The new Budé Nonnus is the result of a joint enterprise by Prof. Vian and some of his pupils. The project started in 1966 and has produced its first fruits 10 years later: vol. I covering Books 1 and 2 by Vian himself, and vol. II covering Books 3-5 by P. Chuvin. Each volume contains (besides introduction, text and translation) 60 pages of valuable 'notes complémentaires', as has been made good practice in recent Budé editions. Together with the 'notices' these notes virtually amount to a commentary. One complaint: the practical use of this commentary is handicapped by its being dispersed over three different parts. Each volume closes with a useful index rerum notabilium.

One part of the general introduction concerns the man and his work. V. accepts Nonnus' authorship of the Paraphrasis, but questions Keydell's thesis that Nonnus was a convert and that therefore the Paraphrasis should follow the Dionysiaca, on the assumption that the Paraphrasis is a "modeste exercice de versification", whereas the Dionysiaca requires more capability. The anteriority of the Paraphrasis is thought to be proved by a comparison of Ev. Joh. 9, 10, Paraphr. 9, 55 and Dion. 25, 284-5 (although the opposite inference was made by Keydell and Bogner from this same comparison). V. is (rightly, I think) sceptical about Nonnus' alleged conversion and refers to the coexistence of paganism and Christianity in fifth century Alexandria; the Dionysiaca is dated between 450 and 470. V. also challenges Keydell's view that this epic is a simple juxtaposition of independent elements, and convincingly argues for a certain organic unity (pp. xxii-xxix), rather than following Collart's Liedertheorie or Keydell's idea of an Ur-Dionysiaka, although V. rightly admits that the work is unfinished (hence some lacunas) and that the editor made some insertions of his own (p. xxxvii).

The second part of the introduction concerns the textual history of the work. As has first been demonstrated by A. Ludwich, the prime witness for the text is the codex Laur. 32, 16 (L), whereas the other manuscripts are (indirect) copies of it. The trustworthiness of this manuscript can be gathered from a comparison with the one other independent witness for the text, the Berlin papyrus 10567.
(II) containing the end of Book 14, Book 15, and the beginning of 16, and dating from the 6th century. Thus two things come out clearly: (a) that II already knows of some variants, which show the uncertainty of the text one century after its composition, and (b) that II in general has better readings than L. This means that conjectural emendation is the only way of improving the text. Vian himself includes only one new emendation in his text, viz. 1, 178 ‘Υφροχώρος, whereas Chuvin contributes 5, 188 <δρμον> ἐν and 5, 281 βοσκίστου.

As to the *apparatus criticus* the following may be noted. As all manuscripts derive from L, the editors rightly do not refer to these manuscripts except for some patently correct readings, although it is not clear whether these scribes arrived at the correct reading by conjectural emendation or by mistake, e.g. 5, 137 λευκὸν F (correct): γλευκὸν L may be coincidence, but 4, 134 χρυσῆ F may be conjecture for χρυσῆ LP. There is no obvious reason for listing the readings διάκτορος (1, 1), or γάρ γνώτερι (1, 7) found in A, which, incidentally, is not listed among the *sigla*: it is a codex from Athos inspected by Cyriaco d’Ancona in Nov. 1444 (see p. lxi). Among the *sigla* does, however, figure V, which was not used in Keydell’s *apparatus*, for the sole purpose, it seems, of mentioning a second hand’s marginal addition of ἓν in 2, 27. One would expect, therefore, to find all divergencies from L marked in the *apparatus*, but in this case V. follows Keydell’s method (cf. K’s edition, 14*-15*) of not listing obvious mistakes in L, such as wrong division of words (see p. lxviii), although it is done rather unsystematically, e.g. 4, 402 κατ’ οὐδαίης L for κατοικίατος is not mentioned, whereas 4, 368 περὶ κύκλων L for περὶ κύκλων is; 3, 142 προδόμου L for πρὸ δόμου is not mentioned, but 4, 403 εὐπνώσσων L for εὖ εὔπνωσσσων (rightly) is. For this reason (and as a general principle; cf. Peek’s *Lexikon*, viii) Keydell’s *prolegomena* remain invaluable for orthographical purposes 1). On the whole, however, the Budé apparatus includes the *minutiae* and in several places seems to correct Keydell’s readings, e.g. 1, 17, where Keydell reports “θόρωσο sed θ ex λ cr. L”, against Vian’s report “θόρωσο L1: χ’- L”; or 1, 515, where Keydell reads πέτρη, whereas Vian reports πέτρη.

Space forbids to deal extensively with text and translation. As to the text, it differs from Keydell’s text in several places, mostly improving accentuation or punctuation. I have noted a few more important changes in the first Book. In 1, 8 Koechly’s ἐφ is accepted for L’s ἐπεί, whereas in 1, 9 δὲ πάρος L is accepted against Keydell’s suggestion (accepted by Peek) δὲ. The view of Peek and Keydell that lines 8 and 9 are variant readings is said to be refuted by the structure of the passage. However, it seems to me that Vian