

elaboración de lo que el autor define como una «ideología del ocio», en la búsqueda del equilibrio entre la acción política y su negación, contrastará con la actitud de un Demóstenes, defensor de la tranquilidad simple del ciudadano, tal como se apreciaba en el siglo precedente. Por otra parte, D. matiza muy bien la distinción entre los ideales de tranquilidad de las nuevas escuelas filosóficas (epicúreos y estoicos), con sus rasgos casi terapéuticos y de búsqueda de una especie de *vita contemplativa*, y el concepto más frecuente de aquélla como un ideal cívico, inseparable de la preocupación por la participación en la vida de la ciudad.

Este breve resumen no puede hacer resaltar de modo suficiente los notables matices y los prudentes razonamientos que D. aplica en la interpretación de los textos; quizá también deja expuesto con extensión similar lo que D. trata con amplitud y profundidad variables según los autores antiguos correspondientes (lógico, cuando se estudian unos 120). Pero todo ello lo podrá comprobar el lector de esta obra, cuya consulta se hace de todo punto recomendable para un amplio espectro de investigadores, incluso para cualquiera (no filólogo) que esté interesado por cuestiones de mentalidad social.

EMILIO SUÁREZ DE LA TORRE

N. Hopkinson, *A Hellenistic Anthology (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics)*. Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 288. Price not stated.

This Anthology, as indicated on the back of its cover, is intended for «undergraduates» It is unfortunately a very defective volume, which contains far too many errors of commission and omission for it to be of any use to the uninformed and inexperienced student. Dr. H. White, in her review of the book, just published in *Sicul. Gymn.* 1991, has performed a dutiful task, in that she has offered a list –incomplete, of course, but significant and instructive– of the mistakes committed by Dr. Hopkinson. Her verdict on the book is just as fully documented as it is severe: may it serve as a warning to would-be users of this Anthology. I shall now perform a duty parallel to the one carried out by Dr. White, namely I shall contribute a list of the errors of omission perpetrated by Hopkinson. My own list is, likewise, not complete: I only offer a sample.

Hopkinson is an Endymion *redivivus*: he appears to have awakened from a long sleep, during which he has remained totally ignorant of the results achieved by recent research. During the last decades, a preponderant role in research devoted to Hellenistic poetry has been played, as is internationally well known, by «l'École Londonienne» (Nachtergaele, *L'Antiq. Class.* 1985, p. 373), «quella scuola Londinese...che tanti meriti ha acquisito nelle indagini sulla poesia ellenistica» (Geymonat, *Riv. di Filol. e di Istruz. Class.* 1990, p. 207). Scholars of world-class calibre never tire of praising the method applied

in research by the London school as being «rigoureusement scientifique» (H. van Looy, *L'Antiq. Class.* 1986, p. 417), applaud «l'hécatombe» which such a method produces» (van Looy, *L'Antiq. Class.* 1989, p. 305) admire the «método riguroso» which enables members of the London school to harvest copious research results (Brioso, *Emerita* 1990, p. 164) and pay fulsome tribute to the «metodología di ricerca... esemplarmente applicata» by the «scuola Londinese» (Crimi, *Orpheus* 1988, p. 377). André Kurz has written that «la méthode de recherche» created and applied in the London school palpably represents «une belle leçon de méthodologie» (*Mus. Helv.* XL, 1983, fasc. 4). All this is too well known for me to have to insist upon it: indeed, a look at standard handbooks of research such as RE, s.v. *Apollonios Rhodios*, col. 49-52, or s.v. *Kallimachos*, col.225 ff. (both articles are by no less an authority than Herter) will adequately make my point. The Endymion-like Hopkinson does not even know that the London School exists, and such ignorance of his causes him to make mistake upon mistake.

