

Ginelli, F. and Lupi, F. (edd.) 2021. *The Continuity of Classical Literature Through Fragmentary Traditions*. Trends in Classics Supplementary Volume 105. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter. Pp. x + 216. ISBN 978-3-11-070037-4. €92.95.

Fragmentology is going through a boom period. The last couple of decades have seen more new editions, publications, and conferences devoted to lost Greek and Roman literature than ever before. The latest fruit of all this exciting activity is the volume under review, part of the rapidly proliferating Trends in Classics Supplements series (which, I note, has already given us four other fragmentocentric volumes in as many years).¹ This major expansion of interest in what has often been regarded as an obscure or *recherché* subdiscipline of classical studies is hugely significant. It is now becoming more fully acknowledged that the extant texts which constitute the traditional canon are in fact a tiny and unrepresentative minority. If we are to comprehend the full range and scope of ancient literature, we need to take fragmentary and lost works seriously: they ought to be at the very heart of classical scholarship, not at its periphery. It is gratifying to see that fragments are increasingly becoming mainstream, and any new book that increases our understanding of this fascinating but frustrating body of material is to be welcomed.

Ginelli and Lupi have done a worthwhile job in assembling this volume, which consists of an introductory chapter followed by eight essays on various individual fragmentary texts, based on papers from the 2017 Celtic Conference in Classics at Montréal. It has to be admitted that the promising-sounding title is misleading: this book is not a comprehensive study of classical literature or fragmentary traditions as such, and it does not attempt to trace continuities between different texts or traditions in any sustained or synoptic sense. Like many collections of conference proceedings, it has a distinctly miscellaneous feel to it. A better (or, at least, more accurately descriptive) title would have been *Assorted Papers on Selected Methodological Questions Relating to Critical Editions of Fragmentary Texts*. At several points the editors or individual contributors refer to their own work as participating in a shared, ongoing ‘debate’ about the study of fragments; it is a shame that the reader is not given a more clearly articulated sense of this debate –

¹ Lamari, A., Montanari, F., and Novokhatko, A. (edd.) 2020. *Fragmentation in Ancient Greek Drama* (TinC Suppl. 84); Karamanou, I. 2019. *Refiguring Tragedy: Studies on Plays Preserved in Fragments and Their Reception* (TinC Suppl. 80); Tsagalis, C. 2017. *Poetry in Fragments* (TinC Suppl. 50); Tsagalis, C. 2017. *Early Greek Epic Fragments I* (TinC Suppl. 47).

perhaps in the form of some connections or cross references between the separate chapters, or a more explicit focus on disagreements and differences of opinion. But despite a certain lack of overall coherence, the book is full of interest and variety, and the chapters, all of which are worth reading, work well as a series of free-standing discussions: they are quite different from one another in terms of their primary material and approach, but each one of them combines meticulous scholarship with a clear central focus.

Stefano Vecchiato ('Marginalia to Hesiodic fragments: a possible dis-attribution (Fr. 41 M.-W.), a possible attribution (Fr. 327 M.-W.), and some recently (re-)discovered fragments', pp. 19-36) discusses questions of attribution relating to a couple of Hesiodic fragments (fr. 41 and 327 M-W). Francesco Lupi ('To belong or not to belong: a few remarks on the lyric fragments of Sophocles' *Tereus*', pp. 37-56) raises similar questions about certain lyric fragments of Sophocles' *Tereus*, and inquires into the nature of the sources and methods employed by the ancient writers who quote these fragments. Chiara Meccariello ('"Well begun is half done"? Uses and misuses of incipits in Greek Antiquity and beyond', pp. 57-78) discusses ancient uses of the incipit or ἀρχή as a naming or identifying device in various types of text, and re-examines three well-known examples of Euripidean tragedies (Archelaus, Meleager, and Rhesus) for which, puzzlingly, more than one incipit was recorded in antiquity. Roberta Berardi ('Collecting fragments for a fragmentary literary genre: the case of Greek Hellenistic oratory', pp. 79-102) describes, stage by stage, the working methods that she proposes to adopt when assembling a new edition of the fragments of Hellenistic oratory. Francesco Ginelli ('The new Nepos: prolegomena toward a renumbering of Cornelius Nepos' fragments', pp. 103-20) proposes the reordering and renumbering of the fragments of Cornelius Nepos, and offers a comparison and critique of existing editions. Jarrett T. Welsh ('The fifth glossary of Nonius Marcellus', pp. 121-43) discusses the scholarly methods and sources of Nonius Marcellus, and makes an important distinction between those quotations excerpted from complete texts by Nonius himself and quotations taken (as ready-made 'fragments') from intermediate sources. Nereida Villagra ('Mythographus Homericus, ἱστορίαι and fragmentary mythographers: a case study on Phineus and the Argonauts', pp. 145-64) attempts to pin down the shadowy figure of the 'Mythographus Homericus' (whose existence and name are nowhere directly attested) on the basis of papyri and scholia which can plausibly be taken as drawing on this mysterious lost source. Giulio Iovine ('The unruly fragments: old problems and new perspectives in Latin Military papyri from Dura-Europos (PDura 56, 64, 72, 74, 76, 89, 113)', pp. 165-92) undertakes a detailed re-examination of Latin military papyri from Dura-Europos, based on high-resolution digital images, and provides a new text incorporating several improvements on previous

