

necesitará manejar otras traducciones y sus anotaciones para comprender adecuadamente los poemas de Horacio. También tendrá que acudir a otras fuentes y estudios para obtener una puesta al día de la ingente tradición filológica sobre el poeta latino. Lo que Luque nos ofrece es una aproximación métrico-musical al programa poético horaciano, con el objetivo de hacernos comprender la gran trascendencia de un poeta que “ha ejercido sobre toda la lírica europea el mayor influjo personal que se conoce” (p. XXIII).

El resultado es un estudio personalísimo, poco convencional en muchos puntos, que nos enseña a imaginar una *recitatio* de esa poesía y en el que Luque, al ofrecernos a “su” Horacio, al poeta latino que él ha hecho suyo, nos brinda una rica lección de cómo hacerlo, también nosotros, nuestro.

M<sup>a</sup> Carmen Puche López  
 Universidad de Alicante  
 E-mail: carmen.puche@ua.es

---

G. Vagnone, *Dione di Prusa. Orazioni* I, II, III, IV; *Orazione* LXII. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento. Roma, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2012. Pp. 277.

Professor G. Vagnone is the much admired author of what the French would call “une édition modèle”<sup>1</sup>, which I have reviewed in *Myrtia* 2006, p. 330 f. The scholarly merits of this outstanding work were made all the greater by the fact that the editor followed “Giangrande’s method”, as I specify in my review, to which for the sake of brevity I refer the reader. A profound knowledge of *κοινή* usage as illustrated in the many fundamental publications written by G. Giangrande (cf. *Emerita* 2012, p. 192, n. 2) is indispensable to understand Vagnone’s *Textgestaltung*, as I underlined in my review and as Vagnone (*Myrtia* 2010, p. 307-312) together with Giangrande (*Myrtia* 2011, p. 329 f.) demonstrated: those who lack such knowledge like Nesselrath, commit “irrisorios errores filológicos”, i.e. are faced with a *pons asinorum* when trying in vain to cope with grammatical, textual and linguistic matters (cf. *Myrtia* 2011, p.329). For instance, Nesselrath does not know that *οἴχοθεν*, as no fewer than six authoritative German lexicographers have shown, means “assai” (cf. now Giangrande, *Tres Notas Filológicas*, in *Archivum*, in the press), he is ignorant of the meaning of verbal, *τυχόν* (cf. *Myrtia* 2010, p.307 and, for such predicative participles, Moulton-Turner, *Gramm. N.T.*, III, p. 322) and, incredible though it may be, does not even recognize – *risum teneatis, amici* – an obvious case of *enallage adiectivi* applied to an abstract (cf. *Myrtia* 2010, p. 310: cf. e.g. Xenoph. Ephes. II, 14, 3 *πλάνη ... ἀδικουμένη* = “walk of a person who has suffered an injustice” (*ἀδικουμένη* pres. partic. denoting anteriority, cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.* p. 80, and Giangrande, *Archivum*, “art. cit.”). *Sed de Nesselrath satis*.

Vagnone’s monumental edition of the five Orationes of Dio Chrysostomus is an impressive achievement, evidently the result of many years’ labour, witness his admirable *Übersicht* of all the manuscripts (p. 22 ff.) and his highly instructive “Bibliographie raisonnée (p. 34 ff.): it is, owing to the high quality of the editor’s scholarship, the best available, and will remain the standard one for the foreseeable future. The edition offers an Introduction by P. Desideri, in which the scholar reminds the reader that, as all experts agree, “I quattro discorsi non costituiscono un complesso organico”, i.e. are not articulated as a coherent philosophical “sistema”, but are “un conglomerato”

---

<sup>1</sup> Dione di Prusa, Troiano, *Or.* XI, Roma 2003.

