very often consist of suggested additions, but one is occasionally inclined to have one’s doubts as to their necessity, for instance in *Epist.* no. 210 = VII 26, 1: *eum <in quo>* (*in quo *ζ, *quod *Ω) and *Epist.* no. 124 = XVI 5, 2: *<quod> poteris* (*poteris* Ω). His suggested solutions of difficult passages are often attractive, but his arguments for his suggestion to read in *Epist.* no. 128 = V 20, 6 graf<phice> visum est instead of the traditional *gravissumest†* (M; gavismum est R; gravissime G) are not very strong and rather one-sided, for the parallels he adduces are both taken from the same author, who moreover uses *graphice* in either case in a very specific sense (Gellius *N. A.* X 17, 2; XII 4, 1).

The commentary contains a great wealth of information, with a clear emphasis on questions of chronology and the identity of the persons figuring in the correspondence. In comparison somewhat less attention is on the whole given to points of literary-theoretical and linguistic-stylistic nature, as for instance appears from the comments on *Epist.* nos. 48 (II 4, about the *genera epistolarum*), 51 (= V 18, a *consolatio*-letter), 187 (= V 16, a letter of consolation to Titius) and 207 (= XV 20, 4, about the correspondence with Calvus concerning Atticism and about the question whether Cicero’s letters were intended for publication or not: some parallels, specifically Tac. *Dial.* 18, are clearly missing here).

However, this extremely careful edition of an important part of Cicero’s correspondence contains so many positive aspects and also so much valuable information that one does not hesitate to speak of a standard-work. The book has been made still more useful by the addition of Concordances and Indices (*Nominum, Verborum, Rerum, Graecitatis*).

Malden, Triangel 7

J. H. Brouwers


Modern literary theorists following the communication model of the linguist Roman Jakobson discern three approaches to literary works: the biographical, the text-centered, and the reader-centered (in the ‘aesthetics of reception’). Classicists working with texts
which are by no means definitive time and again go back to pre-
liminary work: the constitution of their texts.

The Catulliana dealt with here are easy to classify: Thomson's 
edition represents not only the necessary basis for interpretative 
work, but also gives in its introduction and by its very full critical 
apparatus materials for the history of the reception of Catullus' 
poems in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance. Without doubt it 
will be the standard text for years. Stoessl, however, believing 
that a reconstruction of Catullus' artistic development is both 
possible and necessary, returns to the biographical tradition in its 
most excessive form. In my opinion, his book is a sad failure, with 
the exception of some of the 470 notes, which give bibliographical 
information.

Thomson's edition is the result of an intensive occupation with 
Catullus' manuscript tradition and the working up of earlier articles 
such as The Codex Romanus of Catullus: A Collation of the Text, 
RhM 113 (1970), 97-110; A New Look of the Manuscript Tradition 
of Catullus, YCS 23 (1973), 113-129, and (with A. C. de la Mare) 

In his introduction Thomson deals with the well-known problems 
as the interrelation between the main manuscripts (O, G and R), 
the lost archetype (V) and the importance of some recentiores, 
esp. D, which was regarded as a major witness by Bardon (see his 
the alleged merits of this ms. and thus partly about Bardon's 
edition is slashing: "Let us hope that we may now bid farewell to 
the scholarly nostalgia that still lays claim to a special place in the 
tradition for Diezanus 37 [= D]" (p. 40).

Apart from the new stemma (p. 69) and the very useful apparatus 
("perhaps the nearest approach to a definitive apparatus that has 
yet appeared", as the flap says), the edition is important, of course, 
because of its new text, which differs at many important points 
from Mynors' Oxford text (1959) and, as was to be expected, even 
more often from Bardon's Teubner text. I discuss briefly some 
passages, taken from the first twenty poems.

3, 12 Illud, unde negant redire quemquam V, Mynors, Bardon. 
Thomson prefers illuc (O1), which is not only more appropriate on 
account of unde, but can also be defended with a reference to 14,21f. 
Vos hinc interea valete abite / illuc, unde malum pedem attulisist.

4, 23 f. cum veniret a mari / novissime hunc ad usque limpidum 
lacum V, Thomson. Mynors and Bardon print mari novissimo (ξη), 
taken by editors to mean 'remotest sea', which is doubtful. See 
Fordyce ad loc., who favours the adverb with sound arguments.

6, 12 nam ista prevalet nihil tacere O, ni 'ista prevaleat G R m.