

raggiunto il suo obiettivo, ovvero sia “[...] aver gettato più luce su come la poesia epica d’età flavia abbia recepito il suo [di Omero] *altissimo canto*”⁶ (p. 336), nonché “[...] aggiungere qualche tassello sulla cronologia relativa fra i tre poemi in esame (ancora incerta specialmente tra *Tebaide e Punica*)” (p. 14).

BARUCH MARTÍNEZ ZEPEDA
 Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
 baruch.martinez@hotmail.com

GIANLUIGI TOMASSI, *Luciano di Samosata, La nave o Le preghiere*, Introduzione, traduzione e commento, *Texte und Kommentare* 61, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020, 366 pp., €129,95, ISBN 978-3-11-065314-4

The book to be reviewed here is a new commentary on one of the most lively pieces of Lucian of Samosata, his dialogue “The Ship or The Wishes”.¹ The author, a younger Italian scholar, who has already published a number of important items on Lucian,² has produced a substantial volume: 366 pages for 15 pages of Greek text – but one may say that Lucian’s witty dialogue really deserves them.

The extensive introduction (pp. 1–70) starts with a section on “content and structure” (p. 1–5³), followed by a discussion on when to date this dialogue (p. 5–7). According to Tomassi, “la datazione del dialogo è abbastanza sicura [...] intorno alla metà degli anni ’60 del II secolo” (p. 7), but this may be too confident;⁴ in my opinion there is no evidence to exclude that *Navigium* may have been written also later, e.g. in the 170s. The quite ample third section (p. 8–19) is a kind of excursus, devoted to “Il *Bis accusatus* e la poetica di Luciano”. Following some intriguing statements by “the Syrian”, Lucian’s mouthpiece in *Bis Accusatus* (“The Double Indictment”, ch. 32), Tomassi somewhat misleadingly asserts (p. 9) that until the age of forty Lucian had exercised the profession of an “itinerant sophist”, but then distanced himself from the world of rhetorical declamation and switched to writing serio-comic dialogues – again, this may be too credulously taking “the Syrian” at his word,⁵ because Lucian never really stopped being a rhetorical

⁶ La citazione di C. è di Dante, *Inf.*, IV 95.

¹ The last substantial commentary on this text was published half a century ago by Geneviève Husson: *Lucien, Le Navire ou les Souhais*, 2 vols., Paris 1970.

² The most important of them is his 2011 commentary on Lucian’s “Timon”.

³ In note 3 (p. 2), Tomassi rightly rejects Anderson’s (Some notes on Lucian’s *Navigium*, *Mnemosyne* 30, 1977, [363–8] 363–4) attempt to find structural analogies between Lucian’s dialogue and books 7–9 of Plato’s “Republic”.

⁴ Too confidently dated seem also the various stages of Lucian’s life, as they are described on p. 6.

⁵ For contradictory statements of Lucianic mouthpieces concerning their relationship to philosophy and rhetoric at a certain age see e.g. Nesselrath, *ANRW II* 36.5 (1992), 3456–7”.

performer within the cultural parameters of the Second Sophistic (as Tomassi himself acknowledges on p. 10), but combined rhetoric and (both philosophical and comical) dialogue to produce some of his best work.⁶ In the fourth section,⁷ Tomassi returns to *Navigium* and considers its place within the literary tradition (p. 20–30), surveying its relationship to a number of literary genres: he starts with comedy (p. 20–1),⁸ continues with satire (p. 21–4) – a section in which he tries to show that there are “numerosi ... paralleli” between Lucian’s *Navigium* and the *Satyrical* (especially the *Cena Trimalchionis*) of Petronius⁹ –, Plato (p. 24–5), popular philosophy and diatribe (p. 25–8),¹⁰ the *Characters* of Theophrastus,¹¹ as well as epic, tragedy and historiography (p. 29–30).¹²