devoid of an ideological “prospettiva unitaria”: hence Dio Chrysostomus can be seen as a champion of the “ideologia imperiale romana” and at the same time as a “sostenitore” of a “monarchia illuminata”. In examining the “tradizione manoscritta” (p. 22 ff.) Vagnone expounds the “principi” which he has followed for his *constitutio textus*: he emphasizes that the manuscripts are contaminated (“siamo in presenza di una *recensio* aperta”: p. 25), whence it follows that the *stemma codicum* (cf. p. 24, n. 7) has no final authority, and that the choice of the correct variant reading must be ultimately left to the critical judgement of the editor (cf. e.g. p. 226, on the exclusion of a *lectio facilior*). Vagnone’s method is felicitously conservative in that he, adhering to Giangrande’s method<sup>2</sup>, condemns the innumerable “manomissioni del testo” perpetrated by von Arnim and by on (p. 25; cf. p. 224, “ben tre emendamenti in una riga e mezza”) and skilfully selects the readings which offer a linguistically and contextually satisfactory sense: *praestat librorum opem expectare quam temere divinare*, p. 217. Cf. e.g. p. 216 “integrazione superflua”, p. 217 “emendamento superfluo”, p. 224 “espunzione arbitraria”, p. 249 “conservo la lezione dei codici”, p. 234 “superflua la correzione ... di Emperius”). These instances, selected by me at random, will, I hope, interest the reader because they are indicative of the commendable way Vagnone conducts his textual analysis.

The text of the Orations contains very many “passi” which were expunged by Von Arnim and others as interpolations: in view of the fact that Dio, “secondo le consuetudini retoriche” of his epoch, tends to “ripetere in forma diversa lo stesso concetto”, it is often very difficult to decide whether such “passi” are genuine repetitions indulged in by Dio or are to be athetized as interpolations; moreover, a distinction between interpolations and “Dubletten” is not always easy to make (cf. p. 220, 237, 242, 265): on all this cf. p. 212, 225, 227, 231, 232, 236, 238, 240 (“goffa ripetizione”), 251, etc. On the whole Vagnone’s decisions in this respect are persuasively argued<sup>3</sup> on the basis of his cogent stylistical, logical and contextual considerations which are set out in his serviceable “Commento” (p. 193 ff.), where the editor throws much light on textual matters as well as on *Realien* and on ancient constitutional theories (e.g. p. 178 ff., 229 ff.).

In sum: this *echtphilologisch* edition is of very great worth and will remain, not least thanks to its thorough *apparatus criticus*, the normative one, to be used as the obligatory *point de repère* and admired by the *cognoscenti* for years to come.

*En passant*, I deem it useful to point out that Vagnone’s defence of κακοί (p. 84, 32 and p. 212) is *geglickt*: for κακός = “ugly” cf. LSJ, s.v. Herwerden’s “emendamento” μηδίζων, accepted by Vagnone (p. 154, 55, and p. 255) is supported by palaeography: as the critics have failed to note, the variants Μηδία and Λυδία do occur: cf. Ael. *N.A.*, V 42, and Arist. *Mir.* 831b26.

By way of an appendix to this review, I should like to underline that Vagnone’s meritorious work in cleansing the text of the numerous unjustified alterations inflicted upon it by the many critics he justly reprimands can be continued and *mené à bien*: I shall now venture to list a number of conjectures which he has accepted and which seem unwarranted to me. In this respect I cannot help regretting that Vagnone, in preparing his edition, did not trouble to ask for Giangrande’s “assistenza e consigli” (cf. p. 5) as regards the “critica del testo” (cf. his edition of Dio’s *Troiano*, Or. XI, *Premessa*, p. 7).

P. 56, § 28. The reading ἀνόητον is sound. If ἀνόητον meant here “sciocca”, as it does on p. 120, 1.34, it would be contextually nonsensical, and therefore Riske conjectured ἀνόνητον “useless”, as a parallel to ἀνοπλον. But here ἀνόητον means “not thought of”, “not taken into

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Especially my methodological observations in *Myrtia* 2006, p. 330.

<sup>3</sup> The same holds true as regards the problems represented by the “trasposizione meccanica del testo” (e.g. p. 234), which are often perplexing. A couple of significant examples: p. 120, line 21-23: “recte transposuit Emperius”; p. 98, lines 12 ff.: “transponere maluit Arnim”). Instructive summing up on p. 242 ff.

consideration”, “neglected”, as is clear from *ἡμέλησεν* (“si disinteressa dei sudditi”), referring to the “massa” (τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων) which is *ἀνοπλος*, in contrast with the soldiers who are armed. For the various meanings of *ἀνόητος* cf. *Thes.* and Passow, *Handwört.*, s.v.

