

de Sorano (por ejemplo, en Must. 2.6 Rose < Sor. *gyn.* 3.32.7 Ilberg). De este modo, lo que ha quedado omitido, por el motivo que sea, en la redacción La no es la secuencia εἶθ' ὄσπερον, como interpreta Gómez Costoya (p. 87), sino más bien la mención de la lejía como ingrediente de un remedio, que sí aparece en la redacción Aa (*et post haec lexiua, et sic postea diaforeticis uteris emplastris* [pp. 86 y 497]).

Este tipo de detalles no empaña, sin embargo, la gran valía de esta edición con la que la autora, sin duda desde un trabajo minucioso y arduo, proporciona un instrumento utilísimo para el estudio de los textos médicos latinos.

MARÍA TERESA SANTAMARÍA HERNÁNDEZ
 Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha
 teresa.santamaria@uclm.es

STEPHAN RENKER, *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna, Posthomerica 13*, Bamberger Studien zu Literatur, Kultur und Medien 29, Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press, 2020, pp. 348, ISBN 978-3-86309-739-4.

Another commentary on Quintus of Smyrna's *Posthomerica* is to be welcomed, especially in the case of this new study of Book 13. It is surprising that this section of Quintus' epic has been overlooked in favour of commentaries on other portions of the text, given its popular subject matter, namely the events of the fateful night of Troy's fall. The only books of the *Posthomerica* left without modern commentary are 3, 4, 6, 8 and 11. In addition, we already have the excellent, composite commentary of Francis Vian's Budé edition (*Quintus de Smyrne: La Suite d'Homère*, 1963-1969) in French, which still offers the most authoritative version of the text.

R.'s commentary is undoubtedly of the more traditional type. It carefully goes through every line of the text and lists every item of rare vocabulary, itemises the numbers of instances of adjectives, phrases and *formulae* in Quintus in comparison (for the most part) with Homeric practice, and cites, where relevant, the most recent scholarship on key scenes. He prefaces his commentary with a short introduction (surprisingly meagre — only eight pages in length), in which is given a very concise summary of Quintus' dating, the nature of the composition of the *Posthomerica* and the most recent scholarship on the poem. No new insights are offered, and no methodology for the commentary is given (little, for example, is glimpsed of the author's own understanding of the nature of allusion in Quintus, aside from his acknowledging the poet as a *poeta doctus*, and nothing is written on the possible sources and the generic building blocks most evident in the poem). What is most disappointing for such a lengthy commentary is the complete lack of account of the manuscript transmission; in fact, R. does not even tell the reader whose edition he follows (the commentary, despite its attention to

detail, offers no discussion of textual-critical matters, aside from very occasional acknowledgement of conjectures for *lacunae*).

One then must question what the target audience for this book is, given it does not provide the reader with the Greek text for Book 13. At a mere 563 lines in length, only a little space was needed to accommodate it. A lengthy and full bibliography can be found at the end of the volume, but no index; this latter aspect reduces drastically the usefulness of this publication.

The commentary itself is exhaustive in its attention to linguistic detail. One, again, must ask how useful the approach of this type of commentary is in our digital age. To give one example from the beginning of the commentary, which itself is very illustrative of the nature of R.'s approach: he comments on ἐδόρπεον (line 1). He tells us it occurs five times in Quintus and gives the line references. He gives two examples from Homer, and states that in both authors the meaning is 'to have dinner'. This is hardly a startling conclusion or a useful piece of exegesis, but one could easily search the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* were one wishing to discover the frequency of occurrence of this verb in Quintus or in other epic poets. This descriptive approach of the commentary is its chief characteristic, and rarely does R. engage in proper literary criticism, or even comment interpretatively on linguistic choices or intertextual parallels. One of the most marked features of Quintus' epic is his tendency to deploy similes frequently, and often they add a great deal of meaning to the main narrative. R. defers from making his own evaluation of them by quoting the views of secondary literature instead (see for example his discussion of the important fire simile at 488-92). Similarly, in discussion of an unusual but vital section of the narrative, where Menelaus feigns to kill Helen (403-5), he relates the views of two other scholars who have discussed the passage (Ursula Gärtner in her 2010 translation and Tine Scheijnen in her 2018 monograph on heroism) for why Quintus inserts this detail, but does not state which view he finds most plausible. Rarely is the reader met with R.'s own interpretation, but is left instead with an uncritical summary of others' findings.

One must be hesitant in being overly critical in a review of a work which displays a thoroughness of research and detail, especially when that work has as its subject a still under-appreciated poem. Scholars working on Quintus' depiction of the fall of Troy will find in this commentary a useful synthesis of the current state of knowledge on Book 13, and information about the use by Quintus of Homeric (and post-Homeric) epic vocabulary.

CALUM A. MACIVER
University of Edinburgh
Calum.Maciver@ed.ac.uk