



correct to see all (true) representation as depending upon an underlying ontological structure of participation, and vice versa? How would it reshape the question of mimesis as either merely provisional or enduring, of the relationship between symbolic mediation and mimetic representation, and of the distinction between active imitation and worshipful reverence? It would not, I suggest, undermine our appreciation of Gregory's distinctive approach. It may, however, help us to sort out more clearly the various modes that mimesis takes – whether moral imitation, literary and artistic representation or otherwise – as well as the complex correlations between the structure of being (ontology as mimetic) and the shape of creaturely action (dynamic representation as mimetic). Indeed, perhaps there is for Gregory and others no need to posit a trade-off between ontology and mimesis, while there does remain a need to articulate clearly the question of likeness, difference and the possibility for union. My hunch is that this line of questioning would dovetail with another major feature of Gregory's distinctly Christian world view – i.e. his Christology, as shaped by other late fourth-century debates – and that the reconciliation of likeness and unlikeness in Christ may prove to be even more central to Gregory's thought than it might initially seem. Ultimately, it is because of the provocation of such considerations that I am thankful for M.'s scholarly contribution.

Assumption University

TY PAUL MONROE

typaulmonroe@gmail.com

PROCLUS AND PLATO

MUHSAL (D.) (trans.) *Der Homerische Mythos und die Grundlagen neuplatonischer Theologie. Proklos' Traktat über die Dichtung Homers [in R. I 69–205]. Übersetzung und Kommentar.* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 405.) Pp. xiv + 363. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2022. Cased, £91, €99.95, US\$114.99. ISBN: 978-3-11-078728-3.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X2300029X

M., in the introduction to this German translation and commentary of the sixth essay of Proclus' *Commentary on Plato's Republic*, claims that the work is a foundational text of ancient literary theory, alongside Aristotle's *Poetics*, Horace's *Ars Poetica* and Ps.-Longinus, *On the Sublime*. That may be claiming too much, but both Proclus' use of Neoplatonist allegorical interpretation to defend Homer against Plato and his development of a theory of three types of poetry – inspired, educational and imitative – are of considerable significance in the history of literary theory. As such they have rightly attracted increasing amounts of scholarly attention as interest has grown in the philosophy of late antiquity. Proclus' essay was translated into French by A.-J. Festugière in 1970 and has been translated into English both by R. Lamberton in 2012 and, most recently, as part of the new CUP translation of the whole *Republic Commentary* by D. Baltzly, J. Finamore and G. Miles (2018). (It is a little surprising that M. shows no knowledge of the CUP translation. His book derives from a 2021 Ph.D. thesis, and one might have expected him to mention this translation in his introduction, alongside those of Festugière and Lamberton.) M. offers the first translation of the text into German together with a full commentary. The commentary

is not line-by-line, but is structured according to the different chapters into which the text is divided in the sole surviving manuscript, offering a summary of each chapter followed by comment on the content. The comments on individual chapters include quotations of substantial passages from the translation, given in smaller type, and are generally presented in a very full and discursive manner. The work concludes with a résumé of the content of each section of the commentary. (The occasional use of smaller type for passages of comment, on pp. 125, 126 and 241, is presumably a typographical error. It should also be noted that the page references included in the conclusion do not correspond to page numbers in the book; they presumably relate to the thesis on which the book is based.) The volume is aimed at German-speaking Greekless readers, and so most, though not quite all, passages of Greek in the commentary are also translated into German. In the rest of this review, I will focus on the commentary rather than the translation, on the basis that it is the commentary that will be of most interest to readers of *CR*.

Since many of Proclus' allegories involve interpreting Homer's gods in terms of Neoplatonic metaphysics, some wider knowledge of his thought is needed to understand what he is saying. M.'s commentary helpfully includes background material on aspects of Neoplatonic thought that are relevant to the individual chapters of the sixth essay as well as discussion of appropriate secondary literature. For example, pp. 136–9 expound Proclus' interpretation of the Titanomachy and the Gigantomachy, drawing on passages from his *Commentary on the Timaeus*, his *Commentary on the Cratylus* and the commentary on the Myth of Er, which forms the 16th essay of the *Republic Commentary*; pp. 224–6 connect Proclus' interpretation of divine laughter with parallel passages in Hermias and Syrianus; and pp. 236–40, on Proclus' elaborate interpretation of the union of Zeus and Hera on Mount Ida, make use not only of Proclus' *Commentary on the Parmenides* and his *Platonic Theology* but also of parallels in Hermias and of Proclus' treatment of ἔρωϛ in his *Commentary on the First Alcibiades*.

