

REVIEW

TOWARDS A CORPUS OF HISTORICAL POPYRI

R. Funari, *Corpus dei papiri storici greci e latini. Parte B: storici latini. 1. Autori noti. Vol. 1: Titus Livius*. Pisa and Rome: Fabrizio Serra editore, 2011. Pp. 277. Paperback, €185.00. ISBN: 978-88-6227-348-0.

R. Funari, *Vol. 2: Caius Sallustius Crispus*. Pisa and Rome: Fabrizio Serra editore, 2008. Pp. 158. Paperback, €48.00. ISBN: 978-88-6227-047-2.

R. Funari, *Parte B: storici latini. 2. Adespota*. Pisa and Rome: Fabrizio Serra editore, 2014. Pp. 180 + 10 pl. Paperback, €120.00. ISBN: 978-88-6227-622-1.

Mario Capasso first announced plans for a corpus of Greek and Latin historical papyri (*Corpus dei papiri storici greci e latini*, referred to here as *CPS*) at the 21st International Congress of Papyrology in Berlin in 1995.¹ The stated aims of *CPS* were to offer updated, modern editions of historical papyri, aid bibliological research into ancient books, elucidate the relationships between ancient and medieval traditions of known authors, and outline processes of transmission from late antiquity to the Middle Ages. These goals, which are admittedly focused more on book production and transmission than on historical research, necessarily implied an audience beyond papyrologists, who are accustomed to the specialized studies in which such papyrus fragments are normally discussed. The three volumes under review—B.1.1 (= Livy), B.1.2 (= Sallust), and B.2 (= *adespota*)—represent Rodolfo Funari’s contribution to the lofty aims set forth by Capasso.² In them, Funari lays out the papyrological evidence for two known Roman historians, Livy and Sallust, which total ten texts, plus three containing historical works by unknown authors. In sum, he spends nearly 600 pages on these thirteen papyrus and parchment fragments, meticulously treating points of paleography and codicology,

¹ In: B. Kramer, W. Luppe, H. Maehler, and G. Poethke, edd., ‘Il Corpus dei Papiri Storici Greci e Latini’, in *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin 1995*, vol. 1 (*Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, Beiheft 3) (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997) 155–7.

² In addition to these three volumes, the series is represented thus far by two further volumes devoted to Greek historical papyri: N. Pellé, *Corpus dei papiri storici greci e latini. Parte A. Storici greci. 1. Autori noti. I frammenti delle opere di Senofonte* (Pisa and Rome, 2010) and L. Prandi, *Corpus dei papiri storici greci e latini. Parte A. Storici greci. Testi storici anepigrafi. I papiri e le storie di Alessandro Magno* (Pisa and Rome, 2010). Cf. the review of Prandi’s volume by Livia Capponi, *Histos* 5 (2011): 320–4.

the relationship of the fragments to later traditions, as well as issues of historical interest. On the whole, Funari admirably fulfills the promise of the series.

By gathering papyrological witnesses together under one cover, *CPS* resembles projects such as the *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini*, an extensive and valuable collection of philosophical papyri. Such corpora give easier access to often under-appreciated papyrus manuscripts, thereby making the text more widely available. The utility of these editions depends, however, in part on the nature of the evidence. Works such as an epitome of Livy (B.1.1 1F) can hardly be made easy reading. Despite, in a sense, being ‘known’, such texts are nevertheless unique. An editor cannot, therefore, easily jettison the chaff of a messy papyrus text in order to make it more similar to known traditions. The reader has to exert some effort in order to understand the content of these fragments, especially if, as in the volumes under review, the editor seeks fidelity to the text as it appears on the papyrus. Take, for example, the opening lines of the very first text of the first volume, which comes from an epitome of Livy. Funari prints:

[± 6/7]nia Romani caesi.
 [± 6/7] Cn. Manlio cos.
 [± 6/7]s pax iterum data est. P. Lepidinus maximus
 [pontif]ex maximus Q. Fabium pr. quod flamen
 5 [Quirin]alem erat proficisci in Sardiniam
 [± 6/7]unt.

Some modern punctuation is afforded (although the editor does not print the mid-dots that appear on the papyrus indicating abbreviated words, instances of which he notes in the critical apparatus), but for the most part there is minimal editorial intervention. Whereas Grenfell and Hunt, the first editors of the papyrus, marked *maximus* in line 3 with brackets—{*maximus*}—to signal deletion of the word, Funari does not, opting instead to comment in the line note on the redundancy. He does, however, omit it from his translation. Similarly, he chooses not to provide two likely supplements found in other editions, [Hispa]nia in line 1 and [Marco Fulvio] in line 2—but these are supplied in the translation. In general, this accords with the editorial principles given in the Preface (37), although one wonders why some supplements are recorded and others not, particularly for those Livy and Sallust papyri that correspond to known passages and could therefore be supplemented in most cases with a high degree of confidence. Admittedly, there are some places where the texts diverge from the manuscript tradition (e.g., B.1.2 5F verso, line 5f.), but for the most part the known texts printed in B.1.1 (Livy) and B.1.2 (Sallust) do not vary much. Providing secure supplements would aid appreciation of the fragments and give a better sense of the original layout of the text.

While editorial intervention is largely kept to a minimum, there are slight differences in practice across the volumes. For example, in B.1.1, abbreviations are generally left unexpanded—e.g., in 1F, *pr.* for *pr(aetorem)*, col. 2, line 4, and *trib. pl.* for *trib(unus) pl(ebis)* in col. 3, line 24—while they are expanded in B.1.2—e.g., in 1F and 4F *passim*. This may simply reflect a change of attitude between the publication of the first and second volumes, but it hints at a lack of established editorial criteria for the series as a whole. (It should be noted, too, that volume 2 pre-dates volume 1 by three years). Moreover, despite Funari's conservative approach to the text, he does not shy from emending minor mistakes in the manuscript (cf. *Salinatore* in B.1.1 1F, line 19).