The next section discusses “La nave e la realtà contemporanea” (p. 31–40). It begins with a look at Athens’ harbour Piraeus, which is the setting of the first part of Lucian’s dialogue. Why Tomassi here refers to the mighty fortifications of the harbour in classical times, is not clear;¹³ moreover his mention of their destruction by the Spartans “nel 403 a.C.” and their reconstruction “alla fine della guerra del Peloponneso” (p. 31) is inexact: the destruction of the walls took place immediately after Athens had capitulated to Lysander in 404 BCE (see Xen. Hell. 2.2.23), and their reconstruction was undertaken about ten years after the end of the Peloponnesian War (see Xen. Hell. 4.8.9–10). Tomassi then discusses the mighty Egyptian grain ship (named “Isis”) in Piraeus that at the dialogue’s beginning arouses the admiration of Lycinus and his companions, and its voyage from Egypt to Athens (p. 33–9). Again, however, he commits an error by mentioning “il doppiaggio del capo Malea” by the ship: had the “Isis” really passed Malea, she would never have gotten to Piraeus.¹⁴ As for the ship itself, Tomassi leaves it open

⁶ On p. 18, Tomassi correctly states that Lucian never experienced a „conversione alla filosofia”, as some earlier scholars mistakenly believed (enumerated in n. 58).

⁷ At the beginning of this section, he somewhat contradictorily asserts that Lucian, on the one hand, “non è un innovatore”, but that, on the other, he produced “creazioni originali” (p. 20).

⁸ I am not sure whether Tomassi’s characterization of Timolaus as “il tipico *senex libidinosus* della commedia” (p. 21) really hits the spot, because to be sexually attractive to both younger men and women is only one of Timolaus’ many desires; on the other hand, Tomassi rightly rejects Graham Anderson’s thesis that the opening sequence of *Navigium* is indebted to a lost comic model (ibid.).

⁹ I have to confess that the “parallels” Tomassi adduces for this (p. 23–4) do not convince me.

¹⁰ In this section, Tomassi provides a long list “dei principali temi diatribici sfruttati da Luciano” (p. 26), but the quotes he adduces from *Navigium* do not always match the description of these themes.

¹¹ Though Tomassi himself is rightly sceptical about detecting “un’ influenza diretta” of the *Characters* on Lucian, he nevertheless enumerates some instances of possible (but to my mind, not always convincing) parallels between the *Characters* and *Navigium*.

¹² Interesting here are the parallels he enumerates between *Navigium* and Arrian’s *Anabasis* (though we can probably not exclude that Lucian might also have read earlier histories of Alexander the Great).

¹³ Lucian’s dialogue does not mention them, and the dialogue takes place in Lucian’s own time, as do all the Lycinus dialogues.

¹⁴ In ch. 9 it is quite clearly stated that the ship would have had to pass Malea, but did not do so, having instead been blown off its original course and been driven to Piraeus.

whether such an impressive ship could really have existed, calling its description “una delle migliori e più affascinanti *ekphraseis* lucianee” (p. 39).

After a shorter section discussing some further “riferimenti alla realtà contemporanea” (p. 39) in the dialogue, Tomassi concentrates on “I protagonisti del dialogo” (p. 40–58). His discovery of “una certa dose di cinismo” (p. 41) in Lycinus’ three companions Adimantus, Samippus and Timolaus is not very convincing: Adimantus wants to shut out rich people from his estates (ch. 22), but this is no mark of Cynicism but of simple vindictiveness; and a similar vindictiveness is exhibited by Samippus and Timolaus when they fantasize about decapitating the vanquished enemy king (ch. 37) or about splitting the skulls of one’s adversaries (ch. 44), respectively. Interestingly, Tomassi also discovers traits of contemporary historical figures in three of the four dialogue speakers (p. 42): according to this assumption, Adimantus is supposed to resemble the super-rich Herodes Atticus, the would-be conqueror Samippus the emperor Lucius Verus, and Lycinus of course Lucian himself (no contemporary match is presented for Timolaus). Now it is fairly clear that Lycinus is meant to be a persona for the author himself;¹⁵ but the other identifications might be more questionable: Adimantus may have some traits resembling “al tipico benefattore e filantropo di una città dell’Impero romano del II secolo” (p. 43), of which Herodes Atticus was one of the most prominent examples; on the other hand, Herodes was not a “nouveau riche” in the way that Adimantus in some respects seems to be (for this see p. 22). Tomassi detects some vague external signs of a philosopher in him (he walks barefoot, ch. 1, and his hair is close-cropped, ch. 10, which is a Stoic kind of hairstyle), but rightly recognizes that this is not enough to make a philosopher out of Adimantus. Still, Tomassi believes that Lycinus’ companions in this dialogue harbour certain philosophical pretensions, and even thinks that in this respect Lucian might have wanted to characterize them as a kind of would-be philosophers in the way he may have regarded Dio of Prusa and Favorinus (p. 44), but this, in my opinion, is rather too speculative. As for Lycinus, Tomassi thinks that he does not have “a posizione privilegiata che ricopre in altri dialoghi” (p. 46), but this is contestable: after the introductory section of the dialogue, Lycinus wins every argument against his companions, destroying each of their fantasies with a ruthless analysis of their weaknesses. Tomassi himself regards Lycinus as the main spokesman of Lucianic satire, which “non prevede controfferte alle illusioni umane, non propone soluzioni [...] Luciano [...] non ha nulla da offrire agli uomini, se non una filosofia del buon senso” (p. 48) – but isn’t that already something? The Lycinus of *Navigium* is quite comparable to the Lycinus of *Hermotimus* (of which dialogue Tomassi makes no mention here); there Lycinus, too, liberates a fellow human being from false illusions (and, unlike Lycinus’ companions in *Navigium*, Hermotimus gratefully acknowledges this

