

– in der Schilderung von Herakles' exzessivem Wasserkonsum (Verse 1447-1449), nachdem dieser mit seinem Fuß eine Quelle aus einem Felsen gehauen hat, eine witzig-ironische Anspielung auf die gegensätzlichen Typen des *Hercules Stoicus* (der in seiner Enthaltsamkeit nur Wasser und keinen Wein trinkt) und des *Hercules comicus* (der in seiner Gier zu viel trinkt) – eine Auffassung, die sich m.E. durch das bereits in der Antike bekannte medizinische Phänomen der Wasservergiftung, deren Symptome paradoxerweise denen eines Alkoholrausches ähnlich sein können (vgl. Diod. 3.17.5), stützen lässt.<sup>6</sup> Doch sollen hier nicht allfällige Versäumnisse des Kommentars moniert werden – im Gegenteil, dessen weit über den Durchschnitt hinausgehende Qualität, Vollständigkeit und Gelehrsamkeit können eigentlich nicht genug gepriesen werden. Dass die Apolloniosforschung von Stürners Analyse und Kommentierung der Libyenepisode noch viele Jahrzehnte zehren wird, steht außer Frage; dass die Asien- und die Europaepisode wohl noch lange auf eine ähnlich umfassende Aufarbeitung werden warten müssen, ist zu befürchten. Wie gesagt: Es gibt immer was zu tun!

SILVIO BÄR  
 Universitetet i Oslo  
 silvio.baer@ifikk.uio.no

JOHANNA ASTRID MICHELS, *Agenorid Myth in the Bibliotheca of Pseudo-Apollodorus. A Philological Commentary of Bibl. III.1-56 and a Study into the Composition and Organization of the Handbook*, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 402, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2023, xii+897 pp., €194.95, ISBN 978-3-11-060279-1.

Much more than a commentary on a single section of the *Library*, Joanna Michels's volume is probably the most important book on the work of Apollodorus.<sup>1</sup> The lengthy introduction that precedes the commentary offers the most comprehensive overview of the *Library* yet written, and is essential reading not only for those interested in the mythography of the Imperial age, but for anyone who needs to use the *Library* to study a mythical tale or variant.

<sup>6</sup> Vgl. dazu meine Ausführungen in meiner Monographie *Herakles im griechischen Epos: Studien zur Narrativität und Poetizität eines Helden*, Stuttgart 2018, S. 89.

<sup>1</sup> Michels consistently uses the traditional designation of Ps.-Apollodorus to distinguish the author of the *Library* from the famous Athenian grammarian. Following Robert Fowler's remarks (*Early Greek Mythography. II*, 384), it would perhaps be more correct to use the term 'Apollodorus Mythographus' since, as Michels herself acknowledges, there is no reason to suspect that the attribution of the *Library* is erroneous, while Apollodorus was a fairly common name in the ancient world.

After an initial short section on the author (pp. 15-19), the audience, and the historical and social context of the work (pp. 20-6), in which Michels essentially confines herself to collecting and reporting the findings of recent studies in these fields, the bulk of the introduction is devoted first to the textual transmission, with a careful analysis of the *Library*'s witnesses (pp. 27-81), and then to the study of its structure (pp. 82-100), its possible relationships with models, direct and indirect sources, and with other texts of the same type (pp. 101-295). In these sections, Michels offers an impressive contribution that marks a significant step forward in our understanding of the *Library*.

The deep analysis of the *Library*'s manuscript tradition shows the need for a new edition that takes into account the results of Michels's important research. In addition to pointing out a number of inaccuracies in the most recent edition, published by Papatthomopoulos, Michels presents two new witnesses that enrich the manuscript tradition of the *Library*. She recognises for the first time the value of Poliziano's commentary on Ovid's *Fasti* (Monacensis lat. 754 fols. 11-132rv) as a primary witness for the passages of the *Library* corresponding to the missing folios of *Parisinus* gr. 2722 (R), and offers the first published description of a recently discovered epitome of the *Library*, consisting of a large excerpt from the section devoted to the exploits of Heracles (2.74-126). At least three emendations and suggestions already proposed by previous editors are confirmed by the first witness, and the contribution of the new epitome is similarly valuable. Twice the epitome preserves a better text than our manuscripts and probably makes it possible to recover the name of a minor mythical character lost in the manuscript transmission of the *Library*.

Michels's long introductory section also has the merit of demonstrating the untenability of certain assumptions deeply rooted in the scholarship. The attribution to Tzetzes of the *Epitome Vaticana* – a series of extracts taken from throughout the *Library*, including the lost part – is rejected with arguments that are difficult to refute, as is the idea that the text transmitted by the manuscript tradition is a summary of a larger and more complete text. This last argument is found in one of the sections in which Michels most successfully combines her philological acumen with the latest perspectives in the study of Imperial mythography. Her analysis of the organisation of the *Library* identifies certain formulaic phrases, cross-references and transitional markers that reveal the role of the mythographer as an author who conceived an original arrangement of the mythological material derived from his sources. In this section, Michels makes it clear that the fact that the mythographer may not appear to be a good author does not mean that he was not an author at all.

