

one" (p. 23). Here she is absolutely correct: this book is a worthy successor to the *Chronica maiora*.

Heather Blurton, University of California, Santa Barbara

PAOLO GATTI, *Per fabulas*, ed. Caterina Mordeglia and Antonella Degl'Innocenti. *Fabula: Fables from Antiquity to Modern Times* 1. Florence: SISMEL, 2022. Pp. x, 139; 20 colour plates.

This volume (the first of a new series, ideally linked to that of the *Favolisti latini medievali* – then *Favolisti latini medievali e umanistici* – founded in 1984 by Ferruccio Bertini) collects twelve contributions by Paolo Gatti, published in the time span from 1979 to 2016. These are almost all journal articles and essays in miscellany, with two reviews and an entry on Phaedrus from the *Enciclopedia oraziana*. As the scholar's very rich bibliography edited by Michele De Lazzer, which occupies pages 107–128, reveals, this is only a very small part of Gatti's production. It constitutes, however, a thematically important strand, focusing on Latin fables from antiquity to the Middle Ages, with particular attention to Phaedrus and especially Ademar de Chavannes, the protagonist of no less than eight papers.

The *Preface* (in English) by Agostino Paravicini Bagliani highlights "the renewed critical interest in ancient and medieval fables" perceptible in recent years, both abroad and in Italy, and the brief introduction by the two editors shows the importance of Gatti's contributions on the subject, of whose research a concise but timely overview is offered. As mentioned, in this book on fables the "lion's share," to stick to the theme, are the contributions dedicated to Ademar of Chavannes (988–1034), with which the collection opens and closes. Over the course of almost forty years, Gatti has had the opportunity to revise, refine, and corroborate his positions on Ademar, of whom he is one of the greatest experts. Time has thus consolidated his conviction that upstream of the monk's collection lies a fuller Phaedrus than that transmitted by the rest of the manuscript tradition, and that the Latin fabulist's complete collection (different from the largely curtailed one that come together in New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS 906 [P] and the lost *Remensis*, once kept in the abbey of Saint-Rémy in Reims and destroyed in a fire in 1764 [R]) was accidentally and prematurely divided into two sections, now lost but reflected in the indirect tradition. The first strand consisted of book one (and much of book two), the second comprises the remaining fables from book two to book five. Ademar's sources would derive from the first strand, while Niccolò Perotti would have taken his additional fables, now merged in the so-called Appendix Perottina, from a representative of the second strand. Analyzing the Ademarian fables (67 in total, in prose), we find that some (14) also appear in "our" Phaedrus; others have correspondences in the so-called *Romulus* (30); 5 seem to contaminate Phaedrus

and *Romulus*; and 18 have no correspondences. Gatti argues that the latter, and particularly those that feature remnants of iambic senarii compatible with the Phaedrian *usus scribendi* (see especially pp. 61–65), could be actual paraphrases of lost Phaedrian originals. In the course of time, the scholar has gone so far as to provide a *stemma codicum* concerning the Phaedrus tradition in relation to Perotti and Ademar (p. 93). Gatti also detected the latter's use of Tironian notes, resulting in textual improvements (pp. 85–86).

In the last contribution, in a particularly innovative way, he hypothesizes that, contrary to what has always been believed, Ademar is not the author of the collection of fables conveyed by his autograph manuscript Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Voss. lat. O. 15, but simply copied them, moreover in a somewhat careless manner (see especially pp. 104–5). Proof of this would be the fact that the Latin of the fables, often sloppy and corrupt, seems incompatible with that of Ademar's other works. The latter apparently copied the text, hastily and clumsily, in the spaces left free by his drawings, with which he had filled in advance the parchment booklet that later became part of the Leiden manuscript. This is not an unprecedented hypothesis (as Gatti himself notes, it was once advocated by Thiele and Marchesi, among others), but the fact that this time it is taken up by the scholar who is perhaps most familiar with the Ademarian text leads one to pay the greatest attention to it.

