

This part also has the volume's only anomalous inclusions: the inscription on the gilded shields set up by Pontius Pilate in honor of the emperor Tiberius, as described by Philo (no. 14), and the inscription (*titulus*) on Jesus' cross as given in the gospels (no. 15). These inscriptions do not belong in this volume because they are attested only in literary sources. If the editors were going to include literary inscriptions, as well as archaeological ones, there are any number of other candidates for inclusion, notably the decree in honor of Simon the Hasmonean that was allegedly put on bronze tablets on pillars on Mount Zion (1 Maccabees 14:27) or 'on a conspicuous place in the precincts of the sanctuary' (1 Maccabees 14:48). That which is preserved only through literary transmission does not merit a place in a corpus of archaeologically attested texts.

The bulk of the volume is taken up by Part B, 'Funerary Inscriptions', nos. 18-608, mostly ossuary inscriptions. Items of individual interest include nos. 25 (a woman who died in childbirth, interpretation not certain), 45 (house of David), 50 (crucifixion), 54 (builder of the sanctuary), 55 (a long Aramaic inscription written in paleo-Hebrew script), 86 (Yehosef the scribe), 98 (Nicanor of Alexandria who made the doors), 137 (the sons of Hezir), 181 (Diogenes the proselyte), 190 (Shalom the proselyte; perhaps better, Salome the female-proselyte, cf. 238 and 381), 238 (Maria the female proselyte), 287 (*qorban* vow), 304 (Ariston of Apamea and Yehudah the proselyte), 368 (the children of Yeshevav), 461 (Yehosef *qp'*), 466 (*qorban* vow), 528 (*qorban* vow), 534 (Theophilus the high priest), 551 (Ioudas the proselyte), 598 (Shimon the proselyte), 602 (Uzziah king of Judah), and 605 (*'amar* oath formula). The editors argue that the ossuaries of Dominus Flevit are not Christian, since the crosses upon them are not signs of Christianity but masons' marks (nos. 164-206; cf. 479). The editors have a healthy skepticism towards identifying individuals mentioned in ossuary inscriptions with individuals known to us from literary sources (see the commentaries on nos. 6, 105, 115, 123, 461, 474, 521, 531 [re James brother of Jesus], and 547; in contrast, see the commentaries on nos. 534, 701, 702, which admit an identification).

The volume is rounded out by Parts C, 'Instrumentum Domesticum', nos. 609-692 and D, 'Varia', nos. 693-704. Particularly interesting here are nos. 665 (dating by Hasmonean era), 666 (King Herod), 674 (Bar Kathros), 676 (King Agrippa), 693 (payment to workers; cf. 620), 701-702 (Jonathan High Priest and Jonathan King), and 704 (amphora with a Roman consular date). Indices are forthcoming in a future volume.

A recent catalogue from De Gruyter indicates that volume 1 part 2 (Jerusalem, nos. 705-1120) and volume 2 (Caesarea and the Middle Coast, nos. 1121-2160) have already appeared. This project brings honor and prestige to all those associated with it. Welcome to the *CIIP* !

Shaye J.D. Cohen

Harvard University

Peter Riedlberger (ed.), *Philologischer, historischer und liturgischer Kommentar zum 8. Buch der Johannis des Goripp* [sic] *nebst kritischer Edition und Übersetzung*, Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 2010. 503 pp. ISBN 978-90-6980-157-5.

Flavius Cresconius Corippus's epic on John Troglita was first edited by Pietro Mazzucchelli in 1820. Mazzucchelli was succeeded by Immanuel Bekker (1836), Joseph Patsch (1879, in the MGH), and Michael Petschenig (1886). Patsch and Petschenig held the field for nearly a century. The 1970 edition by Diggle and Goodyear was a bracing contribution, solving a number of problems and provoking others to a defence of the transmitted text. An explosion of work in recent years owes something to rehabilitation of later Latin epic generally, but also to current fascination with barbarians and their representation. The last few decades have seen commentaries on Book 1 by M.A. Vinchesi (1983), Book 2 by V. Zarini (1997) and Book 3 by C.O. Tommasi Moreschini (2001). Riedlberger (=R.) has begun at the other end, with the eighth and last transmitted book, which details John's triumph over his Berber opponents near Iunci. Much of the

book is a blow-by-blow account of fighting, but it also includes an abortive mutiny, John's nocturnal ponderings, morning Mass in the Roman camp, and several memorable similes.