¹⁵ See now also H.-G. Nesselrath, *Lukian von Samosata. Der Weg eines Syrers ins Römische Reich und in die europäische Geisteswelt*, Baden-Baden 2024, 60–2.

in the end). Tomassi's subsequent portrait of Samippus (p. 48–54) may be too positive: he regards Samippus' desired exploits as “fondati non sulla fortuna, ma sulla sua virtù” (p. 49) – but Samippus actually wants to begin his career as a chief of bandits (ch. 28), and for his following ascent to the position of king and conqueror he will in fact need lots of good fortune! Tomassi rightly stresses the numerous parallels of Samippus' imperial dream with the career of Alexander the Great – but to regard Samippus' dream as “un divertito omaggio” (p. 51) vis-à-vis the *Anabasis* of Arrian may go too far; in Lucian's time Alexander's tale was surely well-known and even a stock feature of rhetorical education, so that it might be too hazardous to pin down Lucian's Alexander-like Samippus on just one literary model. Besides Alexander, however, Tomassi wants to see yet another historical figure represented (in a distorted way) by Samippus, namely Lucius Verus (see above), and he even goes so far as to correlate certain events of Verus' Parthian War with the dating of Lucian's *Navigium*. Here, however, we get perilously close to creating a vicious circle, postulating that certain events of that Parthian War *must* have *closely* preceded Lucian's writing down of *Navigium* (p. 53), but this argument is far from compelling – some of these events may indeed have found their way into Lucian's fictional (re)construction, but why not many more years afterwards than Tomassi cares to consider? Finally, in the portrait of Timolaus, Tomassi stresses two traits that may seem questionable: Timolaus the old man and Timolaus the negative foil of Menippus (as depicted in Lucian's *Icaromenippus*). It is true that Lycinus calls Timolaus a γέρων ἀνὴρ (ch. 45), but the main reason for that may be to stress the contrast to his “childish” fantasies; otherwise there is not much that suggests that Timolaus is someone of advanced age. And as common traits connecting Menippus and Timolaus Tomassi stresses their desire for “l'esplorazione del cielo e la soddisfazione delle curiosità scientifiche della terra” and that both “hanno il desiderio di apparire come dèi” (p. 57); but this can hardly be claimed for Menippus, and Timolaus' manifold curiosities can hardly be characterized as “scientific”.

The next extended section concerns the literary aspects of the dialogue (“Esecuzione, stilo e lingua del dialogo”, p. 58–67). A first subsection discusses “La tecnica drammatica di Luciano” (p. 58–61) and here mainly the problem how an oral rendering of the dialogue by just one speaker could sufficiently clearly convey the development of talk and action to an audience. The next subsection concerns the style of the dialogue (p. 61–6) and the means by which Lucian achieves liveliness and spontaneity, covering also the range of “espedienti umoristici” (p. 63) Lucian employs and describing (quite interestingly) how the syntax seems to be adapted to convey a certain image of the various interlocutors (p. 64–6). A shorter subsection on Lucian's language mainly reproduces the numbers of Chabert's monograph of 1897, “L'atticisme de Lucien”. There seems, however, to be a certain measure of confusion here: according to Chabert (as cited by Tomassi), 1230 words of Lucian's overall vocabulary of 10400 words are non-classical and more than half of them (i.e. something like 650) are hapax

legomena. But then Tomassi goes on to say that there is a third section of Lucian's own words that he calls "i termini 'propri' del vocabolario di Luciano" (p. 66) – but should we not count the aforementioned hapax legomena among them, as they are obviously used by none other than Lucian and thus are "termini 'propri'" of him? The subsection ends with the enumeration of such hapax legomena and of words used by Lucian with an unusual meaning in *Navigium*.¹⁶