P. 7 ff. The information Hopkinson gives on the nature of Hellenistic «arte allusiva» is hopeless. His readers are not told the paramount facts, which are the following. The London School has executed the task of «chiarire in modo definitivo, in una serie di studi, il concetto di *arte allusiva*» (Fedeli, *Mus. Phil. Lond.* III, 1978, p. 129-133: Fedeli's analysis is most informative in this respect); this is acknowledged universally (cf. e.g. M.A. Rossi, *Class. World* 1984, p.258, on *oppositio in imitando, imitatio cum variatione, Umkehrungen*, etc.; Crimi, *Orpheus* 1983, p. 476f., underlines that the «originale tipo di approccio metodologico» applied by the London school has clarified the «norme dell'arte allusiva»; E.J. Kenney, in the *Proceedings of the Classical Association* 1983, vol. LXXX, *Presidential Address*, goes as far as to say the «Professor Giangrande has taught us» what «arte allusiva» is; L.A. Llera - Fueyo, in *Act. del IX Simp. de la Secc. Catal. de la SEEC*, Barcelona 1991, p. 658, agrees with Kenney, by stating that «la técnica de la alusión» as practised in Hellenistic poetry is «sin embargo conocida» thanks to «algunos trabajos de C. Giangrande»). Of all this research work produced by the London school, Hopkinson, in his long sleep worthy of Endymion, has learned literally nothing, and unfortunately he transmits his ignorance to his hapless undergraduates, who will never recognize an *Umkehrung* or a case of *oppositio in imitando* when they meet one.

P. 22. Hopkinson does not know that the correct text in Callim., *Hymn.* V, 83 is ἐστᾶθη ᾧδ' ἄφθογγος, as I showed long ago. Why the said text is correct has been well explained by McLennan, *Class. Quart.* 1971, p. 425, and was fully understood by Meillier, *Rev. Et. Gr.* 1965, p. 320, note 10. Hopkinson's note on p.118 is worthless: he does not even know that (ἐστᾶθη) is proved to be sound «propter apertam Aeschyli imitationem», as Schneider emphasized, and that Buttman's conjecture ἐστᾶκη was invented by him for the wrong reason, as was shown by Lobeck and Schneider. I take this oppor-

tunity of adding, *en passant*, that Bulloch, in his note *ad loc.*, has not understood either McLennan or me: Bulloch does not know that asydeton is typical of Callimachus' style, and has not realized that the «metrical pattern» which Buttman's conjecture would introduce into Callimachus' line is never attested in Callimachus, whereas the metrical pattern of Hymn V, line 41 is attested in the manuscripts. In other words: Bulloch cannot distinguish between a conjecture and a manuscript reading. These two errors render Bulloch's note devoid of any foundation; other errors by Bulloch I shall illustrate elsewhere.

P. 27. Hopkinson knows absolutely nothing about Hellenistic metre, as was abundantly shown by Chryssafis (*Cor.Lond.* III, 1983, p. 17ff.). To the catalogue of Hopkinson's monstrosities in the field of Hellenistic metre offered by Chryssafis I should like to add one more howler: Hopkinson is ignorant of Hellenistic «Quantitätsausgleich»: he therefore mistakenly believes that ἦοι, in Callimachus Hymn I, 87 must be altered, just as he mistook an impeccable dactyl in Theocr. XXV, 62, illustrated by Chryssafis (νόω δέ τοι), for a «cretic» (*sic: Class. Rev.* 1983, XXXIII, p.131). On Hellenistic «Quantitätsausgleich» cf. my note in *Παρθνασσός* 1991, p.380 ff., where I refer to the article I have contributed to the *Festschrift* Gentili («*L'isocronia vocalica come fenomeno prosodico alessandrino*»).