P. 70, § 80, and p. 205. The verb *ἀγνοέω* governing a personal accusative means “fail to recognize a person” (cf. LSJ, s.v. ). The reading *ἡγνόει*, violently altered by Emperius into *ὑπενόει*, is sound. The personified “Tirannide”, “non guardava francamente in viso quelli che le si accostavano”, and therefore, instead of being affable to her acquaintances who wanted to speak to her (ἐκ δὲ τούτου), “failed to recognize them”, i.e. “ignored them” (cf. e.g. *ἀγνοοίη* p. 56, 6<sup>o</sup> 28, *εἰδέν... ἀγνοεῖν* p. 52, § 20).

P. 78, § 16 and 208. The text is sound. Σὺ δὲ δῆπου, ironically enough, expects a reply in the affirmative, according to Attic usage: “I presume that you will say that you too have a goddess as your mother, like Achilles?” In the phrase ἡ Ὀλυμπιάδα κ.τ.λ. the particle ἡ is = num (= “do you really think that ...”). The dialogue is conducted “tra il serio e il faceto” (cf. p. 81), as the two particles δῆπου and ἡ demonstrate. Σὺ is emphatic (= p. 110, line 20).

P. 82, § 26. It is worth emphasizing that the ellipse of ἡ, wrongly disliked by von Arnim, in reality conforms with Atticistic usage, as shown by Giangrande in *Orpheus* 2003, p. 104.

P. 86, § 37. The reading βασιλέων is sound: we are faced with *comparatio compendiaria*, the sense being “not much worse than that of Semiramis or of the kings Darius and Xerxes?” Cf. Giangrande, *Orpheus* 2003, p. 98, and what I write in *Minerva* 1992, p. 107.

P. 94, § 57. Reiske correctly understood that the text would require the relative pronoun ὅς, which he inserted conjecturally (ὅς φθελγξάμενος). It remains to be added that the insertion is not necessary, because we are faced with the ellipse of the pronoun in question, a feature which Prof. Giangrande has shown to be attested not only in the κοινή but also in Hellenistic prose (cf. *Veleia* 2010, p. 393<sup>4</sup>).

P. 104, § 5. The reading δικαιότερος cannot mean “più perfetto”, as Vagnone suggests: it means “more observant of his duties than the soldiers he leads”, as is clear from p. 120, 6<sup>o</sup> 66-67. For δικαιότερος cf. Ael. *N.A.* XI, 30.

P. 106, § 14. The *lectio tradita* καὶ τοῖνυν πάντες is sound: in Attic, τοῖνυν is used to continue a speech, and simply means “moreover”.

P. 110, § 22. The phrase δικαιότατα χρῆται, which has puzzled the critics, cannot mean “a buon diritto si vale...”: the flatterer has no “diritto” to praise the stupid man. The sense of καὶ δικαιότατα χρῆται τῇ ἀνοίᾳ τοῦ κολακευμένου is “he treats the stupidity of the flattered man with the greatest justice it deserves”, because (τάχιστα γὰρ κ.τ.λ.) the κολακευμένος will cause his well deserved ruin by undertaking τῆς ἀνδρείας τὰ ἔργα.

P. 126, § 59. Emperius changed καί into final- consecutive ὥς, but his conjecture is not necessary, because καί here is final- consecutive (cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 334: “uncultivated κοινή”).

P. 126, § 61. The reading τὴν γνώμην, altered by Geel, is sound: γνώμη, in the sense “mind as the faculty capable of remembering”, is opposed to λήθη in Ael. *N.A.* XVII, 4. Of course τὴν γνώμην may simply mean “in his mind”, cf. Ἄ. Βοσκός, Ἀρχ. Κυπ. Γραμμ. 4, *Leukosia* 2007, p. 400.

<sup>4</sup> Prof. Giangrande makes me observe that the ellipse of the relative pronoun, which he has shown to be attested in Plutarch and Julian, is found in Aelian: cf. e.g. *V.H.* XIII, 40 (<ὧν> arbitrarily inserted by the editor, *N.A.* XI, 10 (<ἀς> twice inserted e.g. by Hercher), XI, 14 <ὅ> inserted by *manus recentior*), XIV, 28 χρόνος εἰμαρμένος = χρόνος εἰμαρμένος = ὥ, “the fated time at which” Scholfield: ὥ is dative of time, cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 243).

P. 126, § 61. The neuter ἡδίων should not be altered in to ἡδίωνα, because it is a neuter predicate (= “the life of the good king must be something still more pleasurable”. Cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

P. 126, § 84. Von Arnim changed the *lectio tradita* βιοτεύειν into βιοτεύει, because he wanted to avoid the repetition of two comparatives (ἱκανώτερος and ἡδίων). However, the infinitive βιοτεύειν can be defended if we take the reading ἱκανώτερος as a superlative. In the κοινή, as we shall see, comparatives (like ἱκανώτερος) are used as superlatives.

