



FRAGMENTARY TEXTS

GINELLI (F.), LUPI (F.) (edd.) *The Continuity of Classical Literature through Fragmentary Traditions. (Trends in Classics Supplementary Volume 105.)* Pp. xii+216, colour ill. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2021. Cased, £93, €104.95, US\$118.99. ISBN: 978-3-11-070037-4.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X24000313

The study of Greek and Latin fragments has become particularly lively in recent decades. Many scholars, such as the editors and authors of this volume, are engaged in the study of the *disiecta membra* of ancient works and their main sources. Ginelli and Lupi in their introduction present the various kinds of texts on which the volume is focused, but the aim of this collection of essays is not to study and classify methods of transmission of fragmentary texts, but rather – as is clear from the title – a broader consideration of how in ancient literatures the texts transmitted in fragmentary form are representative of an infinitely larger literary production than the extant works alone might suggest, and how it is impossible to reconstruct all the tesserae of the mosaic that we call Greek and Latin literature without the contribution of fragments and *testimonia*.

S. Vecchiato argues that previous proposals to attribute Hesiod's fr. 41 M.–W. to the *Catalogue* or the *Megalai Ehoiai* are uncertain and that it should be placed among the *fragmenta incertae sedis*. He rightly believes that, when there is no explicit information from the source (or at least secure evidence), possible attributions to a specific work or a given context should be proposed only in the critical apparatus or in the commentary. The work ends with a review of Hesiodic fragments discovered in recent years or known but now newly reconsidered.

Lupi claims that lines 1–3 and 4–6 of fr. 592 R. of Sophocles' *Tereus* should be split up: lines 1–3 are quoted by Plutarch without the title of the tragedy and should therefore be placed among the fragments of uncertain plays, whereas lines 4–6 are assigned to the *Tereus* by Stobaeus. Moreover, Lupi proposes that fr. 592.4–6 and 593 R. may belong to the same context and be directly contiguous. The exceptional metrical nature of the two fragments (dactylo-epitrites) is considered as evidence. However, the perfect identity of metre between lines 1–3 and 4–6 of fr. 592 R. could also be invoked to join the elements of the fragment that Lupi would prefer to separate. According to Lupi, Stobaeus' MS S seems to preserve the colometry of the quoted fragments. This is likely, although one must then ask how acceptable that colometry is to the modern editor. In my view, the description offered by Radt on the basis of the dactylo-epitrite sequences devised by Maas remains preferable; Lupi prefers to apply the *kat'enoplion* epitrite system described by Gentili and Lomiento (p. 47 n. 34), which explains his greater confidence in the colometry transmitted by the manuscript. As for the scene from which fr. 592.4–6 and 593 R. derive, Lupi is right to observe that they are not necessarily sung by the chorus, since sometimes Stobaeus' MS S displays the *chori nota* even when we can be certain that the quoted passage does not belong to a chorus. Yet, while Lupi's proposal to apply a question mark to the *chori nota* is cautious and seems acceptable, the note should not be placed between angular brackets (p. 51) since the *chori nota* is not conjectural but is preserved in S.

The article by C. Meccariello, with its incipit sequences, does not deal generically with the beginnings of works, but rather with quotations of ἀρχαί, or incipits, which in poetry usually correspond to a line. She examines various types of lists of incipits that have come

down to us, dwelling on the different motivations for compiling this kind of list, starting with the bibliographical need to identify a work through an alternative or replacement for the title. In some cases, however, the *arche*-system fails in its task of ensuring the textual identity of a work. In this regard Meccariello in the last part of the article examines three controversial examples of a double or even triple beginning (Eur. fr. 846 and 516 K.; the *Rhesus*).

R. Berardi is currently preparing the *editio princeps* of *testimonia* and fragments of orators from the Hellenistic period, from 338 to 31 BCE. In this essay she sets out the criteria followed in her work. The main difficulty lies in separating the oratorical fragments from those of the school exercises: her approach is as inclusive as possible. Berardi also deals with fragments not taken from quotations, but transmitted by direct tradition. This is the case with P. Schub. 32 = P. Berol. inv. 7445 (first century BCE / first century CE), of which she provides a new critical edition with translation and commentary. Another case study concerns a fragment of Sosicrates, an orator mentioned only by Rutilius Lupus (whose *De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis* is an important source because it contains Greek examples from the lost treatise of the Athenian rhetorician Gorgias, from the first century BCE). Here, too, Berardi provides a sample of the critical edition and commentary, although it would have been appropriate to provide a small conspectus siglorum or at least some minimal information on the text's transmission.