P. 28. In Cleanthes' Hymn, line 4, the correct text is ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἔσμεν, ὄχου μίμημα λαχόντες, as I have shown in *L'Antiq. Class.* 1973, p. 181 ff. and in *Cor.Londin.* II, 1982, p. 95 ff. In line 6, the manuscript reading (ἀίδω (=ἀείδω) is correct, because Cleanthes employs *enallage temporum*. Whereas scholars have accepted my arguments (e.g. Crimi, in *Orpheus* 1984, p. 264 states that mine is a «felice correzione» of a «*locus corruptus*»), Hopkinson does not know my papers, and therefore makes many grave errors: not knowing what *enallage temporum* is, he changes arbitrarily the present ἀείδω into the future ἀείσω, and he introduces two conjectures (γενόμεσθα and θεοῦ), which are impossible for reasons explained in *Cor.Londin.* II, 1982, p. 96f. It may be added that the emendation ὄχου is further supported by theological arguments as well as by Plato, *Phaedr.* 246 d-247 b: the orbital «bewegung» of the soul, as a metaphorical chariot, is a «Platonische opvatting» which Cleanthes fully accepted (Verbeke, *Kleanthes van Assos*, p. 177, etc.). In sum: by changing one single letter I succeed in respecting palaeography, in saving the overt reference to Aratus and in obtaining a sense which is confirmed by Plato's as well as by Cleanthes' theology; Hopkinson changes violently no fewer than three words in one line and, for good measure, crudely destroys the reference to Aratus, plays havoc with palaeography, and creates a text which is theologically impossible (Zuntz. *Harv. Stud. in Class. Philol.* 1958, p. 293: «vor allem aber: λαχόντες kann nicht für wir sind stehen»).

P. 35 ff. Theocritus' Idyll II has been the object of a fundamental study by H. White (*Studies in Theocritus*, Amsterdam 1979, p. 17 ff.) which has thrown

copious and cogent light on the Idyll and on Theocritus' poetry in general: her results are conveniently summarized on p. 34 f. of her book. Hopkinson (p. 156 ff.) quotes bibliography concerning such things as «intertextuality», «home for lunch», etc.), and yet does not know White's book. His ignorance of the said book causes him to make a long series of errors. For instance, his ideas concerning the «structure» of the Idyll still rest on Gow's hypothesis, which Dr. White has demonstrated to be entirely arbitrary, insofar as it relies on most violent and contextually ungrounded transpositions of lines. It is widely known, internationally, that H. White and I have accurately focused the nature and features of Theocritus' humour (cf. e.g. Mastromarco, *Würz. Jarhb.* 1990, p. 98, note 38; Halperin, *Before Pastoral*, p. 230 ff., etc.; one of my essays on Theocritus' humour was recognized to be so weighty that I was asked to allow it to be reprinted in «*Theokrit und die Griech. Bukolik*», = «*Wege der Forschung*», Bd. 580, p. 36 ff.). Hopkinson knows nothing of all this, and consequently cannot explain to his readers even the most elementary characteristics of Theocritus' wit.

P. 45. The fragment of Phanocles has now been edited by K. Alexander (*A Stylistic Commentary on Phanocles and Related Texts*, Amsterdam 1988). Hopkinson does not know this excellent monograph, and consequently commits many blunders. Not only does he systematically miss cases of *oppositio in imitando*, *imitatio cum variatione*, *enallage*, etc. present in the elegy and well illustrated by Dr. Alexander; he does not know that ὑπῆν in line 11 is the *lectio difficilior*, he does not understand that the accusative Θρηκίην in line 12 is a typical feature of Hellenistic style, and he does not know what Φόρκου means in line 20. He posits a lacuna between lines 15-16 because he does not know the laws governing the structure of the epyllion (this point has been well shown by Dr. White, in her review of Hopkinson's Anthology). He thinks that there exists such a thing as «inceptive imperfect» (p.181): in reality, the imperfect ἔστιζον (line 25) is descriptive, as correctly shown by Dr. Alexander. The imperfect tense cannot by its very nature be inceptive or ingressive: it can be, as here in line 25, descriptive (cf. Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.*, commentary on line 1243). In sum: the reader of Hopkinson's Anthology will learn nothing of the textual, linguistic and *literaturgeschichtlich* problems connected with Phanocles' elegy, and will remain ignorant of all of them unless he reads Dr. Alexander's edition.

