

discussion of Marcion of Pontus, arguably the most important (if problematic) spokesman for Christianity from that region, should have been enhanced and introduced earlier in the course of investigation. Most problematic, though, is the unknown quality of the 'backdrop' for these discussions: the Judaism of Asia Minor during the early centuries of the common era remains a conundrum only slightly softened by the achievements of the archaeologists. The Christian authors under discussion here provide, not infrequently, our only textual evidence for the beliefs and practices of the Jews addressed in their writings.

Lieu is acutely conscious of this final point, as it provides the very fulcrum of her study. The recurrent theme of 'Image and Reality' in the volume continually confronts the reader with the impossibility of any simple reading of these Christian texts as reflecting a reality of early Jewish-Christian relations. Though the texts under discussion are most easily classified as theological, homiletic or exegetical, they suggest almost all of the issues raised in recent discussion of the uncertain boundaries between fiction and history in the (late) ancient world. In Lieu's own words: 'throughout these explorations we have continued to speak of "image" and "reality", while recognising that "image" does not belong to the literary world alone, and "reality" to the external'; 'neither has it been possible to maintain a simple contrast between these, for each helps construct the other.' (279) The central chapters in her book, the detailed discussions of Justin's 'Dialogue with Trypho' and the 'Paschal Homily' of Melito, provide ample evidence of the fruitfulness of this approach.

In summary, Lieu's evocative study is both a rich treatment of the role of the Jewish 'other' in the development of early Christian self-definition and a bold attempt to define an aspect of the 'rhetoric' which, as Averil Cameron and others have argued, was to provide the basis for centuries of Christian discourse.

David Satran

Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Glenn W. Most ed., *Editing Texts: Texte edieren*, Aporemata Band 2, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998. xvi + 268 pp.

In 1996 Glenn Most organised at Heidelberg a conference that was intended to help close a 'theory gap': the gap, that is, between classicists, who 'seem not yet to have publicly admitted just how fascinatingly complex one of their most cherished activities, the edition of texts, really is', and those in other disciplines (especially, as can readily be imagined, English and American literature) who have been increasingly concerning themselves with 'the thorny theoretical questions raised by the practice of textual editing'. It did not work out quite like that. The participants, more numerous than the twelve scholars whose papers are here assembled, obviously had a good time discussing their trade (Luc Deitz's attempt to lay down rules for editing sixteenth-century Latin prose texts proved particularly provocative). But their discussions seem usually to have concerned details of practice rather than theory. Only Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht stands back from the fray, or rather far above it. And those who are attracted by the last words of his contribution, 'For text-editing is about roles

and not about identification — and this could almost be a definition of philological tact', will find the other eleven woefully close to the pit face.

Editing is my own trade. Each edition (I have found) sets its own practical problems: How is *this* new (and entrancing) manuscript tangle to be sorted out? How is *this* text to be spelt? How shall I best punctuate and paragraph it? But theory is not going to help me. Take orthography. It is not that it does not matter, or I should not worry about it at all. It is rather that it raises difficulties that normally cannot be definitively solved. When I edit the *Gesta Pontificum* of William of Malmesbury (who wrote in a period whose texts are barely mentioned in this volume), I can spell the text as the author intended, because his autograph is in the library of Magdalen College, just down the street. When I edit William's *Gesta Regum*, where there are four authorial versions and no autograph, I can export the principles extrapolated from his practice in the other text. But that practice is not completely consistent, and even if it were there are words in the *GR* that do not come in the *GP* and have to be spelt somehow. And granted that William was capable of writing 'Danemarcia' in one line and 'Danemarkia' in the next, I am forced to wonder if he would have thought it mattered very much which I put. On the other hand, when I edit a classical text, I can trust no manuscript and appeal to no arbiter. Yet I must spell it somehow. In our volume, there is a diverting exchange between Deitz and Helga Köhler on this topic. Deitz asserts (of his sixteenth-century texts) that 'the search for the "original" should stop at the level of the *sequence of words*, whereas their spelling ought to be rigorously normalized according to one classical dictionary in common use' (p. 151). Köhler, after a nuanced discussion, concludes that, as normalising editors always have to make exceptions, 'man fragen möchte, ob es nicht konsequenter gewesen wäre, die ungerregelte Graphie der gewählten Handschrift(en) oder des Erstdruckes beizubehalten' (p. 179). In many texts, such a decision would be as arbitrary as anything proposed by Deitz. In any case, this discussion is not about theory, but about practice: what should we do that is in the best interests of the author, the editor, and the assumed reader?