Among the contributions not related to Ademar, of particular note is an article from 1991 (pp. 31–42) in which Gatti discusses the “fable elements” in *Asinarius* and *Rapularius*, which allows for folkloric comparisons, with references to the Aarne-Thompson repertoire and Indian parallels of the first story. The collection of contributions is followed by the extensive bibliography already referred to, in which Gatti's many recent contributions to *DigilibLT* (*Digital Library of Late Antique Latin Texts*) and the entries he edited for the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, among others, stand out. Lastly, as a kind of bonus track for Ademar scholars, there then follow twenty colour plates reproducing in full the collection of fables in the Leiden manuscript (to which is added a folio from the Frankfurt codex of the *recensio Gallicana* of *Romulus*, referred to on p. 52). The volume is then concluded by indexes of manuscripts, scholars, authors, and works also edited by Michele De Lazzer.

The layout of the text is clear and elegant. A few typos are noticeable: in the running head the form “Aldemaro” sometimes appears instead of “Ademaro” (see pp. 5–6; pp. 97–98); Perotti is referred to as “umanista bipontino” (for “sipontino”) on p. 13; on p. 31, “fomali” should be “formali”; on p. 69 *asinus* should be *asinum*; on p. 77 *onustus* should be *onustum*. There is a somewhat unfortunate statement in the introduction, where the *Rapularius* is designated as a “noble medieval Latin forerunner of the more popular Rapunzel by Disney” (“nobile antesignano mediolatino del più popolare Raperonzolo disneyano,” p. x). In reality, as Gatti himself noted on p. 37, the *Rapularius*

is related not to the fairy tale of *Rapunzel*, but to “Die Rube” (*The Turnip*), also present in the Grimm brothers’ collection.

Beyond these trifles, this collection makes it possible to follow the valuable work devoted by Gatti over decades to the fable and to Ademar in particular, including the acquisitions of more recent years. It is therefore indispensable as a complement and update to the edition of Ademar edited by Gatti himself and Ferruccio Bertini in 1988 (*Favolisti latini III: Ademaro, Favole*), which is still the standard text. Moreover, it is to be hoped that the availability of these contributions in a single, convenient volume will make it possible to overcome the lack of communication between specialists in not-so-distant fields that, especially in the humanities, is still an obstacle to a true and fruitful interdisciplinary approach: suffice it to think that even in the most recent Teubner edition of Phaedrus, where Ademar’s relevance to the Roman fable tradition is duly acknowledged, there is not the slightest reference to Gatti’s work.

Tommaso Braccini, Università di Siena

*Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries. Annotated Lists and Guides*, Vol. 13: *Ancient Greek Sophists* (by Eric M. McPhail) and *Publius Papinius Statius* (by Harald Anderson), ed. Greti Dinkova-Bruun, Julia Haig Gaisser, and James Hankins. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2020. Pp. xxxv, 364.

The thirteenth volume of the inimitable *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum* is an invaluable resource for the scholar working on either of its two covered topics. Easy to navigate and beautifully typeset, it consists of two articles which, although intended primarily to collect and summarize existing knowledge, prove nevertheless to be excellent studies of classical reception in their own right.

An article by Eric M. McPhail’s opens the volume, providing a fascinating overview of the reception of several ancient Greek sophists. The discursive portion of his contribution, *Fortuna* (pp. 3–24), is comprehensive and wide-ranging. Of particular interest is his entry into the historiographical problem of identifying the sophists as a coherent group (esp. pp. 4–5), in spite of the dearth of surviving primary sources, the lack of a single, unifying philosophical doctrine, and the negative bias of contemporary and later evaluations of their work, which may have distorted their ideas and certainly consigned much of their *œuvre* to transmissional oblivion. These negative judgments, especially by Plato, Cicero, and Quintilian, turn out to be some of the principal sources of the sophists’ group identity. Despite the series’ temporal emphasis, it is gratifying for the reader to receive a hint of the contents of this history’s modern chapter, including the role played by Hegel (p. 24). Because of this same emphasis, the short temporal range of the translations and commentaries listed in the comprehensive bibliography