The longest part of the introduction is devoted to source criticism and the *Library*'s relationship to other mythographic and erudite texts. This is a splendid example of source criticism, which shows how much work remains to be done in this area. Determining the channels through which the mythographer gained access to mythological material is a question of primary importance on which

studies have long focused almost exclusively. Although studies from the first half of the last century have already shown the many lost intermediate sources and the continuous contamination of heterogeneous material even within a single section of Apollodorus' text, it is still common to use the *Library* to reconstruct very ancient versions of a myth or to reconstruct the contents of lost works. Excessive optimism about the mythographer's possible direct access to classical sources was evident in certain French studies in the last decade of the last century, and strongly opposed by Marc Huys. Michels, who studied in Leuven in the same tradition inaugurated by Huys, displays a similar caution with regard to excessively direct readings of the *Library*. A good example is the long chapter devoted to the idea that the *Library* used as a source a corpus of *hypotheses* of Euripides' dramas. Michels examines with acuity and subtlety many passages that can be related to the content of tragic works, and shows the constant contamination of different materials that is interpreted as evidence of derivation from intermediate sources. Compared to Huys's approach, however, Michels's is more flexible, and the textual dependence on a mythographic handbook advocated by Huys, although accepted for many of the passages examined, is not the only channel of transmission considered here.

This extreme caution does not prevent Michels from recognising the influence, probably indirect, of certain texts from the Archaic and Classical ages. She acknowledges the influence of the *Catalogue* attributed to Hesiod, especially with regard to the first book of the *Library*, the work of Pherecydes and other traditions, including the Orphic tradition in the theogonic section, although in the latter case the arguments put forward by previous studies have proved very weak.

The commentary develops the various themes raised in the introduction by examining in detail the text of the section of the *Library* devoted to the Agenorid genealogy. This section covers the Cretan myths and the Thebans from Cadmus to the events of Oedipus. In this sense, Michels's work begins exactly where Anna Söder's study of the sources (*Quellenuntersuchung zum 1. Buch* – a book that Michels expressly admired and regarded as a model) ended. Exactly in line with this work, and unlike other commentaries on the *Library*, which, following Frazer's Loeb edition, are mainly interested in historical-religious and anthropological-cultural questions, Michels concentrates exclusively on textual and linguistic issues and on source criticism, although she sporadically provides bibliographical references to studies of a different nature.

The book is enriched by a very extensive bibliography, which reveals Michels's impressive attention to collecting and examining almost all of the corpus of studies that deal, even tangentially, with the *Library* and mythography. Her use of articles published in contexts that are difficult to locate, such as the proceedings of predoctoral encounters or papers presented at conferences that have not (yet) been published, is positively remarkable.

With this book, Michels reveals a profound knowledge of the *Library* and the many philological problems involved in its study. Her comprehensive presentation of the work and her commentary show how much work remains to

be done, starting with a new critical edition of the *Library*, and I am certain that Michels will continue to make great contributions to these tasks.

STEFANO ACERBO  
 Universidad Complutense de Madrid  
 sacerbo@ucm.es

MALCOLM DAVIES, *Lesser and Anonymous Fragments of Greek Lyric Poetry: a Commentary*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2021, 400 pp., £120.00, ISBN 978-0-19-886050-1.

Dieses Buch stellt einen ausführlichen philologischen Kommentar dar zu einer Galerie zahlreicher Dichter, die bereits im Titel als ‚kleiner‘ (*lesser*) eingestuft werden und denen bisher keine eingehende Analyse zuteil geworden ist. Das Wort *lesser* ist selbstverständlich keine Wertschätzung, sondern soll ausdrücken, dass die behandelten Dichter (1) weniger kanonisiert sind (Anonymität ist ein Extremfall dieses Außer-dem-Kanon-Stehens) und (2) eine Textüberlieferung haben, die in kürzere Fragmente zerfällt, deren Interpretation in vielen Fällen reichlich problematisch ist. Diese beiden Aspekte hängen letzten Endes zusammen, zumal der bruchstückhafte Überlieferungsstand von der Unter-Kanonisierung herrührt. Das zeitliche Spektrum ist entsprechend breit: von Eumelos (Ende des 8. Jhd.s v.Chr. [?]) über *carmina popularia necnon convivialia* (sog. ‚Skolia‘) bis hin zu einigen papyrologischen und epigraphischen („*lapidaria*“) Fragmenten.

Der Kommentar hat einen ausgeprägten *in-medias-res*-Charakter: Er beginnt mit einem bündigen Vorwort, das vor allem die Schranken und Begrenzungen des Buches erklärt, worauf nach einigen bibliographischen Angaben der Zeilenkommentar folgt. Der Schwerpunkt liegt fast immer auf philologischem Detail sehr technischer Natur. Dies ist definitiv kein Band für Anfänger zum Schnuppern, sondern ein enzyklopädisches Nachschlagewerk zu hochkomplizierten Texten. Das Buch eignet sich nicht zur kontinuierlichen Lektüre, was nicht zuletzt der Tatsache geschuldet ist, dass der Band keinen Originalwortlaut bzw. keine Übersetzung der Primärtexte enthält, was nach sich zieht, dass der Leser idealerweise Pages *Poetae Melici Graeci* zur Hand haben muss, um die Ausführungen nachvollziehen zu können. Eine besonders leserfreundliche Maßnahme besteht allerdings darin, dass vor dem Zeilenkommentar jeweils die wichtigste Fachliteratur vorausgeschickt wird.<sup>1</sup> Das Zitieren der Forschungsliteratur ist auch sonst sehr ausführlich, weitverzweigt und präzise – jeder kann sich als Orientierungshilfe darauf verlassen, will man

<sup>1</sup> Auf S. XII vermisste ich allerdings das Paian-Buch von S. Schröder, *Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian: eine kritische Untersuchung mit einem Ausblick auf Behandlung und Auffassung der lyrischen Gattungen bei den alexandrinischen Philologen* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 121), Stuttgart 1999.