tai: anything lewd is taboo. Mais parfois la traduction devrait être plus littérale. Par exemple à la p. 41,3-4 τοις ἀπὸ πηγῆς ἀρωσαμένους Ἔλλησιν οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν τὰ ἐκεῖνον δόγματα: Greeks who learned his doctrines at second hand. Mais ainsi, à vrai lire, les mots οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν n’ont pas été traduits. La traduction de p. 3,13-15, à mon avis, n’est pas bonne τὸν γὰρ Ἡράκλειτον ... καταχρύφαντα τὴν ποιησιν ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ναῷ, μυστηριωδῶς ὡς ύπερον ἡ ταύτης ἔκδοσις γίνηται. Heraclitus ... hiding his work in the temple of Artemis, in order to achieve publication later in a mysterious way. Il me semble plus logique que l’adverbe μυστηριωδῶς qualifie le participe καταχρύφαντα. Par conséquent, dans le texte grec il faut supprimer la virgule après ναῷ. A la p. 33,21 τας δὲ παρ’ ἡμῖν παρθένους λοι- δορώντων je ne comprends pas la traduction ‘gods’ dans: and yet abusing our gods.

A la fin de l’ouvrage nous trouvons quelques fragments surtout empruntés à Eusèbe, Clément d’Alexandrie, Origène et S. Jérôme, et deux Appendices très courts, une liste de Citations classiques et deux Index de Noms.
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1) Il n’y a pas mal de fautes d’impression embarrassantes. P. XIV: la comparaison avec un brigand, on ne la trouve pas à la p. 29, mais à la p. 20. P. XVI: que Tatien identifie la matière avec ce monde et avec les démons, on ne lit pas cela à la p. 18,14, mais à la p. 18,4. Que Tatien rebute la médecine, cela ne se trouve pas à la p. 30,11, mais à la p. 19,25 ss.


4) Une faute d’impression très embarrassante à la p. 24,1: θέστις ἡ καθ’ ἡμᾶς lire θέστις ἡ καθ’ ἡμᾶς.


By no stretch of the imagination can this collection of independent essays be called a ‘History of Latin Literature’. It is true that there is a rough chronological order in that the period of the early Mnemosyne, Vol. XXXVIII, Fasc. 1-2 (1985)
republic precedes that of the late republic, but chronology is by no means strictly observed: thus Catullus is treated before Lucretius—a venial decision—, the younger Pliny much less palatably before the elder, the Flavian epic as well as Martial and Juvenal before the Apocolocyntosis and Petronius. It is clear that some attempt is made to cluster generically linked works, but the attempt is not successful. Thus we are faced with almost a thousand pages of comment on Latin Literature arranged neither chronologically nor generically. This would have been acceptable if some other organizing principle had been adopted. None is visible, except for the whimsical attitude which causes the Editor to write (p. xiii): "... the appearance of Apuleius in final place (...) represents an aesthetic rather than a historical decision on the part of the Editor"—a poor excuse, in poor taste.

As harsh a judgement as this on the arrangement of the work is in need of at least partial adstruction. Though gallant attempts are made by several individual contributors to link their particular subjects generically and thematically to preceding and subsequent work, the reader who has ploughed through the volume has not received a consistent picture of the development of any of the literary genres at which Roman writers tried their hands. Menippian satire for instance is mentioned by Horsfall when dealing with Varro (p. 289). He mentions Seneca’s Apocolocyntosis as “the only complete specimen of the genre that survives”, a statement repeated by Goodyear (634). Neither author sees fit, however, to mention the fact that the genre, admittedly considerably reshaped, is revived by Martianus Capella (cf. Browning p. 764) and, at least as a form, finds a high point in Boethius’ Consolatio Philosophiae. On Boethius’ conspicuous absence from this volume see below. Nor does the reader, in several cases, receive a consistent picture of the activity of single authors. Ovid’s elegiac work is treated by Luck, his further work, including the Tristia, by Kenney. Dealing with the Tristia Kenney notes that the elegiac form with its clear links with both love poetry and lament “in a manner imposed itself”. The Fasti belong to Kenney’s task, but a reader asking why Ovid should have used elegiac verse in that work is sent away unanswered, except for a general remark on the inferiority of the elegiac couplet for sustained narrative as compared with the hexameter (p. 430). Since on p. 405 Luck had also attempted to relate the elegiac distich to specific types of content, the question of the form of the Fasti ought to have been raised there, all the more since Browning (p. 690) notes the fact that “didactic poems are written in elegiac