P. 56. In Moschus, *Europa*, line 127, the mss. reading κόλπου, which Hopkinson cannot understand, is sound, and means «chiton or robe», as H. White has elegantly shown (*Cor. Londin.* VI, 1990, p. 87. f.). In the same *Europa*, the mss. reading ἀγαλέοισι πόδεσσι at line 136, which Hopkinson is unable to comprehend, is perfectly sound, because it represents a case of *enallage adjectivi* (cf. my *Scr. Min. Alex* I, p. 48 ff.). In sum: Hopkinson is not acquainted either with *synecdoche* (cf. White, *Cor. Londin.* VI, 1990, p. 87 f.) or with *enallage adjectivi*.

P. 62. The fragment of Rhianus, as Hopkinson does not know, has been edited and commented upon by me in *Scr. Min. Alex.* I, p.35 ff. and p. 62 ff.

Not having read what I have written, Hopkinson defaces the text of the fragment at every step: to quote but a few examples, he does not understand that the readings ἀφραδέη (line 3), θαρσαλέως (line 6), ὑπερ αὐχένας ἴσχει (line 13) or κριόεντι (line 21) are sound. Saal did understand, in 1831, that κριόεντι is not an *Unwort*.

P. 64 f. Hopkinson does not know my paper «Interpretation of Herodás» (*Scr. Min. Alex.* II, p. 411). Consequently, he has not understood why the reading of the first hand in I, 2, ἀποικίης, is the correct one. The crucial point is that Metriche is waiting for a letter from her husband in Egypt, not for visiting peasants from a farm: from this it follows that, since ἀποικία can, in the mouth of mainland Greeks, mean precisely «Egypt», the reading ἀποικίης in I, 2, is sound, in that it denotes exactly the place where Metriche's husband was. Of course, since Egypt was full of Greek ἀποικίαι, «settlements» (listed by Launey and Préaux) it could well be that ἀποικίης, in I, 2 denotes the settlement (in Egypt) where Metriche's husband was. In either case, the criterion of *utrum in alterum*, together with the presence of Greek ἀποικίαι in Egypt and the contextual situation (Metriche's husband was in Egypt) show that the reading of the first hand, ἀποικίης, is the genuine one (as usual), whereas the reading of the second hand (ἀγοικίης) is (as is normally the case in the Herodas papyrus) a trivialization. Of all this, Hopkinson has understood nothing. The passage Herodas I, 15 f. (τὸ γὰρ γῆρας ἡμέας καθέλκει χῆ σκιῇ παρέστηκεν) merits a detailed illustration. For reasons well explained by Headlam, which have been correctly understood by Lloyd-Jones and Cunningham, ἡ σκ ἡ here cannot mean «the shadow of death», as Hopkinson now erroneously repeats. The Biblical phrase σκιά θανάτου denotes the σκότος, the darkness, the *umbra Erebi* in which Hades and the dead dwelling there were «enveloped» (Grimm-Thayer, *Lex. New Test.*, s.v. σκιά), and does not denote a shadow which exists on earth and «stands by» (παρέστηκεν) those who are alive on this earth, like Gyllis. Moreover, «das bloße σκιά» is never used «vom Todesschatten», as mistakenly stated in Bauer, *Wört. N.T.*, s.v. σκιά, because in Matth. 4, 16 we read σκιᾶ θανάτου.

Old Age is described by Callimachus, fr. I, 1, 32ff., by means of a mixed metaphor, as a weight which the poet would like to slough off: γῆρας... ἐκδύοιμι... βάρος κ.τ.λ. means «that I might slough off old age, this burden...»: transl. Wilkinson, in his edition (privately printed at King's College Cambridge) which Hopkinson closely follows. Lloyd-Jones and Cunningham have cleverly suggested that Herodas employs here, like Callimachus, a mixed metaphor (not a tautology, as Mandilaras very strangely writes in his commentary *ad loc.*) to denote Old Age, whereby γῆρας is envisaged as a weight (καθέλκει) and as a metaphorical shadow which, like her real shadow, stands by (παρέστηκεν) Gyllis (one's real shadow was proverbially ἀντίστοιχος and could not be discarded). In *Scr. Min. Alex.* II, p. 414 f. I have shown that there is no need to delete the article ἡ before σκιῇ, in Herodas' line, as Lloyd-Jones and Cunningham had seen themselves obliged to do. I should now like to add

