

narrative, in which, as in the shorter poems before it, he expresses his complete devotion to the Trinity.

The changes made by the Editors to the text, which often, but not always, depend on the readings of Laur. Plut. VII. 10 (L) sometimes with the support of other MSS and the Syriac Version (Syr. [B]), where it exists, tend to restore readings rejected by previous editors for doctrinal or other reasons. Hence, line 183b is retained, having been suspected of possibly too Neoplatonist and Gnostic a leaning, though orthodox in expression, and the order of 187–91, changed elsewhere to follow the order of these events in the O.T., is restored. In 400, Syr (B) confirms the ungrammatical *ἰλήκοις λόγων* of the MSS for the Editors, a construction not found elsewhere, even in Gregory (cf. *PG* 37. 514.9, of doubtful authorship), who also keep *τοῦ μὴ λαθεῖν τοῖς ὕστερον* as the original text in 1352. In 461, Par.gr.2875's reading *ψυχρά* (not *ψυχαί* of L) is kept with Syr (B). Two lines, not found in the MSS, are inserted from the *Doctrina Patrum*: 611b clarifies the grammatical transition between 610 and 611; 651b 'of very probable authenticity', and perfectly orthodox, could have been omitted through its possible links with Nestorianism in the eyes of others. The replacement of *πολυπόδων* by *μιμούμενοι* in 710 (L) is appropriate, for Gregory elsewhere uses one of these comparisons at a time, not both together. *Σπανῶν* (L with two others, 1285) fits well in place of *σπλάγχνων* of the rest for explaining the Spanish Emperor, Theodosius', adherence to the Trinity.

The translations of II.1.1 and 11, with their full and helpful notes, give robust, yet sensitive and accurate, portrayals of these unflinching self-portraits, warts and all, of the great and revered Theologian.

University of Edinburgh

JENNIFER NIMMO SMITH
j.nimmosmith@ed.ac.uk

NONNUS' PENTHEUS

SIMON (B.) (ed.) *Nonnos de Panopolis: Les Dionysiaques. Tome XVI. Chants XLIV–XLVI*. (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé.) Pp. xii + 263. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2004. Paper, €46. ISBN: 2-251-00521-8.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X05000442

This volume represents the third to last in a monumental, two-decade-spanning edition of Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* (D.) under the magisterial direction of Professor Francis Vian: still awaited are vols. 12 (D. bks 35–6) and 15 (bks 41–3). Vian himself finished off the numerically final Volume 18 (Book 48) in 2003.¹ Here in Volume 16, Bernadette Simon in every way maintains the high level of scholarship displayed in previous volumes. She adds an excellent new edition, translation and commentary on Nonnus' own Pentheid, the self-contained tragic epyllion of Dionysus' frenzied arrival at Thebes in Books 44 to 46. Highlights of this Nonnian Pentheid are Dionysus' Orphic conversation with Selene–Hecate–Persephone in Book 44 (lines 191–257), Pentheus' debate with Teiresias (and the latter's interstitial, learned digression on the

¹CR reviews of previous volumes include the following: Martin West in *CR* 28:8–10, 36:210–11, 42:19–20, 45:434–5; Neil Hopkinson in 45:14–15; Adrian Hollis in 47:414–15; and Mary Whitby in 48:480 and 50:419–21.

Tyrsean pirates) in Book 45 (96–215), Agave's graphic dismembering of her son and its aftermath in Book 46 (209–309), and, throughout, Nonnus' accomplished interweaving of Euripides' *Bacchae* (pp. 130–2; e.g. 46.116–27).

In editing the text, S. diverges from the standard edition of Rudolf Keydell (Berlin, 1959) only very occasionally, and none of these changes represents a controversial disagreement. A few examples will suffice: ἐλέλιζε for ἐλέλιξε at 44.9; no lacuna at 44.31–2; line 44.99 after 44.97 instead of 44.96; καταστάζουσα (the Laurentian reading) over καταγάζουσα at 45.281.

In her commentary S. provides a wealth of philological and mythical information. Her work would not have found any parallel elsewhere were it not for Francesco Tissoni's (T.) recent Italian commentary on these very books (Florence, 1998). S. rightly does not forswear T.'s help but considers him a dialogue partner, measuring his (more adventurous) textual conjectures against her own opinions and those of earlier editors. As noted, she usually comes down on the side of Keydell, but the combination of T.'s book (his dissertation) and S.'s commentary means that we now enjoy the unexpected privilege of multiple access points into this magnificently erudite version of Pentheus' downfall. (We also now have the further benefit of an Italian translation of Books 40–8 by Domenico Accorinti (Milan, 2004), of which S. makes use in her commentary.)

In the normal style of this series, the text and translation of each book are preceded by a 'Notice' which takes account of the main argument of the book and, in this case, its relationship to Euripides. Notes at the foot of the translation mainly comprise explanations of names and epithets, though it is unclear at times why some points make it on to the page (such as the occasional highlighting of chiasmus: e.g. 44.312, 45.215, 46.94) and some are relegated to the commentary (such as the intriguing discussion of the thyrsus as an emblem: p. 161, on line 44.57).

One of the more delightful aspects of the book is S.'s careful attention to internal allusions within Nonnus' Pentheid. This literary technique is especially apparent between the portentous dream of Agave at 44.46–80 and the death of Pentheus and its aftermath at 46.106–238. S. provides a helpful table of allusions (p. 13) and comments: 'Le goût de Nonnos pour les prédictions, brèves ou longues, lui fait annoncer la tragédie de Penthée par un de ces songes prémonitoires qui jalonnent le poème' (p. 12). She notes that this technique is common among Euripides' successors (p. 12 n. 4), but it could be said with equal justification that it corresponds to a late antique taste for blatant foreshadowing, seen for example in the contemporary prose *Life and Miracles of Thekla* (*Life* 9.75–80, 13.53–9, ed. G. Dagron). While S. is clearly not unaware of the fifth-century A.D. resonance of the *Dionysiaca*, she takes pains to separate herself from T.'s argument that Dionysus is for Nonnus a *figura Christi* (pp. 133–4; cf. G.W. Bowersock *Hellenism in Late Antiquity*, Chapter 4). She prefers a traditional position that favours Nonnus' debt to Euripides and the Hellenistic poets over parallels with his *Paraphrase of John*.

As has been written several times before in *CR* reviews of this series, the volumes of the Budé *Dionysiaca* are a benchmark for accessible (if meticulous) scholarship and add tremendously to our understanding of later epic. S., Vian and the other editors should continue to be commended for their hard work. The combination of this series and the ongoing Italian edition of Nonnus' *Paraphrase*, overseen by Enrico Livrea, provides an unprecedented opportunity for new research on one of the most prolific and audacious Greek poets of antiquity.

Harvard University

SCOTT JOHNSON
sfjohns@fas.harvard.edu