

puzzlingly assigns the siglum P, are not only by Petrus Sabinus, but in his hand (pp. 117, 162). Sabinus seems to have been the first humanist epigrapher who systematically collected Christian inscriptions (pp. 139, 144, 156) and had publication of his sylloge as the end in view (p. 113). As with Balbani, G. has carefully put together the material that allows us to see Sabinus as a scholar and a person; particularly important is the acknowledgement in a letter to Sabellicus (pp. 144–5) of his debt to Cyriac of Ancona and Giocondo (I do not think that Sabinus refers to loose signatures of the latter, *contra* p. 146). I cannot myself, however, see the slightest resemblance between the hand of Sabinus in Pl. XII and the page reproduced from Vat.lat. 6040 on Pl. XXII. The discussion of the relationship between the various MSS copies of the sylloge of Sabinus is also problematic (it would have been helpful on p. 149, for MS Chigi I V [not VI] 168 to have a reference forward to pp. 150–1; and at the top of p. 149, read 1565, not 1465). G. produces a charming picture of Sabinus, making repeated trips round the ruins of Rome, updating his sylloge, with MS Ottob.lat. 2015 representing the earliest recension. The reality is in my view different. Some of the differences between the MSS are trivial errors in copying, some are the result of there being slightly different ways of saying the same thing, depending on the habits of the copyist, for instance ‘de Valle’ or ‘Vallensis’. Since all the Vatican MSS are currently inaccessible, I have operated with the information given by G. I would regard the evidence in general as showing the Carpentras, Chigi and Venice MSS to be derived from the same exemplar, perhaps, but not necessarily, the autograph of Sabinus, with the Venice MS operating a partially successful attempt to separate the Christian from the non-Christian material. In the case of *CIL* VI, 22763, the Carpentras and Chigi MSS have, I think, tried to explicate a very compressed description of the relief on the stone and generated nonsense, which might suggest a shared intermediary between Sabinus and these two MSS; the Venice MS, on the other hand, has a perfectly intelligible account, which is presumably that of Sabinus. The account in the Florence MS looks like an attempt to restore intelligibility to that in the Carpentras MS; the rest of the evidence supports the notion of the descent of the Florence MS from the Carpentras MS. The Ottoboni MS is so ruthlessly abbreviated that it cannot in general be securely linked to any other; but the case of *CIL* VI, 9675, where Florence and Ottoboni have a distinctive location (pp. 175, 184), might link these two.

University College London

M.H. CRAWFORD
imagines.italicae@sas.ac.uk

DIELS (H.) *Griechische Philosophie. Vorlesungsmitschrift aus dem Wintersemester 1897/98*. Edited by Johannes Saltzwedel. Pp. xxii + 99, ills. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010. Paper, €24. ISBN: 978-3-515-09609-6.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10003227

Everybody interested in early Greek philosophy is familiar with the name of Hermann Diels (1848–1922) and his philological masterpiece ‘Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker’, which appeared in 1903 (edited in 1934 by Walter Kranz) and is still indispensable for any study of the Presocratics. But in spite of some specialised publications and a collection of papers compiled by Walter Burkert, rather little is known about his general perspective on the development of Greek philosophy. Consequently it is a pleasant surprise that notes of Diels’ lectures on Greek philosophy have come to light. In 1897/98 the future Egyptologist Friedrich Wilhelm von Bissing (1873–1956) attended Diels’ class in Berlin. His notes are concise and readable; apparently the writing is close to the spoken original. The manuscript came into the possession of Uvo Hölscher, probably via Karl Reinhardt, was lost, and has finally been edited by Johannes Saltzwedel, who found it in a second-hand bookshop. It is a neat irony that Diels’ thoughts about the history of Greek philosophy underwent a difficult tradition, rather like Theophrastus’ *Doxographi Graeci*.

The volume begins with an informative introduction by the Editor and closes with an index of names. S. has completed Diels’ suggestions for further reading and added the Diels–Kranz citations, Diels having used Ritter and Preller, *Historia Philosophiae Graecae* (7th ed., Gotha, 1888). In the lectures Diels draws a fascinating picture of Greek thought from Homer, Hesiod and the Orphics, via the Ionians, Pythagoreans, Heraclitus, Parmenides,

the Atomists, the Sophists, Socrates and Plato, to Aristotle. The manuscript ends somewhat abruptly with an interpretation of Aristotle's *πρώτη φιλοσοφία*; von Bissing missed the last lectures because he left for Egypt. After some remarks about the current situation of philosophy in a scientific age Diels moves *in medias res* to the origin of the word *φιλοσοφία*, suggesting that it was coined as a technical term by Socrates (p. 2). His emphasis lies on the sources and he begins with an appraisal of testimonia and questions of dating and biography before discussing theoretical features of each philosopher. These interpretations establish the intellectual context, and some are still illuminating.