A few lines of the *Iohannis* appear in the Verona florilegium of 1329, now convincingly attributed to Guglielmo da Pastrengo.<sup>1</sup> Otherwise the text rests exclusively on the fourteenth-century codex Trivultianus (T), copied by the humanist Giovanni de Bonis. R. has recollated the manuscript and deploys photographs of individual readings to good effect. The layout of the resulting edition is unconventional; rather than a continuous text, R. splits the text into brief chunks (printed against a grey background for visibility), which appear at the top of right-hand pages. I appreciated not having to flip back and forth constantly between text and commentary (though some flipping is still necessary, since some notes appear on the opening before the text they comment on). At the same time, one inevitably loses a sense of the book's larger architecture; I found it helpful to have Diggle and Goodyear within reach.

Readers familiar with the poet may be surprised to find him referred to as 'Gorippus'. T and the Verona florilegium call him only 'Cresconius'. Of the two witnesses to a lost codex Budensis, Cuspinianus gives *Gor-*, Vadianus *Cor-*. The Matritensis, the sole witness to Corippus's later poem *In laudem Iustini*, exhibits both forms. (R.'s photographic evidence on this point is conclusive.) *Corippus* is not otherwise attested as a name, while *Gorippus* is found at Dura Europos (whose garrison may have had African recruits). R. is, I think, right that the balance of probabilities speaks for *Gor-*, but a switch this late in the day would involve major inconvenience for pretty limited gain.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to this question, R.'s introduction covers the textual history, the historical background, and the literary aspects of the work: language and style, genre and poetic models, as well as panegyric aspects. R. sees in the poem 'weder ... ein Propagandapamphlet noch ... den Versuch einer justinianischen Aeneis'. Rather, a work commissioned for recitation in 546, which was originally intended to end with the defeat of Antalas in Book 5, but had three more books added c. 548.

The commentary does full justice to both philological and historical aspects. (The "liturgischer" component refers to the Mass at 8. 318-369). The notes mostly focus on immediate problems of text and interpretation, but some raise wider issues (e.g. 8.298 on Corippus's promiscuous use of pagan and Christian phraseology for God). R. is alert to Corippus's verbal habits and has usefully tagged some recurrent features: 'Baukastenjunktur' (families of metrical formulae generated by substitution of synonyms); '*percenset-relegens* pleonasm' (finite verb attached to semantically equivalent participle); 'Überbeanspruchung' (disproportionate use of preexisting, especially Vergilian, phrasing). On the historical side, R. is sensitive both to Corippus's value as a historical source, and to his very real limits in that role. He makes good use of Byzantine military treatises to illuminate the representation of John as ideal general, and is alert to 'Verbrämung' ('positive spin' on otherwise negative details). He deals incisively with the nightmarish problems of Berber names (*passim*) and the Berber pantheon (8.304). His control of the secondary literature is comprehensive, though he does not always conceal his impatience with other scholars.<sup>3</sup>

I append some comments on individual points:

**15-17** (*non viribus audet* *Carcasan nostris fretus concurrere telis, arte sed asper agit Latias vexare cohortes*). R. finds it 'unklar' whether *nostris ... concurrere* should be taken with *viribus* or *telis*. But other things being equal, a Latin reader would instinctively link the adjective at the

<sup>1</sup> R. seems unaware of this identification, for which see Giuseppe Billanovich in idem and G. Frasso, edd., *Petrarca, Verona e l'Europa* (Padova, 1997), 127-135.

<sup>2</sup> R. notes the replacement of "Suidas" by "the Suda", but the issues there are more than orthographic.

<sup>3</sup> Or with institutions: I doubt the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek will much appreciate the thanks accorded it on p. 5.

penthemimeral caesura (*nostris*) with the rhyming noun at line-end (*telis*). Indeed, this pattern with *telis* is something of a Corippian tic.<sup>4</sup> R. objects that ‘der Kontrast *telis – arte* [ist] besser als *viribus – arte*’. But the position of *viribus* makes it the likelier contrast-word to *arte*. For *vires + ars* in warfare cf. e.g. Liv. 38.21.6; Justin 29.3.3; Prud. C. *Symm.* 1.653; Veget. 4.12.4. Note especially Liv. 21.50.1: *eludere Poenus et arte, non vi rem gerere*.