The introduction concludes with a „Nota testuale“ (p. 67–70) which presents a list of 26 passages in which Tomassi's Greek text of *Navigium* differs from that of Macleod. The majority of Tomassi's choices can be accepted; in some cases, however, questions remain. In ch. 11, he opts for the reading κενή τις ἔννοια (Kilburn: "an empty notion"; Tomassi himself translates "un'idea sciocca") of the codices recentiores, while the veteres offer καινή instead, which sounds more positive and can indeed be defended: it is Adimantus himself who is speaking here, and why should he devalue his own fanciful idea as "empty" or "sciocca"?¹⁷ In ch. 14, Tomassi follows Dindorf's deletion of καί after καθεδούμεθα, judging it "ridondante" (p. 165), but this is not the case, if we assume that Lycinus' sentence remains uncompleted because Adimantus interrupts him (as already Macleod observed, the deletion of καί "non opus est si loquens interpellatur"). In ch. 15, Tomassi opts for the form ἐδύνατο, claiming that Lucian prefers it to ἠδύνατο (p. 173); but if we look at the whole of Lucian's known works, we see ἐδυν- in 35 passages and ἠδυν- in eight. While this latter number is clearly smaller, it is not small enough to justify the opinion that Lucian only used ἐδυν-; he probably used both (and did not care very much for absolute consistency). Here in Nav. 15, our most important manuscript (Γ) has ἠδύνατο (ipse legi), so we should keep this form.¹⁸ In ch. 16, Tomassi follows Fritzsche's conjecture ἐκάστω (which, it seems, was anticipated by Γa), but ἕκαστος (to be found in Γ originally and in other manuscripts) is clearly the lectio difficilior here and should therefore be retained.¹⁹ In ch. 19, Tomassi prefers to read εἰ θέλεις with the codices recentiores, but again there is no compelling reason why we should not keep the εἰ θέλοις of the veteres. Tomassi again prefers the recentiores' ὑπῆρξεν to the veteres' ὑπῆρχεν in ch. 24, claiming that shortly afterwards Lucian also uses the aorist ἐκέλευσα (p. 210); he does not consider that in the first case Adimantus speaks of repetitive gifts (for which the imperfect tense is better suited than the aorist), which he does not in the second. In ch. 31, Tomassi opts (once again) for the recentiores' συμπαῶσι, but

¹⁶ It might still be debated, however, whether ἀρχή in ch. 34 also belongs to these words. Here and in his comment on ch. 34, Tomassi states that ἀρχή is used in the meaning of "capital city", but he cites no parallels for this use.

¹⁷ In his following words, Adimantus concedes that his sudden fancy might seem "childish" to the others (μειρακιῶδες ὑμῖν δόξει τὸ φρόντισμα), but that does not necessarily mean that he thinks so himself.

¹⁸ On p. 173 Tomassi wrongly claims that ἠδύνατο in this passage is found only in the recentiores.

¹⁹ On p. 174, Tomassi quotes this sentence with ἕκαστος, which he also translates (p. 81): "ciascuno di noi [...] chieda pure [...]".

the veteres indicate a lacuna of at least eight or nine letters after συμπαρ – it would therefore be more prudent to keep the lacuna in the text and cite some proposals that have been made (e.g. Macleod’s συμπαρτάσσονται or συμπαριππεύωσι) in the apparatus or commentary. In ch. 38, Tomassi wants to read αἰ (connected with πόλεις), but the older manuscripts have οἰ, which is clearly a lectio difficilior (with οἰ meaning – as Tomassi himself correctly acknowledges on p. 257 – the inhabitants of the πόλεις). One additional passage (in ch. 39), in which Tomassi differs from Macleod (reading ἐκστάδιος of a more recent manuscript instead of Γ’s ἐκστάδιος, for which see Macleod, *Glotta* 1980, 259) has been omitted from the list (and, judging from his comment on p. 258, Tomassi does not even seem to be aware that he is differing from Macleod’s text here).