that an alternative explanation of Herodas' passage is possible. In Greek, from Homer down to Byzantine times, *σκιά* can denote the «ghost», «Gespentst», appearing on earth, of a person who is dead and dwelling in Hades (e.g. Eur. fr. 532 *κατθανών... ἀνήρ... σκιά*). By a rhetorical exaggeration, however, one could say that an old person, not yet dead, was already his own ghost (Eur. fr. 509 *σκιὰ γήρων ἀνήρ*). Accordingly, Gyllis may here mean that her *γῆρας* is so advanced that her own (*ἡ σκιά*) is already standing by her (*παρόστηκεν*), ready to take over from her the role of appearing on earth when she goes down to Hades.

P. 70. The epigram by Leonidas (*A.P.VII*, 657) is obscene (cf. lastly H. White, in *Mus. Phil. Lond.* VII, 1986, p. 148, with bibliography). Hopkinson does not know this, and therefore crudely alters the mss. reading *ἐμβατέοντες* into *ἐμβοτέοντες*.

P.71. Anyte's epigram (*A.P.VII*, 202) contains numerous features typical of «arte allusiva» (cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.*I, p.223-225; D.Geoghegan, *Anyte*, p.111 ff.). Not one of these features is understood or explained by Hopkinson, who is unaware of the existence of Geoghegan's edition.

P. 74. The epigram by Callimachus (*A.P.XII*, 134) contains fundamental features relating to sympotic tradition: I have explained all of them in *Sympotic Literature and Epigram*, in *Entr. Hardt XIV*, 1969, p. 120 ff. Hopkinson, not having read my essay, is unable to understand any of the said features: he cannot understand what *θύσμου* means, or why mention of three toasts is made, or why *στομάτων* is the *lectio difficilior* (that *στομάτων* refers to the position of the *ὄποθυμῆς* has been correctly understood by Fedeli, *Properzio, Il Primo Libro delle Elegie*, p.124).

P. 74. The whole point of Meleager's epigram (*A.P.XII*, 132b) is that the poem constitutes one of the many examples of «monologo interiore», which contains innumerable Hellenistic *topoi* (cf. especially my paper «*Carácter de la poesía helenística*», *Anuario Est. Filol. Univ. Extremadura VII*, 1984 p.165 ff.; *Scr. Min. Alex.*I, p.229 ff.; *Atti Conv. Internaz. Stud. Properz.*, Assisi 1986, p.226, etc.). Hopkinson knows nothing either about the «monologo interiore», or about the said *topoi*.

P. 75 f. The epigram by Meleager (*A.P.V*, 152) has been analysed by me in *Scr. Min. Alex III*, p. 157 ff. In this paper, I discuss the text of the poem and illustrate its *pointe*. Hopkinson has understood neither the text (he sees himself compelled to accept an arbitrary conjecture by Pierson) nor the *pointe*: he cannot explain why the mosquito should be reward with Heracles' apparel.

P.76. Hopkinson has completely missed the point of *A.P. VII*, 196. Both locusts and cicadas were regarded by the ancients as musical insects (*Scr. Min. Alex.*III, p. 86): the music they emitted induced humans to sleep. Meleager, as is well know, was permanently (*ἀεί*) tormented by love (on this *topos*, unknown to Hopkinson, cf. *Atti Conv. Internaz. Stud. Properz.*, Assisi 1986, p. 258 f.): therefore, Meleager could find relief from his love-pangs only

when he was asleep. This is why he calls the locust (*A.P.* VII, 195, 1: *Scr. Min. Alex.* III, p. 157 f.) ἐμῶν ἀπάτημα πόθων, παραμύθιον ὕπνου; the poet insists on this point in lines 5-6 of the epigram. In the same manner, Meleager in *A.P.* VII, 196, 7ff. (cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.* II, p. 485) asks the cicada to sing him to sleep, so that he may escape the pangs of love which torment him when he is awake (line 7: ὄφρα φυγῶν τὸν ἔρωτα μεσημβρινὸν ὕπνων ἀγρεύσω). It is necessary to remember in this respect that the cicada (*Scr. Min. Alex.* II, p. 448) was φίλυπνος, because its song «induced sleep». Of all this, Hopkinson knows literally nothing, and therefore he misunderstands the epigram grotesquely: what gives to the poet temporary relief from the pangs of love is not that the cicada's song is «diverting» (Hopkinson: *sic*), but the fact that according to the ancient *topos*, the cicada's song lulled one to sleep.