In general, the reader spends a fair amount of time flipping from text to apparatus, to translation, to commentary, and back again, in order to get a clear understanding of the relationship between the printed and original text. For this reason, it is probably a good thing that long papyri such as the first Livy text (B.1.1 1F) are broken up into columns. That is to say that each column is followed by two apparatuses (one diplomatic, one critical), a translation, and line notes, something that does not give a clear impression of the extent of the papyrus roll and is perhaps less conducive to bibliological studies than one might hope, but it better facilitates the kind of to-and-fro reading that the printed text requires. Originally put off by this formatting choice, I came to see the point.

As far as authorship is concerned, Funari does not differ from previous editors. He follows Bravo–Griffin, for example, in attributing P.Naqlun inv. 15/86 to Livy (B.1.1 3F), also tentatively assigning the parchment fragment to the lost Book 11 of *Ab urbe condita*.³ The volume dedicated to the Sallust papyri contains two further texts (B.1.2 5F and 6F) than the section devoted to Sallust in R. Cavenaile, *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum* (Wiesbaden, 1958) (= *CPL*). This is because Sallustian authorship of these fragments was established after the publication of *CPL*. The volume includes two fragments from *Bellum Catilinae*, B.2 1F (= 6.1–4, 5–7) and 2F (= 10.4–5, 11.6–7), three witnesses to the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, 3F (= 31.7), 4F (= 43.3–4, 44.4–5, 49.5–6, 50.3–4), 5F (= 93.1, 93.4), and two to the incompletely preserved *Historiae*, 6F (= I) and 7F (= I?, II). It thus contains more than double the number of witnesses to Livy's work. While most of the Sallust fragments are dated to the fourth or fifth centuries CE, 3F and 7F may be earlier. Both have been assigned by scholars to as early as the first or second century and as late as the fourth. I find it commendable that, for any given text, Funari reports all of the dates proposed thus far in the scholarship, although in the introduction he expresses his own preference for the earlier date for both witnesses (66–68 and 122). Moreover, he lays out the evidence in a compelling way that makes a good case for considering the two

³ B. Bravo and M. Griffin, 'Un frammento del libro XI di Livio?', *Athenaeum* 66 (1988): 447–521.

pieces to be earlier. Still, by recording the entire spectrum of dating possibilities conjectured to date, he illustrates (even if inadvertently) the great difficulty posed by dating criteria that depend on paleography. His judicious commentary on the subject further highlights the complexity and fragility, if you will, of the various proposed dates.

The third and final volume under review (B.2) comprises three fragments of unknown authorship. Two are from Oxyrhynchus and the third from somewhere in Egypt; its exact place of origin is not known. The two Oxyrhynchite fragments, one parchment (1F) and one papyrus (2F), were published under the rubric 'Fragments d'historiens' in *CPL* (nos. 41 and 43). Funari devotes most of the volume to discussion of them. 1F concerns Rome's Macedonian wars, and a significant part of Funari's introduction to the text revolves around paleography. The hand is of interest for its mixture of rustic capital and uncial forms, something highlighted already in the *ed.pr.* In addition to the paleography, the genre of the piece is treated at length. Funari believes that it represents a passage from a compendium or epitome in the annalistic tradition, probably based on an author like Livy or Pompeius Trogus (72–8), author of the now lost *Historiae Philippicae*.

2F concerns military institutions purportedly introduced by Servius Tullius. It is a fairly early witness, dated variously to the first or second century. According to the author of the piece, Servius Tullius's innovations included the creation of military *centuriae* and the implementation of the *pagus* system, with the placement of Rome in the first *pagus*. Much of Funari's thirteen-page introduction focuses on paleographical considerations, which are not without interest given the early date of the papyrus. Discussion of the content is reserved largely for the line notes, where interpretations offered by others are judiciously weighed. One misses a summary of scholarly opinion about the piece's subject matter and possible authorship in the introduction.

To summarize, Funari has done a very good job bringing together known Latin witnesses to Roman historical writings, which are generally considered outside the manuscript tradition. His treatment of, above all, paleographical and codicological aspects of the papyrus and parchment fragments are meticulous, and his commentaries rich. It is very nice to have the texts collected. The drawback to such detailed analysis is that it prevents easy access to the texts themselves. The lack of supplements and somewhat disjointed presentation of multiple columns in the larger witnesses mean that the reader does not get a quick impression of either the content or the layout of the fragment, in the way that he or she does with *CPL*. I found myself sometimes wishing for Cavenaile's texts (or, at least, the layout of *CPL*) and Funari's commentaries. Nevertheless, this shortcoming is offset by Funari's welcome depth of analysis.

One final point should be made about the production of the volumes, which has less to do with the author of the work and the scientific committee behind it than with the press itself. Perhaps the most discouraging things about

the books are the quality and arrangement of the reproductions. The resolution of photographs in vol. 1 is especially poor, which is unfortunate in the case of B.1.1 1F, given the hosting institution's unwillingness to make images of this important papyrus (and many others in its collection) available online. The press would have done readers a great service by printing higher quality photographs. That it did not do this is surely a missed opportunity. The arrangement of the reproductions in B.1.2 and B.2 is also somewhat unfortunate. All photos from the second volume of Sallust papyri appear at the back of the *adespota* volume, which means that anyone wanting to control transcriptions with reference to the photographs needs B.2 at hand when working with B.1.2.

Universität Heidelberg

RODNEY AST
ast@uni-heidelberg.de