On p. 72–101, the Greek text of *Navigium* and Tomassi’s Italian translation follow on facing pages. In some places, corrections of the translation should be considered. In ch. 9 Tomassi translates τοῦ Νηρέως ἡλικιώτην with “compagno di Nereo”, but ἡλικιώτης means “contemporary of” or “as old as” (as Kilburn translates) which jokingly exaggerates the age of the helmsman of the “Isis” (who had already in ch. 6 been called γέρον). In the next chapter, speaker assignments in the translation differ markedly from those in the Greek text: in the Greek text Lycinus only raises the question ἀλλὰ τί τοῦτο; οὐκ Ἀδείμαντος ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν; and Timolaus answers in the affirmative (Πάνυ μὲν οὖν, Ἀδείμαντος αὐτός) and then raises his voice calling Adimantus (ἐκβοήσωμεν οὖν. Ἀδείμαντε, σέ φημι [...] τὸν Στρομβίχου), after which Lycinus resumes, stating that Adimantus must either be wroth with his friends or gone deaf; in the translation, Lycinus answers his own question (Πάνυ μὲν οὖν, Ἀδείμαντος αὐτός), and Timolaus exhorts his companions to call him, does so himself and then also states the two possible reasons (cited above), why Adimantus doesn’t seem to hear. Tomassi nowhere gives a reason why he altered the speakers’ assignments, nor seems there to be any reason for it. In ch. 15, Adimantus’ words ἀποπλευσοῦμαι πάλιν ἐπὶ τῆς νεώς are rendered too inexactly by “tornerò a bordo della mia nave” (cf. Kilburn: “I’ll [...] sail away again on my ship”), and in Lycinus’ answer Tomassi omits καί (καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπιστάντες: “noi resteremmo”, while Kilburn translates “We’ll stay too”). In ch. 16, the words παρ’ αὐτῷ γὰρ ἐκάστῳ τὸ μέτρον τῆς εὐχῆς are rendered much too freely with “Che ognuno sviluppi la sua preghiera a suo piacimento” (cf. Kilburn: “each one may decide the measure of his wish”). In ch. 21, Tomassi has overlooked the δέ in εἰ δὲ μὴ σιωπήσῃ and connected this conditional clause with the preceding words (“e i letti d’oro, se non starai zitto”), while in fact it belongs to the following phrase (καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτούς), cf. Kilburn: “and, if you don’t keep quiet, my servants as well”. In ch. 24, Tomassi has confused τοσοῦτος and τοιοῦτος, translating ἀργύρω τοσοῦτω with “un’ argenteria simile” (cf. Kilburn: “so much silver”). And why translate, in ch. 27, εὖ οἶδα with “sai bene” (Kilburn: “I’m sure”)? Quite inexact is the rendering (in ch. 38) of the phrase αἰ ἄν ὑβρίσωσιν τι ἐς τὴν ἀρχὴν with “se proveranno a fare offesa alla mia autorità” (cf. Kilburn: “(how many cities) that have been insolent to my empire”); just as inexact is the

translation of ὃ θαυμασιώτατε βασιλέων (ch. 39) with “mio re dei re” (Kilburn: “most glorious majesty”) or τινες τῶν ἔξω τῆς ἀρχῆς (ibid.) with “una nazione straniera”. In ch. 42, Tomassi translates μυρίοι with “diecimila” (repeated in his commentary on p. 271), but for this the word would need to be accentuated μύριοι (Kilburn translates “thousands”). Quite inexact is also the rendering of δεήσει καὶ τὴν δεξιὰν συνεπιλαβεῖν in ch. 45 with “servirà anche l’aiuto della mano destra” (a bit less inexact Kilburn: “your right hand must take its share”; Fowler and Fowler: “the right hand must be forced into the service”); and finally, in ch. 46 the words ὁ συκοφαντῶν τοὺς ἄλλους are rendered much too innocuously by “che critichi chiunque altro” (Kilburn: “you who cavil against everybody else”).