P. 76 ff. Callimachus' epigram on the *nautilus* has been dealt with by me, in every possible detail, in *Scr. Min. Alex.* II, p. 409). Hopkinson is totally ignorant of the seven problems and of their solution.

P. 79. The epigram by Anyte (*A.P.* IX, 313) has been explained by me: line 1 is sound (cf. now Geoghegan, *op. cit.*, p. 151 f.); the epithet ὠραίου, in line 2, means «seasonal», and the pointedness of the said epithet has been indicated by me in *Scr. Min. Alex.* I, p. 224.

The epithet ὠραῖος, in Anyte's line, constitutes an elegant paradox: the adjective ὠραῖος denotes, in Greek, what is produced in its proper season: the water of the fountain, which the passers-by, in Anyte's epigram, drink in the summer, is not produced in the summer, which is the dry season, when it does not rain; nevertheless, Anyte can legitimately call the water of the said fountain ὠραῖος, «seasonal», because, as ancient writers on fountains, sources, etc. underlined, the water gushing out of sources throughout the year (i.e. including the summer) was ὠραῖον ὕδωρ (cf. e.g. Theophr. *Caus. Plant.* II, 2,1), that is to say, the rain water which had fallen in its proper season, namely the rainy season (autumn, winter). Paradoxes are typical of epigrammatic poetry.

P. 79. Hopkinson, not knowing what «*falsa anaphora*» is, accuses the unfortunate Philodemus of having written «awkward» poetry in *A.P.* «*falsa anaphora*», the word κῆμα means two entirely different things in respectively line 3 and line 5 of the poem (cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.* II, p. 333f.). Moreover, not content with accusing Philodemus of writing «awkward» poetry, Hopkinson, being ignorant of the fact that Philodemus is known to employ «Quantitätsausgleich», defaces the perfectly sound adjective γλυχύν (in line 6) into γλυχερήν.

P. 86. In Callimachus' epigram *A.P.* XII, 43, for reasons acoustic (ὕστεροφωνία, already explained by Götting, Hauvette and many others) and phonetic (cf. lastly *Scr. Min. Alex.* III, p. 19-20), after Callimachus has uttered καλός echo must repeat not ἄλλος, but κἄλλος; these reasons are fully confirmed by contextual evidence, according to which echo must reveal to Callima-

chus that κάλλος, i.e. «also another» (so e.g. Gow-Page), besides Callimachus, possesses Lysanies. Of all this (cf. lastly *Quad. Urbin.* 1990, p. 159 ff.) Hopkinson knows absolutely nothing, and he transmits his ignorance to his unfortunate reader, who, misled by Hopkinson's errors, is left wondering why echo is inexplicably inaccurate from the acoustic point of view, and why the epigram is devoid of a *pointe*.

P. 87. Hopkinson does not know that the «water imagery» and the «function of πόντος», which Williams did not sufficiently clarify in his commentary on Callimachus' Hymn to Apollo, have been elucidated by me in *Cor. Londin.* II, 1982, p. 57 ff. Of my detailed discussion of Callimachus' literary theories, which my paper offers, Hopkinson's reader will find *nec volam nec vestigium*, and consequently will be unable to understand what οὐδέ (the key word in line 106, which I have explained and which Hopkinson leaves unexplained) means in the mouth of Φθόνοσ, or what *syllipsis* is.

P. 95. Hopkinson is puzzled by ἔλλατε in Callim. Fr. I, 1, 17: he does not even know that Callimachus wrote the perfectly regular form ἔλλατε, in the line under discussion, as is proved by the scholion, and that ἔλλατε, in the said line, is the unfortunate «The Final Line in Callimachus' Hymn to Apollo», forthcoming in *Habis*.

