

decision to use the AV to present Avitus's scriptural citations leaves some mismatches: e.g. John 8.56 (AV): 'Abraham *rejoiced* to see my day' (p. 167). Avitus has *cupivit*.

Besides listing changes to Peiper's Latin text, the appendices list and discuss the abundant honorifics in the letters. A bibliography of studies related to Avitus's letters from the late nineteenth century to the present and a general index complete the work. The book is generally free of printing errors, but *philophischen* for *philosophischen* (p. 210 n. 2), and *did* for *do* (p. 175 n. 1).

In recent decades Avitus has become better known and appreciated through studies of his eloquent poetry, doctrinal competency, and influential statesmanship. The translators are credited with much of the groundbreaking work. Their learned presentation of his letters, joining a series of excellent translations in the TTH series, will serve a wide range of disciplinary interests.

*Ave Maria University*

DANIEL J. NODES

## VIRGILIUS MARO GRAMMATICUS

B. LÖFSTEDT (ed.): *Virgilius Maro grammaticus: Opera omnia*. (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.) Pp. xviii + 267. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2003. Cased, €128. ISBN: 3-598-71233-2.

It is something special to have Virgil report on his conversation with Aeneas (e.g. *epit.* 5.190 *O Virgili . . .*, 8.128 *mei Aeneae praecepti memor . . . qui ait ad me . . .*). This 'other' Virgil therefore attracts attention. Although little is known about Virgilius 'grammaticus', a possibly Jewish author from the Gallic region of the Pyrenees, he has left us a kind of parody containing strange doctrines in twelve *epitomae* and eight *epistulae*, recalling Donatus' *Ars maior* and *minor*.

To 'decode' this seventh-century grammarian—as in the title of Law's study from 1995—a reliable text is necessary, and is duly provided by L., who replaces the old Huemer edition in the Teubner series (1886), while presenting his book only as an addition to Polara's critical text (Naples, 1979). Hence L.'s reader is referred to Polara for detailed information about manuscripts. Nor does L. take the opportunity to collect helpful bibliographical data; his bibliography is cut down to the minimum. Abbreviations are explained, but even publication dates for *Corpus Christianorum* volumes are omitted, and the title of Law's article on Virgilius' fragments (1991) is suppressed. Munzi's 'Noterelle testuali' (1993) is neglected.

L. devotes himself entirely to the Latin text and its most important manuscript, the Neapolitanus (N, ninth century). Unlike his predecessors, and without explanation in his preface, he returns to N's order for both works and has—with unnecessary precision—all the numbers of N's *folia* and of two other manuscripts printed in the margin, with all the usual *incipit/explicit* formulas within the text and even in his own table of contents. They should not be omitted as in Polara's edition, but listed in the apparatus, since the author occasionally marks the endings by statements of his own (e.g. *epist.* 4.151 *scribendi hic terminus ponendus, epit.* 6.170 *ista sufficient. . . finis hic dabitur; epit.* 8.69–71 L. is misled by parts of a false distinction). More useful than the page numbers of a medieval manuscript is Polara's modern division into chapters, which is standard for references (cf. *ThLL*), yet neglected by L. As older conjectures and unfortunately also some of Polara's rejected contributions are omitted from his

apparatus, it seems that L. is not interested in documenting scholarly efforts. According to his own statement (p. ix), his main aim is to correct Polara's mistakes concerning the transmitted readings. Indeed, a comparison of the two editions reveals an amazing number of corrections in L.'s apparatus (e.g. about twenty changes for *epist.* 4 in only six and a half pages), which are an important improvement, even if they do not seem to affect the constitution of Virgil's text. L. also documents rejected *variae lectiones* or obvious emendations of Mai from 1833/1871, which Polara too often ascribes directly to N. In addition, L. includes four new fragmentary manuscripts and eight fragments recently published by Law (he does not mention Polara's single fragment), and even more important, the indirect tradition, exploiting sources like Beda, Bonifatius, Donatus orthigraphus (listed in a second apparatus together with Virgilius' possible sources, and easily accessible by means of two indices, pp. 248–57). This is what L. does best, having edited eight of these himself. Their contributions do not only attest later grammarians' use of Virgilius' text; they provide occasional corrections (e.g. at *epist.* 2.15.31 an addition by Don. orth.; *epist.* 2.151 and 161 conjectures of Mai are confirmed by Ars Bernensis). Disappointingly, three of the newly utilized manuscripts tend only to add misspellings, with rather few useful exceptions (e.g. *epit.* 1.25, 5.6.228 and 235, 7.24, 9.214; they are unfortunately not collected in the *praefatio*), and even the Augiensis, highly praised by L., shows lots of mistakes (about thirty-five within the extant seventy-four lines of *epist. praef.*), while being useful six times and verifying eleven emendations of Mai, Huemer and Polara. Respectively twenty-nine and eighteen other conjectures of Polara are accepted by L. for *epist.* and *epit.*; explicitly rejected are those for *epist. praef.* 92, 1.146 and 328, 2.19, 3.542, *epit.* 2.81, 7.161, 10.77. L. gives at least sixty-five conjectures of his own (about fifty for the *epist.* [most of them for *epist.* 1–3], considerably less for the better transmitted *epit.*), with three ingenious corrections (*epist.* 3.121 *accusatio*, 551 *Latinitatis*, 623 *Stoicorum*) and often simple and thus probable additions of particles, changes of single letters and of word order. They all make the text more legible, but are not always necessary (e.g. *epist.* 3.466, 4.94) and without commentary on Virgil's use of language remain unproved. L.'s *Index verborum et formarum* (eight and a half pages) is shorter than Polara's (twenty-two pages); an additional index of *nomina propria* like Polara's would be helpful.

L. began analysing Virgilius with articles in 1981 and 1982. His new text is welcome and should be esteemed as a valuable contribution to the understanding of a peculiar author, especially as it is announced as a testament to Bernhard Bischoff (pp. ix–x), who entrusted his lifelong collection of material to L. for the preparation of this useful edition.

University of Regensburg

JAN-WILHELM BECK

## INDIAN CONNECTIONS

T. MCEVILLE: *The Shape of Ancient Thought. Comparative Studies in Greek and Indian Philosophies*. Pp. xxxvi + 731, maps, ill. New York: Allworth Press, 2002. Cased, US\$35. ISBN: 1-58115-203-5.

Classicists, with the notable exception of Martin West, have seldom been very happy to explore possible connexions of Greece and India before Alexander. Even when ideological considerations (the East as 'Other') have not come into play, compared with West Asia, India has seemed simply too remote geographically, the contacts too

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved