G., an ancient historian who needs no introduction, aims to give an account of arguments attacking and defending private property, starting out with foundational ancient texts and following their trajectory and reception up to the early nineteenth century. The book's most important contribution, according to G. himself, lies in the centrality accorded to Roman ideas, especially Roman law (p. 274): 'Si j'ai pu faire quelque chose pour favoriser un réexamen de la contribution du droit romain à la théorie des droits, alors cet ouvrage n'aura pas été vain'.

G. begins by describing the property regime in Plato's *Republic*. Kallipolis is not communist: there is no common ownership of goods, not even among the ruling class; the latter merely make use in common of the produce provided to them by the farmers. The farmers in turn do own private property, on which the Guards depend – private property is thus presupposed by what amounts to a 'régime fiscal'. Aristotle and the neo-Platonist Proclus provided influential and misleading readings of Kallipolis, interpreting it falsely as advocating the sharing of property, women and children *throughout* the city. G. admits the impact of the *Laws*' Magnesia on Aristotle and, later, James Harrington, but gives it short shrift.

Chapter 2 deals with Plato's fate in the Middle Ages. We encounter analogies between Platonic property sharing and the communal lifestyle of the first Christians as portrayed in the Acts of the Apostles. Interestingly, the Aristotelian Averroes had a fairly detailed knowledge of parts of the *Republic* and, astonishingly, fully embraced Kallipolis and its property arrangements, as well as its provisions concerning women. Averroes too, however, wrongly thought that property-sharing extended to all citizens. Thomas Aquinas,