There follows the most substantial part of the book, the commentary itself (p. 103-298). It contains a treasure-trove of valuable information, but here, too, I may be permitted to point out some omissions or corrections. On p. 124, one would have liked to read a bit more about the rare verb ἀποβουκολέω (used by Lucian not only here, but also Bis acc. 13). On p. 142, Tomassi mentions “l’ardito viaggio di Scintaro e dei suoi compagni oltre le Colonne d’Ercole” in “True Stories I” ch. 9, but there Scintharus meets (and soon after joins) the crew of the first-person narrator only in ch. 33. For his thesis that “Hermes e Zeus sono gli dèi ‘favoriti’ da Luciano” (p. 179), Tomassi might have cited F. Berdozzo, “Götter, Mythen, Philosophen: Lukian und die paganen Göttervorstellungen seiner Zeit”, Berlin 2011, 34–48 (for the prominence of Zeus in Lucian’s “Dialogues of the Gods”) and H.-G. Nesselrath, Vom kleinen Meisterdieb zum vielgeplagten Götterboten: Hermes in den Göttergesprächen Lukians, in: Chr. Schmitz (ed.), Mythos im Alltag – Alltag im Mythos. Die Banalität des Alltags in unterschiedlichen literarischen Verwendungskontexten, München 2010, 147–159. On p. 186, the correct name for the sea god into which the young Melicertes was transformed, would be (in Italian) “Palemone” (i.e. Palaemon), not “Polemone”. On p. 200, Tomassi claims “Il portiere è una presenza tipica delle case dei ricchi Romani”, but he can also be found already in Plato’s dialogue *Protagoras* (314c–e). On p. 206, a Euripides fragment (905 Kannicht) is still cited from the superseded edition of Nauck. While on p. 212 Tomassi sides with “la critica moderna” in rejecting a too close association of the dialogue figure of Lycinus with Lucian himself, he seems to have no problems (on p. 214) with accepting Jacques Schwartz’ highly questionable procedure of dating Lucian’s dialogues by means of the absence or presence of certain proverbs in their text. In his comment on the beginning of ch. 28, Tomassi apparently misunderstands what Samippus classifies as ἀδύνατον here (“L’iniziale critica al sogno di Adimanto, il cui possesso di una straordinaria imbarcazione è [...] bollato come ‘impossibile’”, p. 223): it is not Adimantus’ ship as such, but that an Arcadian landlubber like Samippus cannot show it to his compatriots (ἦν γε τοῖς πολίταις ἐπιδείξασθαι ἀδύνατον)! One should perhaps not classify Samippus’ first (rather criminal) exploits as “pirateria” (p. 225), because as a landlocked Arcadian he will have started with raids on land. On p. 226–228, Tomassi cites the famous dialogue (within the “Dialogues of the Dead”) between

Alexander the Great, Hannibal, Minos and Scipio four times as “12 [25]”, but these numbers should be reversed, as “25” is the number within the most recent editions (like that of Macleod) and “12” that of older editions. On p. 235, Tomassi claims that Kenchreae (one of the two ports of Corinth) was “situata a 7 km a sud-ovest di Corinto” – in reality it lay to the south-east of Corinth, because it was also “affacciata sul golfo Saronico”. On p. 247, a Greek noun, ἀποδειλία, meaning „vigliaccheria“ is presented that does not exist; the correct form would be ἀποδειλίασις (attested in Polybius and Plutarch). On p. 249, Tomassi wrongly asserts that Athena gave the olive tree to the Athenians “dopo la vittoria su Poseidone”, while according to the mythical story as reported in Apollodorus’ Bibliothekē (3.178-9 = 3.14.1; also cited by Tomassi!) Athena made the gift of this tree already *before* her competition with Poseidon for Athens was decided. On p. 255, Tomassi incorrectly claims that Lycinus “ironicamente dichiara che [...] Samippo sarà irrimediabilmente ferito” in his single combat against the enemy king (ch. 37) – but Lycinus says nothing about “irrimediabilmente”, and Samippus immediately afterwards declares that his τραῦμα is only ἐπιπόλαιον. On p. 256, Tomassi correctly renders the title εἷς στρατηγός (ch. 38) as “stratega unico” – one wonders why he did not also do so in his translation (where we find only “stratega”). In ch. 39, Tomassi notes that once more “Samippo si ispira alla biografia di Alessandro Magno” concerning “la cura straordinari<a> nell’allestire un banchetto” (p. 258) – but it is actually Lycinus (not Samippus) who talks of this banquet here! When talking about the representation of India and its inhabitants in Lucian’s works (on p. 277), it is rather strange that Tomassi makes no mention at all of the prolatia *Bacchus*, the setting of which is wholly located in India. Commenting on the ἀντίποδες people mentioned in ch. 44, Tomassi compares the end of “True Stories” book 2, where the first-person narrator suffers shipwreck “sul continente degli Antipodi” (p. 280) – but does he? One might rather think that with ἡπειρον [...] τὴν ἀντιπέρασ τῆ ὑφ’ ἡμῶν οἰκουμένη κειμένην (VH 2.47) Lucian means the continent on the opposite side of what we now call the Atlantic Ocean, because this continent was also his aim when he set out in VH 1.5 (there he wants μαθεῖν, τί τὸ τέλος ἐστὶν τοῦ ὠκεανοῦ καὶ τίνες οἱ πέραν κατοικοῦντες ἄνθρωποι), but this is not the region of the Antipodes. On p. 289–90, Tomassi wavers in his comment on the second but last sentence of ch. 45 between Cobet’s conjecture ἀπομούξας (which he also has in his text on p. 98) and the manuscripts’ reading ἀποξύσας, without making clear which he would prefer. Similarly, in ch. 46 he prints the second μετ’ ὀλίγον within square brackets as if deleted (as Bekker proposed), but translates it nevertheless, and also in his commentary on p. 292 he treats it as genuine text.