P. 97 ff. Hopkinson does not know that the problem of the relationship between the «Reply to the Telchines» and the end of the Hymn to Apollo can be understood, as a «programmatic» manifesto, only by an analysis of Callim. *Egipr.* 21 Pf. I have studied the problem in every possible detail, in *Scr. Min. Alex.* I, p. 235 ff. This paper of mine was deemed to be so momentous that permission was asked for it to be reprinted in «Wege der Forschung», vol. 296, p. 319 ff. Hopkinson evidently never reads either the volumes of «Wege der Forschung», or «Hermes», where my paper originally appeared. The decisive point concerning Callimachus' *Poëtik* is of course the fact that his biological triumph over βασιανία becomes, through his precise and skilled argumentation (cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.* I, p. 251), proof of the literary validity of his poetry. Of all this, Hopkinson is totally nescient.

P. 98-101. It has long been known that I have devoted an «indagine altamente specialistica» (so Corsaro, in *Orpheus* III, 1, 1982 p. 149) to the influence exerted by Callimachus upon latin programmatic poetry (cf. e.g. Fedeli, in his commentary upon Propertius, Book, III, p. 169). As regards Propertius, the «Accademia Propeziana», significantly enough, invited me to study the problem in a specific paper (*Colloq. Prop. Secund.*, Assisi 1981), now reprinted in *Scr. Min. Alex.* II, p. 486 ff. and IV, p. 515 ff. Fedeli wrote that my «analisi degli influssi ellenistici» upon Latin poets is «fondamentale ed illuminante» (*Aufst. und Niederg. der röm. Welt* 33, 1983, p. 1873): Hopkinson knows simply nothing of what I have written on this topic, and offers a most faulty survey, which leaves his readers completely in the dark as far as the literary and historical factors are concerned. Hopkinson has not understood two capital points.

First. The «*recusatio*» (cf. Fedeli, in his commentary upon Propertius, Book III, *Index*, p. 783, s.v. *recusatio*) was, by its very nature, one single *topos*: therefore, merely to re-state it would have been monotonous. The Latin elegists, therefore, who, like their Hellenistic models, strove to be original, achieved originality by vying with each other in applying the canon of *imitatio cum variatione* towards Callimachus: on the witty introduction of Quirinus instead of Apollo cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.* II, p. 486; on *oppositio in imitando* by Ovid vis à vis Callimachus in his own literary programme, but employed by Ovid cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.* II, p. 488 f. («Ovidio finge ser recalitrante»), on «Selbstrionie» never used by Callimachus in his own literary programme, but employed by Ovid cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.* II, p. 488 f.; on Ovid pointedly replacing Apollo (the supreme authority in the field of poetry, according to Callimachus) by the all-powerful *Amor* cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.* II, p. 491; on the overt opposition between the consistent approach adopted by Callimachus and the change of mind suffered by the Latin elegists cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.* IV, p. 526.; on the introduction of the utilitarian purpose (inspired by Hermesianax, not by Callimachus) on the part of Ovid and Propertius cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.* IV, p. 528 ff. Hopkinson, in sum, still lives in the pre-Pasqualian era. Pasquali highlighted the need for an investigation of the literary techniques by means of which Latin poets transformed, according to the canons of *arte allusiva*, the apologetic element (cf. now, on this, *Scr. Min. Alex.* IV, p. 524 f.) contained in Callimachus' «programmgedichte», and adapted this element to their purposes of *recusatio*. The *desideratum* underlined by Pasquali has been, I believe, met by my research: by not having even a remote inkling of the existence of my publications Hopkinson precludes to his readers a whole chapter of *arte allusiva* at its best in Latin poetry. Second. Propertius, the most «programmatic» of the Latin poets, managed to declare his allegiance to Callimachus, and yet patently to belong not to the Callimachean school, but to the opposite school, i.e. the Meleagrian one (cf. lastly Mastromarco, *Würz. Jahrb.* 1990, p. 97, with footnote 35). Hopkinson has no knowledge of this complex literary «Programm» pursued by Propertius.