**36** R. would alter T’s *cautis ... monitus alis* to *cautus ... montis ab alto*. The unmetrical *monitus* makes some change necessary, but Mazzucchelli’s *montibus altis* seems easier palaeographically and can claim as much support as R.’s suggestion from the parallel at 2.261f.

**73f.** *fu\*\*ram primum parvamque exire favillamsaepes vides*. The deleted letters appears to be *-ne-*, and R. prints Mazzucchelli’s *funeream*, but neither this nor *fimum atrum* (Bekker) seems quite right. Perhaps *fumiferam*? Cf. *Aen.* 9.522 *fumiferos ... ignis*; the adjective also occurs in Lucan, Silius, Statius, Claudian and the *Ilias Latina*.

**75** *densos fēdunt mala flamina colles*. The unmetrical *edunt* needs change, but Gärtner’s *<per>edunt* seems weak; as R. notes, *flamina* should mean ‘winds’, not ‘flames’. Watt’s *prendunt* has some appeal. Perhaps *incendunt* (deleting the empty *mala* as a later attempt to mend meter).

**86** *saxa, faces, gladios, quicquid furor, ira ministrat*. R. is surely right to keep *ira*. The asyndeton *bimembre* is rare in hexameter verse, and still rarer with nouns, but Corippus has examples with adjectives (2.104, 6.470), and the figure is used elsewhere to suggest haste or reckless activity (cf. *Lucr.* 4.1199 *subat, ardet*, of a mare in heat).

**97** On indicatives in indirect questions R. cites two contributions by C. Bodelot, regretting that they do not cover late Latin. He overlooks her paper in *Latin vulgaire-latin tardif* 5 (Heidelberg, 1999), 213-222, which does.

**100** *ut strepitus sensit dubios* (sc. of the mutinous troops). R. renders *dubios* as ‘gefährlich’; his note suggests ‘indistinct’ as another possibility. But I wonder if *dubios* is not a transferred epithet; cf. *OLD* s.v. *dubius* 1b ‘wavering or faltering in one’s allegiance’.

**160** *ductoris maior in omnes|the gentes terror* (T). R.’s *it omnes|per gentes* seems unlikely; I cannot find any parallels (in Corippus or elsewhere) for *it* in this metrical position. And can *omnes ... gentes* really mean ‘both Romans and Berbers’? Perhaps keep *in* and read *quam gentes*, ‘They were more terrified of their leader than of all the barbarians’ (for the thought see R.’s note on 133; for the construction with *in*, cf. *TLL* 8.910.28; *OLD* s.v. *in* 11a).

**175** *gentes dubias se credere campis|efficit ipsa quies*. Perhaps *dubiis*? Cf. *Lucan* 9.1009 *dubiis veritus se credere regnis*.

**176** *certum putat esse pavorem|infelix Nasamon*. R. renders ‘für unzweifelhaft hielt der unselige Berber die Angst [seiner Feinde]’. I would prefer Petschenig’s interpretation (ignored by R.) that *certum* here = *aliquem* or *quendam*. (One might have expected a word meaning *consilium* or the like, but *certum* can hardly mean that.)

**185** R.’s *permixta* (for *sic mixta*) is appealing. Note that the *per* abbreviation is found not just ‘seit dem 8. Jh.’ (so R., citing Cappelli), but at least as early as the Verona Facundus (*CLA* IV.506), which may have been written in Corippus’s lifetime.

**203-5** The comparison (applauding assembly = sea) deserves comment; it looks back ultimately to Homer (*Il.* 2.394-7).

**207-8** R.’s analysis of this difficult passage is helpful, though his solution is not wholly convincing. I wonder if something has not fallen out after *fuit*.

**226** *luce sequenti*: to R.’s parallels add Jordanes *Getica* 254.

**250-51** For the incentive of plundering the enemy camp cf. *Lucan* 7.328f.

**252-3** *Ammon|sorte dedit Latias bello superare catervas*. Is *Latias ... catervas* object (as Carcasan supposes and R. translates) or subject? Both, of course. R. finds the present infinitive odd, but a future would give the game away.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. 2.13, 2.231, 3.440, 4.165, 5.69, 5.101, 5.274, 5.359, 5.442, 6.508, 6.639, 7.432, 8.62.

