The volume is rounded out with an essay of great historical interest. J.E. McGuire, in ‘Natural Motion and its Causes: Newton on the Vis Insita of Bodies’, traces the tradition accrediting the elements with self-motion from the Stoics, by way of Philoponus and Averroes, so as to suggest the origins of Newton’s concept of an active power responsible for the principle of his First Law (a body persists in motion or rest unless subject to an external force). In Newton’s own century Zabarella argued that for Aristotle there must be an immediate source of the elemental impulse to fall or rise (318-24). It would have been interesting to see a comparison between modern interpreters and the high scholastics. Zabarella is certainly no lightweight, influencing Joachim’s authoritative commentary on GC (1922). Of course a collection on such a large, albeit now almost forgotten, scientific topic cannot do everything, and what this one achieves is significant: it emphasises that (owing to Waterlow as much as Furley) the question of Aristotle’s view of self-motion is back at the centre of debate about his conception of nature.
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The Alexandrian Library made the book into a defining cultural product in a new way in the third century BC. Down market, the project of collecting all of Greek literature brought forth a grab-bag of odd texts misattributed to big-name authors, for the benefit of buyers acting for the Ptolemies; while abler minds saw that, as a vehicle for their work, publication in books
had more potential than ever before. Kathryn J. Gutzwiller (G) argues (45) that ‘the poetry book’ (meaning a book which was a collection of short poems) was invented by the poets of the fourth century; yet in practice she places the books of Anyte, Nossis and Leonidas in the third century context. Antecedents for Hellenistic ‘poetry books’ may have been few: the majority of fourth century poets saw the stage as their showcase. Hence a virtually endless roll call of fourth century comic playwrights: Alcaeus, Alexis, Amphis, Anaxandrides, Anaxilas, Anaxippus, Antidotus, Antiphanes...

G traces what is known of how the work of early epigrammatists, whose poems had been written—and kept short—specifically to be engraved on stone, came to be collected in book form. But, perhaps paradoxically, the first wave of third-century epigrammatists ‘participated in the process of remaking the briefest of poetic forms into high art by refocusing it, away from its traditional subjects, toward marginal figures and themes’ (53).

Tackling Anyte first, G is persuasive up to a point on how she found ‘ways of expressing ... female experience within the confines of genres created to define the male world’ (60). All the same, the preservation of a clutch of animal epitaphs by Anyte has perhaps distorted things. G says that ‘the first surviving animal epitaphs that appear to have been inscribed at gravesites ... date to half a century or so after Anyte’ (61). The inference is that feeling over the death of animals was in the range of ‘sensibilities more commonly permitted women than men’. Maybe: but G might have rephrased her argument if Theophrastus Characters 21 (which she does not cite) had come to mind: ‘when his Maltese dog dies, he makes a tomb and puts up a little gravestone (στηλίδιον) and engraves on it “Klados the Maltese”’. The Man of Petty Ambition stops short of an actual poem for the tike, but he is not too emotionally crippled to give it a memorial.

After discussing Nossis along lines set down by Marilyn B. Skinner, G moves to the deeply unfashionable Leonidas of
Tarentum. She argues, surely correctly, for the traditional and early dating rejected by A.S.F. Gow: two epigrams on victories over the Lucanians should not be dismissed as spurious (89), and date to a time before 272, when both Tarentum and the Lucanians submitted to Rome. G traces Leonidas' moves to build up a distinctive authorial persona, influenced by Cynic admiration for simplicity and by the democratic traditions of Tarentum, so that he 'represented himself as ... an advocate for a lived philosophy characteristic of the poor.' This is one of the strongest sections of the book, reaching well beyond the much-parroted stereotype of Greek authors as upper class men who might toy with thoughts of idyllic poverty.

The sections on Asclepiades, Posidippus, Hedylus and Callimachus are clever and sometimes insightful, but are characterized by an increasingly obtrusive disinclination to listen to Alan Cameron. Didyme in Asclepiades 5 G-P (Anth. Pal. 5.210) for example, so far from being mistress of Ptolemy II, is not necessarily connected with Egypt at all, for G, who seems to come close to wilful misreading of Asclepiades at 136 n.42 when she sees in κείνους θάλωμεν a suggestion that 'Didyme is sexually aroused by the poet'. Well, the image of coals glowing like rosebuds 'when we heat them' has a sexual overtone all right—but saying something which might make a maiden blush, or her royal boyfriend cough, is different from claiming to have been in bed (or some other sort of clinch) with her.

On the last couplet of Callimachus 2 G-P (Anth. Pal. 12.43: οὐ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλὸς ... ἤχυ φησί τις “ἄλλος ἐχεί”) all G lets in at the end of 221 n.78 is 'yet another emendation (ἄλλον ἐ'χει, partially anticipated by Schneider) has recently been proposed by Cameron (1995) 393.' Neither the omission to discuss Cameron's detailed case, nor the pained tone of 'yet another', is really excusable in a book like Poetic Garlands which aspires to be an authoritative and comprehensive treatment.
On the broader canvas there is a sense throughout the book of very good scholarship applied to produce a fragile construct. Critical comments poem by poem are nearly always perceptive: and (Heaven knows) Gow and Page can seem dated and superficial these days—so that G has done students of the ancient world a huge service in putting her book out. But a key argument in it is that epigrammatists—all of them, or virtually all—published poetry books, arranging their own poems in ways which interwove themes subtly to produce a sophisticated result. Fragmentary relics of these arrangements, axiomatically, survive in the sequencing found in the Palatine Anthology, via Meleager and others.

The partially published Milan Papyrus of Posidippus, P. Mil. Vogl. inv. 1295, hangs like a sword of Damocles over this argument. Written apparently in the last quarter of the third century, it seems not to represent a copy of an author-edited collection. G argues (28) that it is unlikely that it is typical, with its assignment of poems under quirky and poorly interconnected headings (including 'stones', 'omens', 'equestrian epigrams', 'cures', 'manners'). Naturally the only substantial extant selection copied in the third century may have been eccentric in its time—one does not know: but if collections were floating around which were not in the author's order, who can say if Meleager used authorized versions or pirate copies? And who, above all, knows which epigrammatists were as clever at ordering poems as Kathryn J. Gutzwiller?

The mass of first-rate work in Poetic Garlands makes it a pity to seem critical; but even a partisan of G's might admit that her overall approach is premised on a bet that she has got the picture right, and the rest are barking up the wrong tree—Cameron loudest and most stubbornly. My bet, by contrast, is that in retrospect The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes (1993) and Callimachus and his Critics (1995) are going to look like the epoch-making texts. If in fifty years some student yet unborn reads this and knows I was wrong, he or she may visit my deserted
cenotaph on the shore of the Manukau Harbour and have a good laugh.
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