P. 128, § 87. The comparative σπουδαιότερα should not be changed into σπουδαιότατα. In the κοινή, the comparative is very frequently used instead of the superlative and *vice-versa*: cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 301. The confusion in question is found at every step in Aelian, *N.A.* Note, for instance, an example on p. 130, § 96 τερπνότερον... ἀηδέστατον (τερπνότατον is a “hypercritical” variant).

P. 132, § 128. There is no need to alter μακάριος into μακάριον: the nominative μακάριος shows that the text of *PETO* is the correct one. Cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 146, § 3 b.

P. 138, § 133. : τὰ ἀξιώματα is a *pluralis poeticus*, as such untouchable: cf. Giangrande, *Mus. Phil. Lond.* 2002, p. 97.

P. 138, § 136. The *lectio tradita* λιμοῦ καὶ ψύχους is sound. The repetition ψύχος ...ψύχους is typical of Dio’s style: cf. my observations *infra* concerning the repetition of φασί(ν) on p. 152, § 47. Dio alludes to the well-known *topos* coupling *Fames* and ψύχος (cold weather, winter): cf. Ovid, *Metam.* VIII, 787 ff. In cold weather, grass (νομή) needed by animals<sup>5</sup> does not grow (Ael. *N.A.* XVI, 26, XVI, 32), and animals (herbivorous and carnivorous, which latter preyed on the former: cf. Ael. *N.A.* XVII, 31: cf. also Dio, *Oratio* III, p. 114, § 43 νομῆς ... θήρας) to be hunted are not easily found (εὗρεῖν): Teiresias, in Callim. *Hymn. Pall.*, hunts gazelles and deer in hot weather, and Artemis in Callim. *Hymn. Dian.* goes hunting in the grassy and leafy countryside. Game (e.g. Ael. *N.A.* XVII, 26) was of course eaten by the θηραταί (cf. also Ael. *N.A.* XIV, 11, XVI, 32 and XVI, 7).

P. 142, § 13. The reading ἔδρυνται is sound: the “schema Atticum” is not always followed in the κοινή: cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 312 f. Many examples of neut. plur. + plur. verb are found, for instance, in Aelian, *N.A.* Cf. Aelian, *V.H.* V, 8 καταλέλυνται, wrongly altered by Hercher into καταλέλυται.

P. 148, § 31. Casaubon’s conjecture Διὸς παῖδας replacing the *lectio tradita* δίχα παιδείας is too violent to be acceptable, and tautological after οὕτω: the *lectio tradita* is sound. Dio has stated that those who had received the θεία παιδεία (p. 146, line 28) were called Διὸς παῖδες (Διὸς παῖδες εἰσὶ τε καὶ λέγονται p. 146, line 24). He then goes on to say that the θεία παιδεία is called either παιδεία or, in avoidance of the word παιδεία, ἀνδρεία καὶ μεγαλοφροσύνη (§ 30). Finally, he adds “therefore (“perciò”, καί: i.e., given the possibility of avoiding the use of the word παιδεία) the ancients called thus (οὕτω ἐκάλουν = λέγονται § 27), i.e. called “Διὸς παῖδες” in avoidance of the term παιδεία (δίχα παιδείας) those who had received τὴν ἀγαθὴν παιδείαν, i.e. the θεία παιδεία. For δίχα + genit. cf. Passow, *Handwört.* and Thesaurus, s.v.

P. 148, § 35. The conjecture φιλοτιμοῦνται is not necessary, because μιμοῦνται governs the infinitive of purpose ἐξαπατᾶν, cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 136. Cf. e.g. Xen. *Ephes.* IV, 4, 2 πεισόμενος μαθεῖν, where μαθεῖν is “Infinitiv des Zweckes” (Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf, *Gramm. N.T.* § 390-391).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Ov. *Met.*, VIII, 281 ff. on the Calydonian boar; Ael. *N.A.* XIV, 14 τὴν γαστέρα ἥρος ἀρχομένου πεπληρομένην; cf. also *N.A.* V, 45 χλοροῦ σίτου κ. τ. λ. and *N.A.* VII, 39 λειμῶνας ποίμνια τ’ ἄλση, XI, 7 νομήν, XVI, 33 τὴν πόαν.