**258** *dum medio calet hora die*: R. cites Symmachus and Augustine but not Ov. *Met.* 1.592.

**280** I think R. is too quick to dismiss Andres' *natura* (the abbreviation *n̄a* would explain T's corrupt *nostra*). In the interval between day and night, nature has time to catch its breath.

**285** For *gelidos ... pisces* cf. Apul. *Apol.* 30.4: *piscis brutus et frigidus*.

**375** If we accept *furor, ira* at 86 (see above), then *gentes, signa* for the unmetrical *gentes et signa* might not be impossible.

**381** R. defends *clipeatis ... campis*, but the image remains bizarre. Is *clipeatis* conceivably meant to be construed as a substantive?

**385** For missiles blotting out the sky R. cites *Aen.* 11.611 and might have added 12.578. But the image (found also at 450f.) is traditional: Hdt. 7.226, Ar. *Vesp.* 1084, Lucan 7.519, Stat. *Theb.* 8.412f., Avien. *Orb. terr.* 1247, Claud. *Cons. Stil.* 1.258, in *Ruf.* 2.122.

**423** *compulsat* (previous edd.) for T's *compulsit* seems an easier change than R.'s *compellit*; *compulsare* is rare, but R. acknowledges four other attestations (all from post-classical North African writers). Corippus has the even rarer *compressare* at 538 (and uncompounded *pulsare* frequently).

**434f.** R. punctuates after *vos*, rather than *veniens*. But a strong stop after the first *longum* would be unparalleled in Corippus. Of eighty single-word enjambments in the corpus, only one (6.319 *signa*) occupies less than a full foot, and only three others are less than three syllables (*Ioh.* 2.231 *pulsat*; 4.400 *ductor*; *Iust.* 4.25 *linquunt*).<sup>5</sup> The traditional punctuation gives better sense: *minas* represents the preliminaries, *hostis ... veniens* the assault itself.

**477** *percipiunt* looks like a stand-in for the more natural (but unmetrical) *rēcipiunt*.

**485** I find R.'s *guttura Manti* for *guttur Amanti* appealing. As he notes, a Mantus was slain at 411, but better poets than Corippus have killed the same warrior twice.

**499f.** I think R. is right to retain *dum video*, but I would accept Bekker's *si vincitis* and Petschenig's *tum vivo*.

**508** *caelum* and *letum* are similarly confused at Lucan 9.870.

**511** If emendation is needed, Knecht's *cuneos* seems better than R.'s *campos*.

**518** T's *tum* does not seem impossible, and *sic* is not an easy change.

**527** The common epigraphic use of *funus acerbum* is worth mention: see Olcott's *Thesaurus* s.v. *acerbus*.

**536** Full-scale "mowing" similes may be rare in Latin poetry, but the metaphor is not (*OLD* s.v. *meto* 3).

**547** R. cites four parallels for *lumina fessa* (add Stat. *Silv.* 1.1.87), but all involve actual weariness (from eyestrain, weeping, etc.). The idea here seems closer to Catull. 64.188. *languescens lumina morte*; Sil. 10.153 *dubitantia lumina condit*.

**617ff.** *non illum salvavit ...*: Another epic trope worth comment (*Il.* 2.859, 2.873, 5.53, *Aen.* 7.756, etc.).

R. has hunted conscientiously for parallels, but some additions are possible (especially from later poets).<sup>6</sup> For a sample section (540-600), and without claiming exhaustiveness, I note:

**541** *vulnere victus*: Lucr. 5.1321, Verg. *Aen.* 10.842, 12.640, Maximianus 5.45, *CE* 1233.11.

**542** *fusos per gramina* + **564** *gramina terrae*: *Aegritudo Perdicae* 75.

**547** *lingua loquellam*: cf. Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 15.305, Sedul. *Carm.* 4.63.

**552** *vulnera ferri*: Ov.(?) *Hal.* 61, Auson. *Mos.* 252, Sedul. *Carm.* 5.303, Drac. *Romul.* 9.178, *Orest.* 405.

**555** *fortis adhuc*: also 7.301, *Iust.* 1.139.

<sup>5</sup> I use Diggle and Goodyear for *Ioh.*, Cameron for *Iust.*, and count all instances with punctuation stronger than a comma.

