end to the main features of his political virtue although they do not fully grasp the truth and now that we have put a seal on his friendship (in order to testify that it is genuine) etc'. Πη (line 440, ch. 18) should be πη; ϒύρον, line 648 ch. 26 should be ϒύρον. In line 746 (ch. 30) I prefer ἐπέθετο to ἀπέθετο which I should like to translate as ‘(the sickness) attacked (him first)’. There should have been a note on the eclipse of the sun (line 895 ch. 37). What seems to be strange is that in the text the θ is mostly written (but not in line 891) in another form than in the commentary.

In spite of these critical remarks the text and the translation are reliable and will prove to be helpful to a better understanding of this strange but influential philosopher of late antiquity.

Ede, Marnix College

R. Ferwerda


For the text of Triphiodorus’ poem (henceforth Tr.) the twentieth century has had only the Loeb edition by A. W. Mair (1928) prepared on the basis of one MS (F), reputedly the codex optimus. In this respect Mair followed the lead given by Weinberger in his (now superseded) Teubner edition of 1896. All of a sudden two editions vie for our attention, both of them of excellent quality and based on a much more careful assessment of the tradition as contained in 10 MSS. What has been the source of this renewed interest? To begin with, there has been in the last few decades a far-reaching and deep-probing research into, and reappraisal of, later Greek epic poetry. R. Keydell, the editor of Nonnus (1959) is the éminence grise in this équipe (it is to him that Livrea dedicates his Tr.); Livrea himself has given us already a Colluthus (1968), a Pamprepius (1979), and presents us now with this Tr., and at the same time with a Teubner edition of Musaeus’ Hero et Leander (also reviewed in this volume); in France F. Vian has produced an edition of Quintus Smyrnaeus (1963-1969), of Nonnus I-II (1976), and he has been the guide of Gerlaud for the latter’s edition of Tr. There is another, more special reason for renewed interest in Tr.

The *communis opinio* had it that Tr. was an imitator of Nonnus, and that he therefore lived in the (second half of) the 5th century A.D. Wifstrand was the only one who challenged that opinion, on metrical grounds, and he has been proved right. In 1972 P.Oxy.2946 was published, the first (and so far the only) papyrus of Tr. ever found; and this papyrus has been dated with certainty to the 3rd century A.D. So it has turned out that Tr. comes at least two centuries before Nonnus, and is a younger contemporary of, among others, Plotinus (si licet magnum componere parvo). It has evidently been a challenge for the specialists to give a reassessment of Tr.’ text and of his place in Greco-Roman literary history.

Both editors use the same ten MSS, and group them in two families: (a), the Laurentian family, headed by a Laurentianus (Weinberger’s F), with two descripti, M and V which are used wherever F is undecipherable, and (b) the Parisian family to which the remaining seven—two of them kept in Paris—belong. The two editors do not agree on all details concerning the relationships between the MSS within these two families but most important for the non-specialist reader is the fact that they have proved both traditions to have independent value, and that in their constitution of the text they use them accordingly.

A comparison of the two editions seems to be called for. Gerlaud provides three extras: (1) a copious introduction in which he discusses also the textual tradition and Tr.’ date and literary ‘context’, and presents an analysis of the structure of Tr.’ poem and of the relation of its different parts to earlier treatments of this saga in Greek and Roman literature (coming down strongly against the view that Tr.folows Virgil); finally he discusses the rhetorical (Reardon) and metrical (Wifstrand) aspects of Tr.’ poetry. In addition there is (2) a translation, according to the tradition of this French series, and (3) a careful and detailed annotation (50 pp. of small print) which comes close to a commentary. Livrea, on the other hand, has to follow the more austere conventions of the Teubneriana, but he offers two items which Gerlaud does not give: a rich bibliography and a complete *index verborum* (δέ, κατ, ο etc. included). His report of the MSS variants and the scholarly emendations in his app.crit. is also fuller than Gerlaud’s.

A few detailed comments: In line 40 Gerlaud prefers ὑπό (F) to ἐπί (b). He adduces as Homeric parallels N 198 and P 235, but in both cases ὑπό + genitive is not locative ‘under the safe protection of’ (that is ὑπό + dative, see Tr. 437), but separative ‘away from