After the commentary we get a section with antique (and non-antique) illustrations of ships and seafaring (p. 299–318), an ample bibliography (p. 319–347), and “Indici”: of “nomi e [...] cose notevoli” (p. 349–355), of “termini greci” (p. 356–8) and of the principal quoted (and discussed) passages from ancient texts (p. 359–366).

Finally, let me note a few more mistakes that might impede a reader's understanding (I will not mention some further misprints, as they do not impair reading comprehension): on p. 6 n. 16, Tomassi calls Macleod's OCT text an "edizione critica con trad.", but there is no translation in OCT texts; on p. 12 n. 32, read "Ledergerber" instead of "-berger" (in the bibliography, the name is correctly spelled); p. 22 n. 67: "Meyer 1913" (= Ernst Meyer, *Der Emporkömmling: ein Beitrag zur antiken Ethologie*, Giessen 1913) is not in the bibliography. On p. 69, Tomassi attributes a conjecture (in ch. 29) to me, which was actually made by Rudolf Kassel (as I have made quite clear in *Gnomon* 62, 1990, 508). On p. 69 (and 236), Tomassi ascribes the conjecture of διαβάλωμεν (instead of the codices' διαλάβωμεν) to Fritzsche, but Fritzsche himself ascribes it to the French philologist François Guyet (of the 17th century). On p. 127, "Ippogigi" seems to be an error for "Ippogipi" (for Greek Ἰππόγυποι in Lucian's "True Stories" book 1, ch. 11). On p. 141, read σχιζόμενος instead of σχιμενος; on p. 156, ἐπεβίωσα (repeated on p. 162) should be changed into ἐβίωσα, on p. 158 "Dypilon" into "Dipylon". On p. 165-6 the passages in which a laughing Anacharsis is depicted by Lucian are wrongly given as "*Scyth.* 1, 9 e 39" – they are all to be found in the homonymous dialogue (*Anacharsis* 1, 9 and 39). In the sentence "Caronte non fa che 'versare con abbondante flusso' [...] versi omerici e indispono Caronte" (p. 174), the second "Caronte" must be changed to "Hermes" (Charon's interlocutor in the homonymous dialogue). On p. 180, the word δώτορ either has a wrong accent (if the vocative is meant – as in a number of Homeric passages –, it should be δῶτορ), or it should be changed into δῶτορ (nominative). On p. 183 "cura" in the quote from Varro's Menippean satires must be corrected to "curas". On p. 193, read "sollecitare" for "solleticare". On p. 196, read (as a reference to Oltramare's "Origines de la diatribe romaine") "p. 51, no. 34 [the number as fallen out] 'il faut fuir le luxe ...'". On p. 268 read "Tosi 1992" instead of "T. 1922". On p. 282, "Tomassi 2014" must be corrected to "Tomassi 2015".

Despite such corrigenda, Tomassi's commentary is a valuable tool for better understanding – and enjoying – one of Lucian's liveliest dialogues.

HEINZ-GÜNTHER NESSELRATH
Georg-August-Universität Göttingen
hnessel@gwdg.de