While M. owes many of his observations to earlier secondary literature on the sixth essay, as he acknowledges in his footnotes, he does offer some original insights. I was struck by the remark on p. 137 that Proclus' approach to the Gigantomachy may owe something to the Battle of the Gods and the Giants in Plato's *Sophist* as well as by the suggestion in n. 455 on p. 210 that an allegory of the myth of Narcissus may lie behind the description of someone looking at their reflection in a river in Proclus' *Commentary on the Timaeus* 3.330.9–24. I was less immediately convinced by the claims on p. 118 and pp. 338–9 for the significance of the possible allusion to Plato, *Euthydemus* 298b–c at *In Remp.* 70.22 or the view presented on pp. 319–21, that Proclus' interpretation of Plato, *Phaedrus* 245a draws on Aristotle's theory of four causes, but these suggestions too deserve serious consideration.

The commentary includes some treatment of textual points, in particular a discussion on pp. 288–90 of the question whether Proclus' essay was originally divided into two books as the word δεῦτερον found in the manuscript at *In Remp.* 154.13 might suggest. M. argues carefully and convincingly that such a division does not go back to Proclus himself. His discussions of other, small textual points are largely persuasive, but it should be pointed out that n. 503 on p. 226 and the corresponding n. 21 to the translation on p. 54 are mistaken in attributing the conjecture ἀκατάληκτος instead of ἀκατάληπτος in *In Remp.* 127.24 to Heilmann; it is found already in Festugière and followed by both Lamberton and the CUP translators.

M. is on the whole well informed about the scholarly background to his work, but I noted a few errors and omissions. In addition to the failure to mention the CUP translation, it seemed to me odd to refer to the 1933 first edition of E.R. Dodds's edition of Proclus' *Elements of Theology* rather than to the second edition published in 1963. I was also

surprised to find M. taking it for granted on p. 180 that the Neoplatonist Proclus was the author of the *Chrestomathy*; this is not the standard view and needs to be argued for. Similarly, pp. 301–2 argue, on the basis of Proclus' 43 references to the third-century Cassius Longinus, that he was probably familiar with the treatise *On the Sublime*, without any mention of the uncertainty surrounding the date and authorship of that work. Finally, some important parallel passages, noted in A. Sheppard, *Studies on the 5th and 6th Essays of Proclus' Commentary on the Republic* (1980, p. 68 and pp. 80–1), are missing from the discussion of Proclus' interpretation of Hephaestus as demiurge of the sensible world on pp. 222–4 (cf. also A. Sheppard, in: C.-P. Manolea [ed.], *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Homer from the Hellenistic Age to Late Antiquity* [2022], pp. 413–15). Despite these weaknesses, this volume is a useful addition to the literature on Proclus' sixth essay. Not only will it undoubtedly be helpful to its intended readership of Greekless German speakers, but it also makes some valuable contributions to the overall understanding of Proclus' interpretation of Homer and his theory of poetry.

Royal Holloway, University of London

ANNE SHEPPARD
a.sheppard@rhul.ac.uk

COMPARISON OF LATIN ADJECTIVES

PULTROVÁ (L.) *The Category of Comparison in Latin*. (The Language of Classical Literature 36.) Pp. xvi + 340. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2023. Cased, €125. ISBN: 978-90-04-52346-3.
 doi:10.1017/S0009840X23001269

This book deals with comparison of Latin adjectives, i.e. with their ability to form the comparative and/or the superlative degree. It consists of four chapters: 'Theoretical Background and Methodology', 'The Forms of Latin Comparison', 'Gradable and Non-gradable Latin Adjectives' and 'Conclusions'. It is accompanied by a bibliography and an 'Index of Adjectives and Adjectival Affixes'.

In the introductory chapter P. reviews approaches to comparison, both in modern Latin grammars and in late Latin grammatical treatises. From general linguistics she adopts some useful concepts, namely gradability, i.e. the (semantic) ability of an adjective to express a greater or a lesser degree of a quality. Gradability can be represented as a scale going from the weakest degree to the strongest or highest degree and adjectives allowing gradability are 'scalar adjectives', for example *long*, as opposed to non-scalar adjectives, for example *mortal*. Scalar adjectives are basically of two types (p. 25): paired adjectives *long* – *short*, the degree of which can increase (open scale adjectives), and paired adjectives *full* – *empty*, which have an end-point on a scale (closed scale adjectives). The former type can be modified by the adverb *very*, the latter by *completely*. Closed scale adjectives, sometimes called 'absolute adjectives', also include pairs such as *silent* – *loud*, which admit the adverb *completely* for one member (*silent*) and *very* for the other (*loud*). P.'s main aim is to determine which Latin adjectives are gradable and which are not. For this purpose, she established a large corpus containing 10,000 adjectives, excerpted from the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, and with the help of the *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina III* database, she searched the comparatives and superlatives, both in *-ior*, *-issimus* and with *magis*,