P. 152, § 47. Given Dio's propensity to repeat words (e.g. ἀνθρώπων ... ἀνθρώπων p. 154, lines 32-33, ὠφέλιμα ... ὠφέλιμα p. 130, line 15, συγγενείας ... συγγενείας p. 134, line 26, ψῦχος ... ψύχους p. 138, lines 4-5, πεπόνθασι ... πεπόνθασι p. 134, lines 31-32) the repetition ὡς αὐτοὶ φασι ... παῖδές φασι cannot be objected to: the contrast is clearly between who the deluded βασιλεύς thinks he is ("si illude": οἶεται σπουδάζειν) and who his playmates, obviously acquainted with him, assert (φασι) he in reality (τῷ ὄντι) is. The opposition between the two *verba dicendi* could not be more obvious: the playmates openly say that the so-called βασιλεύς who has defeated them is not a βασιλεύς, whereas the rulers defeated by Alexander will openly say (σὺ ὀνομασθήσῃ) that he is a real βασιλεύς (§ 49).

P. 152, § 48. The conjecture <συμ>φιλονεικοῦντες is not justified: cf. *Orpheus* 2003, p. 110 f. Hercher's conjecture <συγ>κυνηγετούντων at Ael. *N.A.* I, 7 is equally unwarranted.

P. 156, § 60. The word πλὴν cannot signify "poiché": it is an adversative particle (cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 338, and Moulton-Milligan, *Vocab. Gr. Test.*, s.v.), the sense being "not worrying lest he might be punished, and *on the contrary* knowing that nothing would happen to him".

P. 162, § 87. Emperius' conjecture is not necessary: in τῷ πλάττειν the dative would be instrumental or causal (Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 142, = "col modellare"), but τοῦ πλάττειν can be final-consecutive (τοῦ πλάττειν ... ἐπιδεικνύμενοι = "demonstrating ... so as to represent...": cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 141).

P. 164, § 93. The reading καὶ δαπανώτατα is sound, and the conjecture καὶ δαπανώτατα is patently wrong. Money is not a commodity that can be acquired ("affluisce") "a buon mercato": it flows into the coffer of the money-lender ("cresce", Vagnone) "at great expense" (δαπανώτατα) suffered by those who must pay the high interests: προβαῖνον καὶ φθάνον οἶμαι τὰς τῆς σελήνης περιόδους.

P. 164, § 96-97. The text is not "corrotto" (p. 261). After τῶν ἐταίρων we must put a full stop, and the new sentence ὧν ἴσμεν ὅδε ὁ δαίμων κ. τ. λ. means: "of those we know, this demon is ignoble and unseemly". Cf. e.g. ὧν εἶπον p. 130 § 96, asyndetic ἦν (p. 60, § 43) and Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 324. Cf. Aelian, *N.A.* II, 15 ὧν ἴσμεν

P. 166, § 99. The reading κατέχει "holds back" is correct and is pointedly opposed to συνέπεται (= "follows"). The "Rektion" of the verb nearer to the noun concerned (i.e. κρατεῖ) prevails over the "Rektion" of κατέχει, which verb would require an accusative: hence κρατεῖ τῆς ψυχῆς. Exactly the same occurs in § 100: ἡγούμενον would require an accusative, but the "Rektion" of προσετηκότα (genitive διανοίας) prevails.

P. 170, § 119. Emperius conjectured ψόγου, thus creating a tautology ("disapprovazione e ... biasimo", Vagnone). The context shows that the *lectio tradita* φόβου is correct. The man "si nasconde" (Vagnone), i.e. escapes, scurrying in a dishonourable flight caused by the powerful men (παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων) οὗς ἐκεῖνος θεραπεύει καὶ τιμᾷ who have disapproved of his behaviour. The abstracts ἀδοξία ("dishonour") and φόβος ("flight": cf. e.g. p. 76, § 10) are a hendiadys, the sense being "dishonourable flight" (for abstracts so used cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 335 f.).

P. 172, § 123. The finite verb ἀναγκάζει coordinated with the participle περιθέων is correct, cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 343. Vagnone approves of ἀναγκάζει in his translation ("obbliga").

P. 172, § 124. The particle δῆ, used *quinto loco* (cf. LSJ, s.v., IV, 3) shows that Emperius' conjecture <ῆ> βασιλέων is not justified. The sense is "in assemblee o in letture pubbliche, e specialmente (δῆ) nelle cosiddette relazioni di amicizia e di ossequio con re o con tiranni".

