The book under review is published under the aegis of an international research project in Spain in which the author takes part. This book is composed of three parts: the introduction, where the author builds a solid argument for the transmission of the Pepli Epitaphia; the second part which comprises an indispensable list of manuscripts and abbreviations, two stemmata, and a heroes list; and the third part which is the critical edition itself, translation, and commentary on the Peplos. Naturally, in a work like this, the author also presents indexes, concordances, and bibliography.

In the Introduction, the author traces the transmission of the Pepli Epitaphia, supposedly attributed to Aristotle. Its first mention, suggests the author, as a recognized literary genre appears in Cicero, which establishes the existence of an “example of peplographia”. Possibly collected by Porphyry in the III century AD, it is only in the XII century AD that Eustathius mentions Aristotle’s authorship and that John Tzetzes collates the examples of epitaphs of heroes and incorporates some of his own creation. The problem of origins is analyzed by the author in this work in a coherent argument about the transmission of the Pepli in two stemmata: (1) transmitting what is ascribed to Aristotle and (2) what is collected and created by John Tzetzes.

As referenced above, this book, being part of a Spanish research project, also collated two manuscripts at the National Library of Spain, copied by Constantinus Lascaris - here represented as mss. M and Md - that introduce new readings for the Pepli Epitaphia, and for that matter the author essays the position of the manuscripts in the stemmata (2), created by Leone in 1988, but somewhat confusing: thus a clearer presentation is needed.

In the second part of this work, it would be preferable that the abbreviations list (manuscripts and fons codicum) and both stemmata in any following editions be side by side on an even and odd page, in order to be easier to read and to identify manuscripts and codices. The heroes list could then come before or after that.

The third part contains the Peplos, presented with testimonia, and the author transmits 93 epigrams altogether under the following categories:
Sylloga Florentiana, Sylloga Tzetiana, Spuria, Dubia, Ausoniana, and Apochrypha Tzetiana. The author presents the text and its translation; some entries have additional information and the majority receive a commentary on selected verses or words. Most epigrams of Ausoniana category do not have a commentary and only some undergo word analysis (only three in eleven). All are written in Latin, with an exception of a small Greek passage in this edition’s epigram 84, which is one of the Ausonian epigram commented upon.

The selected bibliography is not extensive but it covers the necessary topics for this subject’s discussion.

Overall, this book which intends to be ‘the most comprehensive possible’ critical edition of the Pepli Epitaphia, in my opinion, reaches its goal.
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This work is a welcome addition to the study of the development of Athenian law and indeed to that of archaic Greek law in general, as it is the first collection of Solon’s laws with English translation and commentary. The first modern edition of Solon’s laws was that of Eberhard Ruschenbusch in his 1966 work entitled Σόλωνος νόμοι. Die Fragmente des Solonischen Gesetzeswerkes mit einer Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte (Historia Einzelschriften 9, Wiesbaden 1966; 2nd ed.: Stuttgart 1983). Ruschenbusch had begun a thorough revision of this work. After his death in 2007, Klaus Bringmann edited and completed a new edition under the title Solon: Das Gesetzeswerk - Fragmente. Übersetzung und Kommentar (Historia Einzelschriften 215, Franz Steiner, Stuttgart 2010). Leão and Rhodes have followed Ruschenbusch’s format, but have revisited de novo the assignation of fragments (some not included in the collections of Ruschenbusch and Bringmann) to various categories and the status of various nomoi as authen-