

SANZ MORALES (M.) (ed) **Chariton of Aphrodisias' *Callirhoe: A Critical Edition*** (Antike Texte 2). Heidelberg: Winter, 2020. Pp. xxx + 185. €32. 9783825366155.
doi:10.1017/S0075426922000519

The Teubner edition of Chariton by the late Bryan Reardon (Munich 2004) has been the authoritative text in recent years. How does Manuel Sanz Morales' edition compare to Reardon's? The most conspicuous difference is Sanz Morales' extensive critical apparatus. While Reardon lists critical variants rather selectively, Sanz Morales returns to the fuller approach of W.E. Blake's 1938 edition by presenting variant readings not only below the running text but also by adding an enormous wealth of critical material in an appendix-like *apparatus criticus additicius* (167–79). This complementary apparatus lists all known readings except manifestly mistaken ones because of confusion of some kind.

As for the constitution of the text, Sanz Morales is somewhat less conservative than Reardon and more willing to correct or supplement where Reardon sees incurable corruption: compare, for instance, in 1.1.5 Reardon's five lacunae with Sanz Morales' two. Reardon's cruces in 5.5.9 (ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ †τι θαῦμα ἐρωτικὸν τὴν παλαιὰν ἐπιθυμίαν† σφοδροτέρων αὐθις ἐλάμβανε πληγὴν, 'it was as if, on top of † some marvel of love regarding the old passion †, he had now been struck an even more violent blow') are removed by Sanz Morales with a minimal correction (ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τραῦμα [...]), 'it was as if on top of the wound of love [...]'), resulting in a difficult but defensible construction with the accusative of respect. Reardon's *locus desperatus* in 5.3.1 (γύναιον Ἑλληνικὸν ἐπιστρατεύεται ταῖς ἡμετέραις τοικίαις· ὃ† και πάλαι μὲν πάντες ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τῷ κάλλει, 'a little Greek woman is attacking our †households. Whom† everybody has admired because of her beauty for some time') is remedied by οικεῖαις, ἃς ('is attacking the women of our kin, whom everybody has long admired because of their beauty'). I wonder if the original γύναιον [...], ὃ, with the full stop changed to a comma, would not make equal sense, given that Callirhoe (disrespectfully belittled as γύναιον ('little woman') by a Persian woman) had been admired for her beauty before on various occasions and by 'all people' (πάντες), both in and outside Persia.

Apart from the critical apparatus, Sanz Morales provides a fuller *apparatus similia* than Reardon. But the rationale of what is adopted here and what is not remains unclear. Quite a few intertextual suggestions made in recent scholarship (for example, in various studies of Stephen M. Trzaskoma) have not been considered. The melodramatic parting scene in 3.5.4, in which Chaereas' father implores his son to stay (τίμη [Reardon: τί νῦν] με καταλείπεις, ὃ τέκνον, ἡμιθνήτα πρεσβύτην, 'My child, to whom are you abandoning me [Reardon: why are you abandoning me now]? I am old, and half-dead already'), is tentatively compared to Dido's reaction to the departure of Aeneas in Vergil's *Aeneid* 4.323 (*cui me moribundam deseris, hospes?*, 'To whom are you leaving me dying, my guest?'). This is well worth considering, but why are more obvious parallels to the *Aeneid* not adopted? Compare, for instance, 1.4.12 (on Callirhoe fainting: ἐρριμμένην δὲ αὐτὴν αἱ θεραπαινίδες βαστάσασαι κατέκλιναν ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην, 'She fell down, and her maids picked her up and laid her on her bed') with *Aeneid* 4.391–92 (on Dido fainting: *suscipiunt famulae conlapsaquemembra/marmoreo referunt thalamo stratisque reponunt*, 'Her maids support her, carry her swooning form to her marble bower, and lay her on her bed'), and see my full discussion of Chariton and Vergil in *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel* (Oxford 2010, 261–97).

