This extremely rich volume emphatically takes Rudolf Pfeiffer's *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968) as its point of departure. Its professed aim is to assess the changes that have taken place in the study of philology in antiquity since Pfeiffer's exemplary work, and indeed, one cannot escape the conclusion that the developments in the last 28 years almost amount to a shift of paradigm. Pfeiffer stressed the discontinuity between the beginnings of ancient scholarship up to and including Aristotle and the incisive new approach developed in Alexandria ("a definitive break," Pfeiffer 1968, 87). He is strong and convincing on intra-literary criticism in early Greek poetry, and explains the connection between poetic and philological activity in Alexandria, but the chronological limits he imposes on his work preclude a further exploration of this phenomenon in (Roman) antiquity—his second volume discusses scholarship from 1300 to 1850, so there is a large gap. Furthermore, he tends to concentrate on certain types of scholarship, especially ‘higher’ philology, i.e. textual criticism and editorial activity, to the detriment or the exclusion of others, e.g. ancient bibliography, rhetoric, literary criticism, and the history of the book. *La philologie grecque* aims at a reassessment of some of Pfeiffer’s assumptions and at supplementing some of the perceived lacunae in his work.

The most striking difference in scholarly consensus concerns the position and influence of Aristotle, or, more circumspectly, the Peripatos. This topic is addressed explicitly by Richardson, who points out the parallels and agreements between Aristotle’s work and that of the Alexandrian scholars, but cf. also Tosi p. 182 (and p. 195) on the paroemiographical tradition; Arrighetti on the biographical tradition, passim, but esp. p. 237 ff.; Schenkeveld on literary theory, p. 273. Although rightly wary of postulating any direct knowledge of the corpus Aristotelicum in the Hellenistic period, the authors agree on an essential continuity in many important respects between the work carried out by Aristotle and his suc-
cessors and the philological activities developed in Alexandria and, as rightly stressed by Irigoin (p. 73), elsewhere. Schenkeveld points out that there must have been an important body of orally transmitted Peripatetic school-knowledge (p. 33 ff.), that makes up—to a certain extent—for the lack of availability of Aristotle’s esoteric works.

A list of the topics discussed will of itself be enough to show how supplementing Pfeiffer’s work has formed a central concern; it will give me the opportunity to make some brief remarks on each of the contributions. For Richardson: ‘Aristotle and Hellenistic Scholarship’, p. 7-28, discussion p. 29-38, see above.

Irigoin: ‘Les éditions de textes’, p. 39-85, discussion p. 86-93, provides an excellent discussion of the relationship between the history of philology and that of the material form of written products. Irigoin is especially strong when he points out how an awareness of the book as a medium influences later authors, who thereby automatically perform a number of tasks carried out by professional grammarians for earlier literature (e.g. providing a book-division). A minor critical remark: the emendation proposed by Heracleides of Tarentum on Hippocrates Epid. II 3.22, proposing as the correct text πρὸς δὲ τὸ Ἀφροδίσιον αἰ θύραι ἔβλεπον (as discussed in Galen’s commentary a.l. (17a794 K.) and in his preem to his commentary on Epid. VI) is surely meant as the address of the patient, not as a complicated sexual metaphor (p. 66), cf. e.g. Hipp. Epid, II 2.20 (5.92 Littré).

Maehler: ‘Die Scholien der Papyri in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Scholiencorpora der Handschriften’, p. 95-127, discussion p. 128-41, discusses the scholia on a.o. Theocritus, Apollonius Rhodius and Pindar. Using Bacchylides as his example, he shows how commentaries of widely divergent level, ranging from simple paraphrases to learned discussion, were current at the same time.

Tosi: ‘La lessicografia e la paremiografia in età alessandrina ed il loro sviluppo successivo’, p. 143-97, discussion p. 198-209, gives a useful survey of this technical material, that was used both in reading older texts and in producing new ones. The distinction Tosi draws between Alexandrian work in this area—allegedly mainly exegesis-oriented—, versus the more production-oriented research in the second sophistic seems only partly correct in view of the literary production of the Alexandrians themselves. Tosi concludes that the paroemiographical tradition is more monolithic than the