

BOOK REVIEWS

Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium, post W. Morel et K. Büchner edidit J. Blänsdorf (Stuttgart and Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1995), xxvi + 494 pp.

The lapse of only thirteen years between Bü(chner)'s 1982 revision of M(orel)'s *FPL* (1927) and the present one marks a renewed interest in literary history after almost half a century dominated by the tendency of New Criticism and Structuralist Poetics to treat integral works in isolation. It is, however, sheer bad luck for the publisher that Bl(änsdorf)'s third revision was completed such a short time after E. C(ourtney)'s *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993), which covers more or less the same material with the addition of a good commentary.

Bl., who was involved in the production of Bü.'s edition, has come out with a volume more than twice the length of the previous one. This is partly the result of a more open (and pleasant) layout, but also of a considerable augmentation of the corpus with new (or newly admitted) fragments and a conscientious updating of the detailed bibliographies introducing each entry. Another welcome addition in this revision is that of *testimonia* prefixed to all but the most celebrated poets, as well as to some general entries, such as *carmen* (1-2) or *poetae novi* (194). This important constituent of any good collection of fragments is on the whole attentively compiled. The editions of the sources cited are brought up to date, and the *apparati* have been revised. However, Bl. is not very revolutionary in his approach to the text of the fragments, and the often-criticised readings of Bü. are seldom altered.

References to Fronto sometimes follow Naber's pagination (360, 413) and sometimes that of Van den Hout's first edition (361, fr. 4), whereas the latter's 1988 edition is now standard. The *testimonium* of Schol. Pers. 1.121 on Labeo should be included even if it is somewhat redundant. Valerius Aedituus fr. 2.1 (93): Baehrens' emendation *quae nil opus nobis* is probably to be preferred; see L. Holford-Strevens, *LCM* 10 (1985) 112 (not in the bibliography). Madius fr. 6 (114): the apparatus should include Mazzarino's *deterit*, though the prefix *con-* (shortened to a single stroke Ꝣ or ꝣ) is more likely to have dropped. Baehrens' *conterit* seems a plausible source for the corrupt *tenet/tenit* of the MSS., and C.'s hesitant *demetit* is beautiful poetry, but I can see no advantage in adhering to M.-Bü.'s *contigit*. Varro fr. 2.1 (186): C.'s brilliant *<locis di>catus* deserves to be included in the apparatus (if not in the text). Amicus Gelli l. 5 (348): Bl. sticks to Bü.'s *animula <et> aegra et saucia* (†*anima aegra et saucia* ω and Macr.: *animula* Carrio), whereas Russell's *<en> animula* or C.'s *<tunc> animula* would avoid the pleonastic *et*.

In range this collection generally keeps to the often-deplored confines of previous editions, excluding not only the bounteous Ennius and Lucilius and all varieties of *scaenica*, but also pieces preserved in anthologies or from epigraphical sources, even when these may be attributed with some certainty to the poets included in the collection. Bl.'s references to *CLE*, *AL* or *PLM* for such additional evidence (e.g. 339, 344, 366) are a step in the right direction. Among entries omitted in previous versions and admitted in Bl.'s are Varro's verse fragments (apart from those in Menippean Satires) and Seneca's adapta-

tions from Greek Tragedy as well as fragments of Vergil, Tibullus and Tiberianus (though, again, with only a reference to at least three more long pieces in the Beauvais anthology). Bl. does include, albeit from the *AL*, the twenty-two verses from a *Pontica* (by Solinus?), and the independently transmitted *Historia Apollini Regis Tyri* (both not in C.), and admits the fragments from the *Epigrammata Bobiensia* among those of Domitius Marsus and from the *Priapea* among Ovid's. To the papyrological fragments of Gallus already included in Bü. are now added those from the *de Bello Actiaco*, but the Barcelona *Alcestis* is excluded *integritatis causa* (p. ix; wouldn't this criterion also exclude the epigrams cited from Gell. 19.9, for instance?).

In keeping to the familiar numeration of M.'s *FPL*, Bl.'s edition might furnish a more convenient standard reference to the fragments of Latin poets than C., which is confessedly selective in other respects. But for a convenient and comprehensive view of the poetic remains of a Pliny, Hadrian or Apuleius one has still to look elsewhere.

Amiel D. Vardi

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Martin Goodman, *Mission and Conversion. Proselytising in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994, 194 pp.

In recent years the issue of mission and conversion has become very popular in scientific circles. Studies about it have been published by McKnight, Feldman, Will-Orrieux and others.¹ In eight chapters, Goodman again goes over the evidence in pagan, Jewish and Christian literature. His hypothesis is that mission was not inherent in religions of antiquity, and that only few Christians and Jews were active in mission. This hypothesis leads him to some far reaching conclusions. Let me mention some of his points.

Goodman starts with a thorough discussion (chapter 1) about the nature of mission in antiquity, and concludes that there were four types of mission: educational, apologetic, informative and proselytizing. A missionary religion "had to be universal and therefore outward-looking in its scope and inclusive in its intent" (p. 6). He strengthens this point by saying that "the crucial issue will be to discover whether missionaries who sought to convert others to their beliefs or groups saw themselves at the time of their missionary activity as members along with their auditors of such a universal society". Now, the question is whether these statements are valid, and whether people in antiquity (or missionaries for that matter), were aware of these distinctions. One can claim for instance that a mission which had any bearing on a religious cause was by its nature educational and/or informative. The fact that Goodman is greatly impressed by the direct results of mission, namely the number of converts that one can find at the end of the process of mission, affects his whole argument. (This matter, which is debated throughout his book, remains very problematic precisely because of our lack of evidence concerning numbers of proselytes.) To put it more bluntly, the fact that there are no proselytes at the end of the process of mission does not necessarily mean that the educators' intention was not to convince people to change their beliefs and affiliations. The use of a different "discourse"

¹ S.McKnight, *A Light among the Gentiles. Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period*, Min. 1991. L.H.Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World*, 1993. E.Will, C.Orrieux, *Prosélytisme juif? histoire d'une erreur*, Paris, 1992.