Last but not least, Sanz Morales avoids the considerable number of minor slips and typos that have crept into Reardon's Teubneriana. All in all, the principal attraction of Sanz Morales' edition is its full presentation of and convenient access to all variant readings. Readers will also appreciate the greater number of similia, although the references given here are not as complete as in the critical apparatus. In terms of critical judgement, Reardon and Sanz Morales take different approaches but there is no 'winner' since both

texts are sound in their own ways. It cannot be said, then, that this new edition ‘replaces’ the Teubneriana, but it is now an excellent starting point and it certainly must be considered in any future discussion of Chariton’s text.

STEFAN TILG
University of Freiburg
Email: stefan.tilg@altphil.uni-freiburg.de

BENAISSA (A.) **Dionysius. The Epic Fragments.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. Pp. xiii + 352. £90. 9781107178977.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426922000520](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000520)

Amin Benaissa has produced a superb critical edition with translation and commentary of the fragments of Dionysius. An epic poet of uncertain date (post-AD 79 is tentatively suggested), Dionysius authored the *Bassarica* (the Bassarids were a group of Bacchae who sided with Dionysus in the war against Deriades), and the *Gigantias*, concerning a gigantomachy and its prehistory, apparently centring on Heracles’ role in the war between the Dorian king Aigimios and the Lapiths.

The book contains a rich and informative introduction, where Benaissa examines in painstaking detail the ancient reception of Dionysius (1–13), the relationship of the *Bassarica* with Nonnus’ *Dionysiaca* (13–31), the literary background of the legend of Dionysus in India (31–50), Dionysius’ language and characteristics of its epic style (50–58), metrics (58–75) and manuscripts (75–80). The fragments of the *Bassarica* come with a full-scale commentary (147–224), whereas those of the *Gigantias*, which are preserved in a much more mutilated state, appear with shorter explanatory notes in a long appendix (225–89).

A new edition of the fragments of Dionysius was made necessary by the publication in 2011 by Benaissa himself of a novel fragment, *P.Oxy.* 5103, which was reunited with a previously unattributed fragment written in the same hand from the Oxyrhynchus collection, *P.Oxy.* 2818. The discovery gave us 30 more lines of Dionysius, which are absent from the previous editions by Livrea (Rome 1973) and Heitsch (Göttingen 1963²). The new Oxyrhynchus fragments are now added to a corpus already featuring two papyri, one from the British Library (*P.Lond. Lit.* 40) and one from the Oxford collection (*P.Oxy.* 2815). These are republished here in a much-ameliorated form.

Benaissa’s re-edition of the papyrus fragments (nos 33–41) contains both a papyrological and a critical apparatus, including suggestions by authorities in the field such as W.B. Henry and G.B. D’Alessio. Benaissa provides a greatly improved text, based on a fresh examination of the papyri, particularly *P.Lond. Lit.* 40. He deserves praise for deciphering segments of papyrus text which must have seemed unintelligible to previous editors (and indeed appeared as such to me in the online image of the British Library website). Preparatory work on *P.Lond. Lit.* 40, including numerous notable new readings, was previously published by Benaissa in a 2013 article (*P.Lond. Lit.* 40 revisited: new readings in Dionysius’ *Bassarica*, *APF* 59.2, 280–97), but there are further important improvements here, most of which are decisive and some of which remarkable: see, for example, 33^v.45–46, where a syntactically difficult passage is normalized thanks to a minor correction by Henry.

Nearly all of the non-papyrus fragments of the *Bassarica* (1–32) come from Stephanus of Byzantium and feature verses or contextual information from books III, IV and XIV. Most come in fact from Book III, which contained catalogues of the allies of Dionysus from the Sicilian, Cyprian, Lydian, Phrygian, Macedonian and Thracian contingents (frs 1–10), and those of Deriades (12–28*). Several of these are marked as doubtful and are notably absent from previous editions (frs 4, 8, 21, 24, 32). Criteria for their inclusion seem sensible, for