And in fact several of the contributors talk, untheoretically, about the problems, and rewards, of their own texts. Much of interest is elicited on the way. Ann Ellis Hanson fascinatingly shows us Galen explaining that 'certainly $\theta\upsilon\rho\alpha\iota$ was written with a *theta*, but the scribe thought it was $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\iota$, because the middle stroke of *theta* was lost', perhaps because it was eaten by a fly (pp. 43-4); or laying down the First Law of criticism: 'It seemed to me far preferable to preserve the old reading, always expending effort to explicate it, but when I could not accomplish this, to make a plausible correction' (p. 47); or writing a sombre epitaph on a textual critic: 'Dioscorides ... made corrections ... that people praise and esteem ... but it is clear that with all his words he came to no positive result beyond the fact that he wasted his life away and expended his efforts for nothing' (p. 44). And she makes the excellent observation of her own that 'the ability to correct [mechanical] errors was a skill generations of intelligent readers throughout antiquity brought to the hand written rolls they confronted' (p. 49). Michael Reeve splendidly analyses the editorial technique of John Wallis, who held the Savilian Chair of Geometry at Oxford from 1649 to 1703, and who had been known to me only as someone who calculated a method of

flooring the Sheldonian Theatre. Martin West bracingly says of the *Iliad* that 'we are dealing with a written text' (p. 100). It is surely an act of faith when he decides to 'give qualified approval to van Thiel's view that a small selection, ten or a dozen of the older copies ..., will normally be adequate to catch those ancient variants that survived the Dark Ages' (p. 102): with which compare and contrast the words of R.D. Dawe (from what is predictably the most trenchant of all these essays): 'to this day we have no comprehensive knowledge of what exactly is in the Homer manuscripts' (p. 115). Not that Dawe's own author is in much better case: 'of the two hundred or so manuscripts of Sophocles only a handful have been fully collated' (p. 116). That would no doubt be too much to ask; but have they all been subjected to sample collation?

I shall mention briskly Franco Montanari on the Alexandrian editors of Homer, David Blank on 'Versionen oder Zwillinge' of the Rhetoric of Philodemus (he decides for 'Zwillinge'), Patricia Parker's fanciful and absurdly repetitive study of a phrase in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and Pierre Petitmengin's magisterial 'simples remarques' on multiple editions. But more should be said of Anthony Grafton's 'Correctores corruptores? Notes on the Social History of Editing', dedicated felicitously to those modern polymaths of the Oxford University Press, John Wás and Leofranc Holford-Strevens. This paints a wonderfully vivid picture of the 'correctors' who in the Renaissance 'collated manuscripts, read proofs and sometimes proposed emendations to the heroic figures who signed the title-pages of the more elaborate critical editions of texts' (p. 55). Such people might include even Erasmus, correcting proof for Froben, or (in another sense) Niccolò Niccoli collaborating with Poggio (and here quoted from beneath a pile of letters from writers asking for his opinion: 'I have already to deal with several hundred volumes of authors of repute before I shall be able to consider yours' (p. 57), a polite formula that might prove useful to readers of this review); and their activities could be such that at times 'the difference between correcting and editing seems vanishingly small' (p. 76). I wish that I had read this essay before writing my amateurish piece 'In Praise of Raphael Regius' in *Antike Rhetorik und ihre Rezeption, Symposium zu Ehren von ... Carl Joachim Classen* (Stuttgart 1999), 99-116, where correctors are several times mentioned. Regio thought them menaces to the purity of texts: thus 'correctorem aliquem, ne dicam corruptorem, penitus et iudicio et diligentia carentem' (*Ducenta Problemata* on Quintilian 5.11.32). I had imagined them to be inefficient professors (with whom indeed Regio sometimes pairs them). Now I can visualise the corrector as he was, working under pressure from the person (sometimes a bored child) reading him the text aloud in a crowded and noisy printing house, and feel for him the sympathy denied him by the arrogant Regio.

Michael Winterbottom

Corpus Christi College, Oxford