P. 174, § 128. The comparative πλείονα is correct, and is equivalent to the superlative πλεῖστον (cf. L. Rodriguez-Noriega Guillén, *De Grecia a Roma y de Roma a Grecia*, Pamplona 2007, p. 276: cf. Aelian, *V.H.* II, 41, where πλεόν means πλεῖστον, as Hercher failed to understand). The θαλλός reaches its maximum size (θαυμαστόν μέγεθος) in one day, and then ταπεινοῦται.

<sup>6</sup> Παρά + genit. = ὑπό + genit. as used e. g. at p. 172, line 10.

P. 174, § 128. The reading δυσθυμίας is correct: the man, after being elated when praised, “si affloscia”, either because he is blamed (ψόγου) or because he has “un carattere incostante e disuguale, e si allietta e si duole”, i.e. he falls a prey to despondency (δυσθυμίας) after being elated.

P. 174, § 129. The reading ἐπαίρουσα is sound: it means “elating him”, “lifting his spirits”, “exalting him”.

P. 174, § 130. The reading κινδυνεύσει is correct: the verb is used here impersonally, in the sense “there is here the likelihood for me to revert to the myth of Ixion”. Cf. Thesaurus, s.v. κινδυνεύω.

P. 176, § 136. The reading δυνήσόμενος is sound: it is one example of participial “breach of concord ... in case”, which is frequent in the κοινή (cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 351 f. and especially Giangrande, *Myrtia* 1999, p. 251, quoting Hatzidakis, Dieterich and Radermacher). For examples of participial “casus pendens” cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.* p. 342, and 314 ff. For μεμυκότες in Ael. N.A. I, 18 cf. Giangrande in *Emerita* 2012, p. 193: cf. also Aelian, V.H. X, 18 βουκολῶν, wrongly altered by Jens into βουκολοῦντος.

Since “breach of concord” in the use of moods and tenses is now known to occur in the κοινή -for instance, in Ael. N.A. XIV, 20 we read κατατήξει (indic. fut.) ... δόη (opt. aor.), and at XIV, 11 the *lectio tradita* is ἔλοι (opt. aor.) ... ἀποκτείνῃ (pres. subj.), we may perhaps see such breach in Diō, p. 176, § 137 τράπηται καὶ καταδύσεται (Moulton-Turner *op. cit.*, p. 109, on moods used “promiscuously”) and p. 188, § 4 μέλλει καθέξειν ... καταστρέφεισθαι (for μέλλω + inf. cf. Moulton-Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 79). The “breaches” in question may be regarded as “Zulassungen” which those Atticists who were less “puristas” than others allowed themselves (cf. L. Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén, *De Grecia a Roma, cit.*, p. 270, and *Class. Quart.* 2005, p. 452), and not necessarily as scribal errors.

I might as well conclude. I hope I have shown that many allegedly corrupt passages, if examined within their context and in the light of κοινή usage, can be shown to be perfectly sound, and I trust that my contributions to the defence of the *textus traditus* will, if anything, confirm the validity of the conservative approach adopted by Vagnone.

Heather White

*Apuleyo. Obra filosófica*, Introducciones, traducción y notas por Cristóbal Macías, Gredos, Madrid, 2011, 287 pp. [ISBN: 978-84-249-2206-1].

La obra que ahora presentamos es una nueva traducción española del *corpus* filosófico de Apuleyo, que viene a actualizar la ya veterana de A. Camarero, publicada por la UNAM en 1968, para lo cual su autor se ha basado sobre todo en las ediciones de Beaujeu y Moreschini. De los tratados filosóficos atribuidos a Apuleyo, el autor solo excluye el *Asclepius* por considerarlo a todas luces espurio, ya que solo a partir del siglo IX se le empezó a atribuir por las evidentes semejanzas doctrinales. Asimismo, como es habitual en los volúmenes publicados en la Biblioteca Clásica Gredos, se incluyen aquí una Introducción general e introducciones parciales a cada uno de los tratados traducidos del Madaurensis, relativamente extensas en comparación con el número de páginas del libro.

<sup>7</sup> For “disparates” in literary texts cf. Giangrande, “On the Text of Antoninus Liberalis”, *Athlon, Satura. Grammatica in Honorem F.R. Adrados*, Madrid, 1987, vol. II, p. 369.