

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Anderson, Graham (1993) The 'metamorphoses' of antoninus-liberalis - a translation with commentary - Celoria,F, Translator-commentator. Review of: The Metamorphoses of Antoninus Liberalis by Celoria, Francis. Classical Review, 43 (2). pp. 423-424. ISSN 0009-840X.

DOI

Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/20777/>

Document Version

Publisher pdf

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Francis Celoria: *The Metamorphoses of Antoninus Liberalis: a Translation with a Commentary*. Pp. x + 241. London and New York: Routledge, 1992. £35.

Graham Anderson

The Classical Review / Volume 43 / Issue 02 / October 1993, pp 423 - 424
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00288161, Published online: 16 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00288161

How to cite this article:

Graham Anderson (1993). The Classical Review, 43, pp 423-424 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00288161

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

In his elaborate Commentary H. aimed to present the Egyptian sources of Plutarch's work. There are basic inadequacies in this facet of his study: see my remarks in op. cit. 4–5 and also the strictures of Jean Hani in his *La Religion égyptienne dans la pensée de Plutarque* (Paris, 1976), 23. The enduring merit of H.'s Commentary rests on two other features: first, his mastery of the comparative literary material in Greek and Latin which formed a part of his excellent *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae* (1922–5); secondly, his authority in the field of the Greek magical papyri, where the two volumes of his *Griechisch-Ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber* (1921; 1924) retain their importance. The German publisher has done a good job of the re-issue. Although the format is smaller, the printed text is still clear and it is an obvious boon to have the two parts in one volume.

University of Wales, Swansea

J. GWYN GRIFFITHS

RICHARD J. DURLING (ed.): *Galenus Latinus II. Burgundio of Pisa's Translation of Galen's ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΕΠΟΝΘΩΤΩΝ ΤΟΠΩΝ 'De interioribus'*. (Ars Medica II Abteilung. Griechisch-Lateinische Medizin. Band 6/2 B.) Vol. 1, Introduction and Text. Pp. 1–178. Vol. 2, Critical Notes and Indices. Pp. 185–450. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1992. Paper, DM 178.

This is an edition of the Latin translation of Galen's *περὶ τῶν πεπονθῶτων τόπων*, *De Interioribus*, better known as the *De Locis Affectis*, done by Burgundio of Pisa in the twelfth century. Vol. 1 contains introductory essays and the Latin version. Vol. 2 contains not so much critical notes, as its title has it, as critical apparatuses and indices. One critical apparatus compares the Latin version with the Greek text, where we still have no modern edition and have therefore to rely on Kühn (Galen, *Opera Omnia*, Leipzig, 1821–33). A second apparatus gives variants as between the five manuscripts of Burgundio's translation. Of particular note are the section of the introduction devoted to Burgundio's scientific vocabulary, especially his neologisms, and the two indices that tabulate first Greek terms, giving Burgundio's Latin equivalent(s), and then the major Latin terms, with the Greek ones they are used to render. It will be for subsequent historians of medicine to make the best use of the scholarly tool that Durling has now provided.

Darwin College, Cambridge

G. E. R. LLOYD

FRANCIS CELORIA: *The Metamorphoses of Antoninus Liberalis: a Translation with a Commentary*. Pp. x + 241. London and New York: Routledge, 1992. £35.

This book comes as something of a surprise. Those scholars who use Antoninus Liberalis at all are resigned to doing so mainly to supply cross-references to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and its Hellenistic predecessors, in much the same way as one might refer to Parthenius when working on the Greek novel. Now we have a translation and keyed commentary (without Greek text) which invites general classicists and many others to approach Antoninus' collection as a whole. The result for many readers may be simultaneous fascination and incomprehension. Antoninus' summaries of stories are frustratingly short, and exhibit a sometimes monotonous frequency of offended gods, metamorphoses (notably into birds), and sometimes obscurely summarised local legends. But C. has done much to ease the reader into what to look for. He is well read in Greek bird lore, less inhibited than many classicists (including H. J. Rose) in linking myth and the standard folklore indexes, and good at pin-pointing the essential oddity of this or that individual narrative. And he is not ashamed to provide elementary information for those from other disciplines who will need it.