The contribution by Ginelli likewise deals with an ongoing research project: a new edition of Cornelius Nepos' fragments. This study more than any other in the volume tries to fix methodological principles and universal standards. Ginelli traces the history of previous editions and concludes that the new one must provide detailed information on the nature of the quotations by distinguishing between quotations of Cornelius Nepos' exact words, on the one hand, and paraphrases and summaries of the text on the other (contrary to common usage he often defines the former as 'direct quotations' and the latter as 'indirect quotations', definitions that usually pertain to the so-called *Zitierweise*, i.e. whether the source directly accessed the text it cites or found it in another source and so cites it indirectly). In Ginelli's view, in the absence of such preliminary work the mere collection of passages of an author from the sources 'would diminish the role of the editor, and it would also lack a "principle of arrangement", which is the fundamental aim of the scholar who tries to sketch an overall portrait of an author by collecting literary fragments' (p. 109). This is far from a simple task, not least because in addition to collecting material the editor must also address the state of preservation of a text, which often requires restoration. Furthermore, I do not understand the methodological novelty: for every editor who places the *testimonia uitae atque artis* in a different section will, in the case of the *fragmenta*, face the challenge of distinguishing the *ipsissima uerba* of an author from paraphrases or accounts and summaries of the content of a lost text. A simple graphic expedient (such as a different font size), as Ginelli himself suggests on p. 110, is enough to make one thing stand out from the other, but this is what is commonly done. In the last part of the article Ginelli examines some case studies of Cornelius Nepos' fragments that it would be appropriate to assign to the group *ex libris incertis* rather than attributing them to a particular work as previous editors have done. In spite of my few reservations, exclusively focused on some of his methodological statements, the specific examples put forward by Ginelli give reason to hope that his work may represent a definite advance on the most recent edition of Cornelius Nepos' fragments edited by J. Briscoe and A. Drummond in *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* (2013).

J.T. Welsh's study is very useful, focusing on the uses of one of the lexicographical sources used by Nonius Marcellus in composing the *De compendiosa doctrina*, the so-called fifth glossary, according to Lindsay's reconstruction. It is not possible to

summarise the results of this valuable study in detail. ‘Gloss. v’ has the habit of rewriting quotations with a strong tendency to simplify the examples. Welsh mainly examines passages that we also possess by direct tradition, shows cases in which the quotations are equipped with a paraphrase and investigates the connections already postulated by Lindsay between the fifth glossary and Verrius Flaccus’ *De uerborum significatu*. Finally, he offers three examples of fragments for which the fifth glossary (and consequently Nonius) is the only source. The method and results of Welsh’s study are interesting and deserve much attention, despite the fact that one may occasionally also consider the possibility that some quotations (e.g. Plaut. *Cas.* 245 examined on pp. 126–7) were altered not by the source, but by the scribes of the Nonian tradition (an aspect that Welsh discusses on p. 135, although he tends to attribute the inaccuracies of the quotations more to the sources and to Nonius himself than to the scribes). We should also take into account that some changes with respect to the direct tradition are found not only in quotations from glossaries, but even in quotations from complete texts consulted personally by Nonius: an error may be due to a fault in the manuscript owned by Nonius, to misquotation by the latter or even to a simple error in the archetype. In any case, Welsh is absolutely right to argue, on p. 135, that ‘Quotations from sources like “Gloss. I” (which shows a bewildering patchwork of accurate and inaccurate material) and “Gloss. V” (which shows frequent inaccuracies of several types)’ are ‘rather more often inaccurate and slipshod’ when compared to the other Nonian sources identified by Lindsay.

N. Villagra deals with the so-called *Mythographus Homericus* through the relationships between the version attested by the papyri and that of the ἱστορίαι in the Homeric *D-Scholia*. The article examines the best-preserved example on papyrus (*PSI* 10.1173), that relating to the myth of Phineus and the Argonauts, which is also attested in the ἱστορία of the *D-Scholia* on *Od.* 12.69–70. Villagra provides an edition of both texts with extensive critical apparatus. Of particular interest is the discussion of the two main differences between the two texts: the papyri have two omissions, and it is possible either that the papyrus abridged the original text or that the *scholium* added information (p. 155). Villagra (pp. 156–7) inclines towards the first hypothesis, which is also in my opinion the best. To her observations I would add that there would be no reason for the *D-Scholia* to expand the material contained in the *Mythographus Homericus*: why would the *scholia* add information that is totally outside the Homeric passage being commented on? Thus it is more likely that the *scholium* took all its data from the *Mythographus Homericus* and the papyrus instead represents an abbreviated version of it. Also interesting are Villagra’s final thoughts on the special status of the *Mythographus Homericus* as a text not perceived as an authorial work even in antiquity and therefore more susceptible to alterations.

The last article concerns documentary and non-literary texts. G. Iovine presents a thorough and meticulous study, in which he reviews and improves some readings of the Latin military papyri found in Dura-Europos from the archives of the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum* (*P. Dura* 56, 64, 72, 74, 76, 89, 113).

The volume represents a heterogeneous collection of studies focused on the fragmentary nature of the texts considered. These eight essays, taken individually, constitute excellent examples of scholarship and represent sound advances on the specific topics studied.

Università del Molise

SALVATORE MONDA
salvatore.monda@unimol.it