is rather forcing an "architecture savante" (p. 8) upon the text: Semele gets 3 lines, Zeus gets 4, Athena 3, whereas the two births of Dionysus are each given 5 lines: a double structure for these first 10 lines. However, a closer look reveals that this arithmetical structure only applies "à peu près", as Vian (p. 8) admits.—In 1, 17 Koechly's δπως is rejected, because Nonnus does not use δπως for introducing an indirect question. On the other hand, δπη is used by Nonnus exclusively in a local sense.—In 1, 79 Peek's suggestion δς δυς την δειπει rightly finds acceptance.

Not being a native speaker I find it hard to pass judgement on the merits of the translation. The following may be noted in passing. In 1, 13 παρά γείτων νήσῳ has been translated ‘dans l’île voisine’ (rightly, but introd. p. x it seems that παρά is translated by ‘près de’).—At 1, 37 εὔγαμοι has not been translated, but p. 135 it is said that the adjective must have “une valeur verbale”: “désirant εὕος Αῦρα”, but Peek’s ‘für die Hochzeit bestimmt’ fits well; cf. other compounds as εὔθάλαμος, εὔπαρθενος and εὔπτάλεμος.—In 1, 32 παρά θυάδι ληνῷ ‘dans un pressoir ivre’ sounds bizarre, hence ‘seething’?—In 1, 44 λιπορφίνω which is not translated, is said to be a borrowing from Nic. Alex. 537, but there it means 'with greasy skin'. Therefore Rouse’s translation 'skin-stript' seems adequate.

I may end by expressing my admiration for the high quality of both these volumes, and the hope that one will not have to wait another ten years for the second pair to be published.
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1) Further minor inconsistencies in the apparatus include the following: 1, 17: as the manuscripts omit the i-subscript in δπη, it should have been noted that this is Graefe’s addition.—At 1, 32 the apparatus gives θυάδι. L: θυάδι Graefe; but then Graefe’s name should also be mentioned for θυάδι (4, 272) and θυάδα (4, 307); Keydell’s edition merely notes forms with iota, without mentioning that L’s readings vary (cf. Peek’s Lexikon, s.v.).—At 1, 43 ἀπνήφωσις is what the text of Agathias actually reads, not ἀπνηφήσει.—At 1, 87 Peek is wrongly credited with the emendation δπη.


This book is important not only to art-historians, but also to philologists who study the poetry of Nicander or Oppian’s Cynege-Mnemosyne, Vol. XXXV, Fasc. 3-4 (1982)
tica. It will even be indispensable to the happy few who devote their studies to the Greek origin and subsequent development of zoological (i.e. scientific) illustrations. Kádár observes that pictures of animals of a more scientific nature are generally given too little attention by art-historians: "scholars have dealt primarily with those pictures which happen to have some artistic moment. Those of a more strictly scientific nature which may have seemed less significant from the artistic point of view,—like some of the animal pictures in the Paris codex of Nicander, for example—have been deemed scarcely worth attention and are never reproduced in the larger works of reference on art history" (p. 17).

From a methodological point of view a discovery made by E. Stresemann, the ornithologist,—I owe the reference to Kádár—who analysed the 24 bird pictures on folio 484v of the Ornithiaca in Dioscorides' Vienna codex, seems to me extremely important. Stresemann has proved that the model of this series of bird pictures must have originated from Asia Minor and not from Alexandria.

In part I the author outlines the differences in style between the scientific attitude towards nature as found in Aristotle and the medieval concept of nature. To my mind Kádár is too much inclined to look for the archetypes of a certain Byzantine style in the works of Aristotle (particularly the lost Anatomiae) rather than in the later Hellenistic centres of learning.

In part II the author provides a detailed and critical analysis (also taxonomically) of the zoological pictures contained in the various manuscripts. By comparing the scenes of a bull-fight in a film with those in a series of pictures on the same subject (Oppian, Cynegetical), the author convincingly illustrates how accurate the observation of animal behaviour must have been during the great age of antique animal painting, the Byzantine copies still being so vivid and impressive. This concerns a series of four pictures on rivalry among bulls, and the outcome of a fight 1).

In part III the author discusses the place in art history of the illustrations of Greek zoological works surviving in Byzantine codices. A favourite subject in the illustrations is the fight of mongoose (ichneumon) and asp (Egyptian snake).

The short final part deals with the significance of the illustrations of Greek zoological works surviving in Byzantine manuscripts for the history of zoology. Remarks worth noting here are: "Amongst all the known antique and Byzantine illustrations, the most reliable taxonomic information about the scorpion family is supplied by the pictures in the Morgan Library Dioscorides codex, New York" (p. 134). "As regards the illustrations of fish, the splendid sheath-fish (Silurus glanis: pls. 75, 1; 94, 6) stands unique in