might just as well have its Homeric meaning 'dangerously large, threatening', see I. J. F. de Jong, Mnem. 38 (1985), 278.—Line 558: I would prefer Gerlaud's ἁγεδανὼς (F) to Livrea's ἁγεδανῦ (b). In 548 ff. Tr. deals with the miserable plight of the Trojan women; of the four categories this one is singled out by the poet for the climax, because theirs is the most horrible way of dying.—Line 684-685: Gerlaud fails to note that Xanthos' behaviour is the fulfillment of the promise reported by Homer in Φ 373-376.

Both editions are excellent specimens of the best traditions of the series in which they appear. Perusal of them has convinced me that this poem deserves the serious attention it has been given. Passages such as 8-16, 59-61, 188-198, 222-226, Cassandra's entire speech 376-416 with its effective ending, 452-453, 500-505, 539-541 show Tr. to be a worthy imitator of the inimitable.

Universiteit van AMSTERDAM, Klassiek Seminarium

J. M. BREMER

1) M. L. West and M. Campbell have provided searching reviews of both editions very shortly after they came out (for the lateness of this review only I am responsible). They both give extensive lists of the instances where they prefer Gerlaud's text to Livrea's or vice versa. In my comments I confine myself to a few passages to which W. and C. do not pay attention, or where I disagree with the verdict given by one (or both) of them. Their reviews appeared in CR 33 (1983), 184-185 and JHS 104 (1984), 220 respectively.


As for Musaeus' epyllion, (henceforth M.), the situation is very different from Triphiodorus'. In the twentieth century no less than ten editions have been published before this new one by Livrea. The Loeb (1974, Th. Gelzer) and Budé (1968, P. Orsini) are even quite recent. Germany has the merit of having offered not only the smallest M. (1961, H. Farber) but also the fattest (1971, K. Kost 612 pp: a very full commentary). Now fatness is a reproach nobody would address to Livrea's M. Some might initially suspect that there was no real need for another M., but that Livrea, having brought his expertise to bear on so much of later Greek epic (Ap. Rhod., Colluthus, Pamphilius and Triphiodorus) simply could not resist the temptation of taking M. on as well. But there was a good

reason for L. to do this; for the plethora of editions did not at all mean that the textual tradition of M.’s poem had been taken into account very carefully. F. Vian, when reviewing Kost in REG 87 (1974), 486-489 complained about this: “Ce n’est pas un des moin-
dres regrets qu’on éprouve en constatant que pour un texte aussi court, chaque éditeur se dérobe devant une de ses tâches essen-
tielles.” Again: this reproach one cannot direct at Livrea. Together
with Paolo Eleuteri—who published in 1981 a Storia della tradizione
manoscritta di Museo—Livrea has collated all extant MSS (33) of M.
To the present volume Eleuteri contributes the critical discussion of
the MSS and the stemma (pp. i-xiv), while Livrea signs for the text and the app.crit. This volume contains no index verborum, unlike
his edition of Triphiodorus; one was provided by D. Bo in 1966 (Olms, Hildesheim).

Eleuteri’s stemma is very complete: it even includes 9 MSS
which have been copied (directly, or indirectly via other editions)
from the ed. princeps, an Aldina of 1495. The stemma is also quite
complicated: up to 16 sigla (from a to π) have been used to indicate
hyparchetypes. For a detailed criticism of this stemma given by an
expert I refer to M. L. West’s review in CR 33 (1983), 185-187. He
calls attention to a mistake in the design of the stemma on p.
xi: the line connecting γ and μ should run from δ to μ. See also
Browning’s review of Eleuteri’s Storia in CR 34 (1984), 22-23.

A perusal of Livrea’s edition of M. with Kost, Gelzer and Orsini
within reach, has led me to note the following: Lines 1-5: it is sur-
prising that Livrea failed to see how necessary Ludwich’s slight
emendation γάμον ἔννυχον is for the balance of this proemium:
λύχνου-πλωτήρα-γάμον — γάμον-νηχόμενον-λύχνον. This is all one
carefully constructed sentence, beginning and ending with the fatal
lamp. As Livrea prints it, the ὁδη clause is an ugly mousetail, and
line 5 begins with asyndeton which here would have no function at
all.—Line 18: given the difficulties of ξυνέχεσ in this context (for
which see Kost ad loc.), Livrea ought not to have printed it; his
defence of it is ineffective (A 8 and Γ 70 are no real parallels).
Palaeography (and also campanilismo?) make me prefer van Len-
nep’s ξιν’ ὁξίν ἔγκεν (Livrea does not even record it) to Dithrey’s
ξυνωσε, printed by Kost.—Line 25: after Λεάνδρω the colon or
comma is missing.—Line 54: the point of this line must be the quan-
tity of beautiful girls coming together: what an opportunity for the
young men! Livrea seems to feel the attractiveness of ἀγαυμένων,
for in his app. crit. he qualifies this variant reading as ‘fort. recte’,