Of course, some of his perspectives and metaphors are time-dependent nineteenth-century attitudes, like the idea, inspired by Herder and Hegel, of an organic structure: the first *φυσικοί* represent childhood, the Sophists are juvenile teens, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle are prime manhood, while the Stoics, Epicureans, and Cynics are the age of senility (p. 11). Moreover, to Diels the development of Greek thought is organised in schools, Xenophanes is Eleatic (pp. 29–30), even Heraclitus established a school (p. 36), and Plato fought competing Socratic schools (p. 74). But his scholarship and his theoretical judgement are impressive. His verdicts about philological reliability are interesting: John Philoponos (490–575), for example, ‘has a memory like a sieve’ and ‘the Christian is a swindler’ (p. 44), while his contemporary Simplicius is considered an ‘autonomous philosopher’ and ‘critical head’ (p. 9). His views on the Sophists are more balanced than one might expect: they are ‘antiquity’s journalists’ (p. 58) and had no *ἐπιστήμη*, only *τέχνη*, but Nietzsche showed their significance and we are not in a position to chastise them (p. 59). Diels, though a Philhellene, does not match the current cliché of nineteenth century chauvinistic Graecomaniacs. I recommend this rich and enlightening book.

Berlin Institute of Technology

HELMUT HEIT
helmut.heit@tu-berlin.de

BUTTERFIELD (D.), STRAY (C.) (edd.) *A.E. Housman. Classical Scholar*. Pp. x + 288, ill. London: Duckworth, 2009. Cased, £50, US\$80. ISBN: 978-0-715-63808-8.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10003239

We have here a splendid 150th birthday volume. Just the book classicists needed. I do believe that Housman himself would have been pleased. He is difficult for classical scholars to commemorate. He is known first as a leading English lyric poet of the early twentieth century. Many of his poems have been set to music. His classical publications are familiar to a tiny minority of those who know his poetry. He purposely avoided the great authors; or better the authors he admired. Manilius or Lucan rather than Horace. His love for Horace or indeed Greek tragedy would have made the objectivity he considered essential for textual criticism impossible. I find this neither ‘strange’ nor ‘deplorable’ but rational and admirable. Contrast Kenney (p. 256). Several of Wilamowitz’ conjectures have been judged ‘better than Aeschylus’; perhaps many of Housman’s may be ‘better than Manilius’. How many alive today are competent judges of Manilius? Further, his homosexuality complicates matters. In 2010 it is a scandal that we are denied discussion of the most troublesome part of the man. The English regularly sweep the most troublesome and hence most interesting aspect of his personal life under the carpet. His lover, Moses Jackson, is excluded, and the book dealing with the problem is not to be found (p. 266) in the ‘comprehensive’ bibliography: add C. Efrati, *The Road of Danger, Guilt, and Shame: the Lonely Way of A.E. Housman* (2002). What we need is an uncensored edition of the correspondence with Moses Jackson, which is rumoured still to exist. Fourteen authors, all but four English, provide contributions, grouped under three headings, ‘Housman the Scholar’; ‘Housman’s Scholarly Environment’ and ‘Housman’s Legacy’. I have only gratitude and praise for the two Editors, the remarkable Latinist D. Butterfield, and the prolific, informed and enormously readable C. Stray.

I think I can best serve readers by listing the contributions followed by author’s name. They cover in order of placement within the volume: ‘Housman and Propertius’ (S.J. Heyworth); ‘Housman’s Manilius’ (E. Courtney); ‘Housman’s Juvenal’ (R.G.M. Nisbet); ‘Housman, Lucan and Fraenkel’ (S.P. Oakley); ‘Housman and Ovid’s *Ibis*’ (G.D. Williams); ‘Housman on Metre and Prosody’ (D.J. Butterfield); ‘Dust and Fudge: Manuscripts in Housman’s Generation’ (M.D. Reeve); ‘Housman and R.C. Jebb: Intellectual Styles and the

The Classical Review vol. 61 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2011; all rights reserved