Occasionally one feels that some banal generalisation has usurped the place of an essential supporting reference: in particular the long introductory note on Typhon (Antoninus 28) could easily accommodate the reference to Nicander's commentator for the claim that Typhon's blood

was the source of biting animals; and it calls for fewer such remarks as 'the episodes (of Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*) are like a script for a film and a scatty one at that' (p. 181). One also strains in vain in the same discussion for a mention of the word 'volcano', which would help to explain a number of Typhon's cult-titles in the magical papyri; while Etna is alluded to almost casually (p. 180) without any hint of its possible significance. Again, one sometimes feels that a distinctly interesting detail has been passed over rather hastily: the awareness that 'Crete was the home of several robotic creatures' (p. 204) seems to go only halfway to realising that Cretan metalwork has acquired legendary status. And sometimes as in the case of Pandareus (36), C. senses the makings of a myth-complex but simply declines to pursue the matter. Occasionally too one feels that larger questions are not always fully signposted: one ought to find a more expansive discussion of why metamorphoses of such broadly similar sorts are so numerous in Greek mythology in the first place (though C.'s general introduction on Greek myth is enviably concise and open-minded, pp. 19–32). Ancient Near Eastern systems are known and alluded to by the author, but the threads could have been drawn together more effectively to provide additional perspective. Yet we must be grateful: it is thanks to C. in the first place that such questions will occur so readily in connexion with Antoninus read as a whole.

It is good to have so accessible a book to use alongside Papatthomopoulos' Budé Antoninus. It will also serve as a convenient casebook to which to apply Dowden's *The Uses of Mythology* and Forbes Irving's *Metamorphosis in Greek Myth*. But C.'s contribution still leaves one wondering about Antoninus himself: thanks to the work of this mythological magpie we have a very odd angle of approach to Greek myth. This is where to find not the golden fleece but the golden dog (36, 41), the genital problems of Minos (41) (and a possible reason why Pasiphae was tempted to look elsewhere); or for Helen as the mother of Iphigenia, only fostered by Clytemnestra (27). We are all the more frustrated to think of so many missing links and variants that must now be irretrievably lost.

University of Kent at Canterbury

GRAHAM ANDERSON

NICOLA PACE: *Ricerche sulla Traduzione di Rufino del De Principiis di Origene*. (Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Milano, 133.) Pp. xviii + 222. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1990. Paper, L. 50,700.

Origen's magnum opus, the *De Principiis*, is the work on which the negative judgements of posterity have most often been based, whether of those who attacked him as a heretic in the centuries after his death or of more recent theologians viewing him as more of a Platonist than a Christian. Yet we only possess this work in a Latin version by Rufinus completed at the height of the first Origenist controversy at the end of the fourth century. In addition there are two substantial Greek extracts from Books 3 and 4 in an anthology drawn from Origen's writings, the *Philocalia* of Basil of Caesarea and Gregory Nazianzen, and also a number of brief quotations intended to demonstrate Origen's heresy in Jerome's Letter to Avitus (in Latin) and in the Letter of the Emperor Justinian to Menas. Rufinus was the most productive of the translators who made available Greek patristic writings to the Latin West and the question of his reliability has often been discussed. Certain characteristics are generally apparent—that Rufinus translates the sense rather than the words, aims at rhetorical effect and clarity for his Latin readers, and works at speed, but in some respects the problems are different for each work. *De Principiis*, the most difficult and controversial of the writings he tackled, was one of his earliest translations, aimed at conveying his own admiration for Origen to Latin readers, but carried out in the face of fierce hostility. His preface to Book 1 mentions his expectation of attacks and his intention of using material from other works of Origen to correct the statements about the Trinity and to clarify obscure points, that to Book 3 makes clear that the expected opposition has indeed flared up.

Rufinus' translation of *De Principiis* has often been studied and one might think that another book could bring nothing new. Yet Pace, who concentrates on a comparison between the Greek and Latin texts of the passages preserved in the *Philocalia*, has proceeded with such thoroughness, penetration and perceptive insight that his book not only makes fascinating reading but does indeed produce fresh results and that the reader is inclined to agree with his judgement against that of experienced earlier scholars. His familiarity with the *De Principiis*,