<sup>6</sup> Dracontius in particular seems underrepresented; he is not in the Brepols LLT database, while the *PLD* omits the *Romulea*.

- 565** *ardua membra*: Pallad. *Ins.* 161 (closer verbally than Stat. *Theb.* 6.836f.).  
**570** *captivum ... trahit*: cf. Drac. *Romul.* 5.163, 10.58.  
**581** *post crimina*: Barcelona *Alcestis* 10, Mar. Victor. *Aleth.* 1.467, Drac. *Laud.* 2.581, 2.669.  
**588** *corrui ante pedes*: Sedul. *Carm.* 3.107, Ven. Fort. *Mart.* 3.350.  
**589** *magnanimi iuvenis*: Drac. *Romul.* 9.181.  
**595** *acer equus*: Drac. *Romul.* 7.80.  
**596** *in terga redire*: cf. 5.278.

R. often ends more detailed notes with a brief *Fazit*, so I will follow suit. This is an outstandingly intelligent, thorough and well informed (if sometimes prickly) commentary. R. has served his readers — and “Gorippus” — well.

Gregory Hays

University of Virginia

Andrew Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient History: Blackwell's Companions to the Ancient World*. Chichester: Blackwell Publishing, 2009. xxxiv + 693 pp. including 5 maps and 27 black-and-white illustrations. ISBN: 978-1-4051-3150-6.

For those whose academic field is ancient history and literature, it is hard to imagine a more daring project than publishing a volume such as the one reviewed here. The thick *Companion to Ancient History*, with its varied articles, each written by an expert in the field, proudly meets its initial purpose as described in the Preface, of offering a wide panorama on many aspects of the ancient world. Like other Blackwell companions, this book is not a handy *vade mecum*, and the present reviewer, after trying it himself, does not recommend carrying this 700-page volume, weighing almost one-and-a-half kilos, in a back pack for long travel abroad. And yet, if one is interested in ancient cultures and history (which, it appears, in this Companion consists mainly of ancient Greece and Rome) this is a perfect book for instructive and delightful hours of reading. Constraints of space require that I only mention the 49 articles in the volume, marking with an asterisk, those I personally found most stimulating. Each reader, needless to say, will find in this rich volume his, or her, preferred sections.

The book begins with interesting personal reflections by Ober, Derow, Giarnina, McLynn and Welch, on the study of ancient history ('Personal Perspectives', pp. 1-10). Eight parts follow. Part I, 'Evidence' (pp. 1-77), presents the main channels which lead to the modern construction of ancient history: 'Historiography' (Marincola), 'Epigraphy'\* (Rowe), 'Numismatics'\* (Meadows), 'Archeology' (Dyson), 'Oratory' (Steel), and 'Ancient Literature' (Whitmarsh). Part II, 'Problems and Approaches' (pp. 87-174), tackles various methodological issues: 'Ancient History Today'\* (North), 'Political History' (Morstein-Marx), 'Economic and Social History' (Morley), 'Ethnicity and Culture' (Herring), 'Population and Demography'\* (Scheidel), 'Writing Women into History' (Richlin), 'Interpreting Myth' (Dougherty), and 'Environmental History' (Sallares). Part III, 'People and Places' (pp. 177-298), presents brief histories of what are considered the main components of the large mosaic of ancient history: 'The Near East' (Brosius), 'Egypt under the Pharaohs' (Ray), 'The Jews' (Bohak), 'The Greeks' (Harrison), 'Asia Minor' (Thonemann), 'Rome' (Bruun), 'Italy beyond Rome' (Lomas), 'North Africa' (Crawley Quinn), 'The Iberian Peninsula' (Fear), and 'The "Celts" '\* (Witt, quotation marks in the original). Part IV, 'Encountering the Divine' (pp. 299-325), deals briefly with changes in religious beliefs and spiritual systems in the ancient world: 'Religion' (Humphries), and 'The Emergence of Christianity' (Curran). Part V, 'Living and Dying' (pp. 327-425), opens a wider vista on social life in the ancient world: 'The Family' (Harlow and Parkin), 'Food'\* (Wilkins), 'Eros: Love and Sexuality' (Davidson), 'Housing' (Nevett), 'Entertainment' (Potter), 'Education' (König), 'Medicine'\* (King), and 'Death'\* (Noy). Part VI, 'Economy' (pp. 429-495): 'The Mediterranean