editions; Iovine's chapter is illustrated with more than twenty images of the papyri, some of which show, rather unsettlingly, that a single fragment can yield two completely different (but equally plausible) readings if rotated by 180 degrees.

The editors in their Introduction state that 'the ultimate goal of this book has been to convene a discussion group on some of the most relevant issues that fragmentologists have to face' (p. 2). As it turns out, the issues under discussion here are almost exclusively of a practical and methodological nature, relating to the editing, arrangement, and presentation of critical editions. Nevertheless, the contributors do occasionally hint at issues of a broader conceptual type relating to questions of interpretation. At various points throughout the book a number of significant or suggestive issues of this sort are raised *en passant*, with tantalizing brevity, but not fully developed. I would have liked to read more about (for instance) the metaphorical comparison of the job of fragmentologists to that of airline pilots (p. 3); or the exact criteria to be adopted when determining 'various degrees of uncertainty' (p. 5); or the concept of 'refunctionalization' (the idea, mentioned on p. 8, that the act of quotation can transform the meaning of a fragment); or the assertion that 'one should not scrutinize fragments as absolute entities' (p. 10 – but is any extant text an 'absolute entity?'); or the consequences that may result from the renaming of the indirect tradition as 'la tradizione mediata' (pp. 53-54); or the extent to which an editor should impose his or her own personality on fragmentary texts (pp. 105-6); or the variety of types of 'dialogue' that can exist between book fragments and their contexts of survival in quoting texts (p. 124); or the practical, interpretative or ontological differences between 'literary' and 'non-literary' papyri (p. 166).

The main focus of the editors and other contributors is really concentrated upon a single fundamental question: what should a critical edition of a fragmentary text look like? At various times throughout the last few centuries, fragment-hunters have responded to this question in very different ways, with the result that there is much less uniformity among editions of fragments than among editions of complete texts. If we decide to examine different modern editions side by side (e.g. *FRHist*, *TGF*, *PMG*, *FGrH*, *DK*), or to compare and contrast contemporary editorial habits with those of earlier generations of scholars, we will find substantial variations in practice. Editors all have their own views about the purpose of an edition, what to include or exclude, exactly how to define the categories of 'fragment' and 'testimonium' (and how to deal with any overlap between the two), what order and arrangement to adopt, how to present the material visually on the page, how much material to place in the 'main' text and how much to relegate to the apparatus, and so on. Perhaps inevitably, no overall consen-

sus on these matters is reached in this book, though all the authors are united by a wish for maximum clarity and transparency in future editions.

Underlying all these discussions, though never fully articulated, is an even more fundamental question about the function, purpose, and readership of fragmentary editions – or, more radically, a debate about whether the traditional medium of the printed book is adequate for material of this type. It is clear that many different types of individuals read (or consult) fragments, for a variety of different purposes. It seems to me that any printed edition is bound to be unsatisfactory for some of its users. Once the editorial choices have been made, and the text and apparatus (in whatever configuration) are typeset, printed, and fixed forever on the page, this material cannot easily be reconfigured or reconceptualized. Many of the issues and problems raised in these chapters could be tackled more effectively by interactive digital editions, since these would have a much greater flexibility and functionality than any printed book. None of the authors here explores the potential of online editions or databases of fragments, but I suggest that this would be a good theme for the next conference of fragmentologists in due course.

Matthew Wright
University of Exeter