P. 123. Hopkinson does not know that the employment of Doric forms in Epic has been systematically investigated by me in *Scr. Min. Alex.* I, p. 65 ff. His ignorance of this is transmitted by him to his readers, who are left wondering why Callimachus should use Doric forms «occasionally». As the reader is lucidly told by McLennen in his commentary on Callim., *Hymn.* I, 4, where he quotes the results of my investigation, Doric forms were a compulsory ingredient of Epic poetry, in the eyes of the ancients, from Homer down to the *Carmina Sibyllina*. The existence of McLennen's outstanding commentary is unknown to Hopkinson.

P. 131. Hopkinson would like to «restore» (*sic*) the optative in Callim. *Hymn.* I, 93, because he mistakenly believes that  $\kappa\epsilon$  with the future indicative can only denote «what is likely to happen». He is, of course, utterly wrong:  $\kappa\epsilon$  with the future indicative can express not only «*probabilitatem*», but also

«*rei...dubiae notionem*» (cf. Ebeling, *Lex. Hom.*, I, p. 695): one such example of  $\kappa\epsilon$  with the future indicative, signifying, as it does in Callim. *Hymn.* I, 93, «*rei dubiae notionem*», is in Ap. Rh. II, 413 ff. (an interrogative sentence, as in Callim., *Hymn.* I, 93); cf. Wahlin, *De usu modor. ap. Ap. Rh.*, p. 43. McLennan, whose commentary on Callimachus, *Hymn.* I is unknown to Hopkinson, does not fail (p.130) to underline that the syntactical construction in point is attested «in Apollonius Rhodius»: Hopkinson knows neither Ebeling, nor Wahlin, nor McLennan, and inflicts upon his readers the result of his ignorance.

P. 182. On the «language» of Apollonius Rhodius, Hopkinson tells his readers nothing. Yet in the section «*Sprache*», in his already quoted article «*Apollonios Rhodios*» (RE) Herter finds it opportune to quote me with unparalleled frequency (from «*arte allusiva*» to «*Gebrauch der Adverbia*» form «*äv mit Ind. praes. und fut.*» to «*Dorismen*», from «*ω̄ beim Vokativ*» to «*das historische Präsens*»). My paper «*Aspects of Apollonius Rhodius' Language*» (*Scr. Min. Alex.* I, p. 289 ff.) in which I endeavour to outline the fundamental principles of Apollonius Rhodius' *Sprachgebrauch*, is not known to Hopkinson, who consequently leaves his readers in total darkness about the basic canons governing Apollonius' diction and style.

To sum up. Hopkinson has demonstrably failed to acquaint himself with the research work published during the last decades in the field of Hellenistic poetry. Consequently, he has not acquired the methodology necessary to comprehend textual problems in Hellenistic authors; and therefore cannot recognize, the *topos* and the literary features (*enallage adjectivi, enallage temporum, enallage modorum, Umkehrung*, etc.) employed by Hellenistic poets; he has no knowledge of the precise and numerous rules governing Hellenistic «*arte allusiva*». His Anthology will, in my view, cause great damage to undergraduates, by misleading them with unflinching regularity.

GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE

Vit Bubenik, *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a sociolinguistic area*, Currents Issues in Linguistic Theory 57, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam-Philadelphia 1989. XV-331 pp.

Como el propio B. hace notar en el prólogo de este libro, a las dimensiones diatópica y diacrónica que marcan la investigación lingüística en el campo del griego antiguo —que él mismo ya cultivó en su trabajo anterior *The Phonological Interpretation of Ancient Greek*, Toronto 1983—, hay que añadir una tercera para las épocas tardías (helenística y romana), la de los factores sociales que condicionan y determinan la evolución. Junto al análisis formal se hace necesario, por tanto, prestar atención a otras circunstancias de naturaleza distinta, como la expansión de las lenguas, fenómenos de bilingüismo y diglosia, etc., objeto de esa variedad de la lingüística que conocemos como sociolingüística. Es precisamente lo que B. trata de hacer con esta nueva obra suya.