same must be said of C.'s reading of the Lesbia-poems, where he does his best to uncover hidden allusions to Clodia, her brother, and their (allegedly incontrovertible) goings-on, although more and more scholars now challenge the notion that Catullus' *puella* can be identified with any historical Roman female (cf. *PCPS* 46 [2000], 28–44). And when, in this same context, C. for instance calls *c*. 104 and 107 'Clodia-poems', he once again risks having readers greet his entire approach with scepticism.

C.'s argumentation is weakened somewhat by the fact that his method has apparently been influenced simultaneously by post-modern semiotics and old-style philological analysis. He rounds off his running commentaries with brilliant observations on *c*. 116 and its sense of an ending (p. 111) and then proceeds to offer us some rather dated, 1960s/70s-style schematic representations in illustration of 'concentric composition', backing these up at the end of his book with conjectures, poems carved up, and verses rearranged. Perhaps C. should have confined himself to commentaries on each poem, investigating the *concatenatio* possibilities in greater depth—and dispensing with the lists and diagrams would have given him the necessary space. But, even in the form it has taken, this section of his book will be essential reading for future interpretations of Catullus.

University of Munich NIKLAS HOLZBERG

POETS AS LITERARY HISTORIANS

E. S. SCHMIDT (ed.): *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine*. (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 47.) Pp. xviii + 406. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 2-600-00747-4.

Ancient poets appeal to the immortal Muses or gods for direct access to material for their undying poems; at the same time, they are as aware as any poet writing out of a more secularist poetics of their position within a purely human tradition. Roman poets are made even more self-conscious of their place within a literary history by their dependence on their Greek predecessors, a dependence which recent work by Denis Feeney and others has converted from a passive admission of secondariness to an active resource of cultural and poetic self-definition. The topics of the present collection of essays have come into the spotlight in recent years above all as a result of an intense focus on genre and allusion. Genre is an inherently historical category, being the hypostatization of the features shared by a line of poets writing in conscious imitation of their predecessors. Allusion, whether reinforcing generic membership or not, writes an earlier into a later text and invites the reader to reflect on the temporal relationship between the two texts, reflections central to Stephen Hinds's *Allusion and Intertext* (Cambridge, 1998), above all in his Chapter 3, 'Diachrony: Literary History and its Narratives'.

A subject very much of the moment, then, and also one of very wide scope, as is clear from the variety of texts and approaches on offer in the volume, whose contents are arranged roughly chronologically, from Ennius to Flavian epic. A curious side effect is that the chapters are also grouped by language: first three in German, then one in French, two in English, and finally two in Italian. I hope that this is not in fact the principle of organization, given the slightly heated spat in the discussion after Hinds's paper about the supposed blindness to one another of Latinist traditions in the anglophone and non-anglophone scholarly communities (pp. 263–5). In fact, there are

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.355 Published online by Cambridge University Press

now welcome signs, of which this collection is one, that Latinists are engaging in closer dialogue across national and cultural boundaries.

The breadth of topic results in part from an uncertainty as to the boundaries of '*immanent* literary history'. By the wider definition, the term includes explicit statements made by an author within a text about his relationship to earlier works or authors (e.g. *Odes* 3.30), in contrast to free-standing literary histories. By the narrower definition, the term refers to implicit literary-historical self-positionings which the reader wins only through allegorical or self-reflexive interpretation of a text which on the surface is about something else. These are two very different procedures, sharing only an obvious tendency to partiality and local rhetorical goals, from which the more 'scholarly' free-standing variety is by no means exempt either. Epic narratives of journeying and contestation have lent themselves particularly to the implicit kind, represented here by Alain Deremetz's cunning if occasionally over-schematic reading of *Aeneid* 2 and 3 as a metapoetic allegory of the origins of Latin epic (using the methodology of his *Le miroir des Muses. Poétique de la reflexivité à Rome* [Lille, 1995]), and by Alessandro Barchiesi's typically deft and innovative set of studies of 'literary genealogies' in imperial epic, based on an approach to intertextuality as a kind of 'poetic aetiology'. Explicit self-positionings are the subject of Jürgen Schwindt's examination of a number of forms—the poet's epitaph on himself, his appeal to the Muses for supernatural inspiration, the claim to primacy in a kind of poetry, and statements of poetic succession—all of which, he suggests, serve only to obfuscate properly historical relationships. 'Never trust the artist'. But where Schwindt sees a denial of history in that most familiar of Roman poets' boasts, to be 'the first' to do something, Mario Citroni, in a subtle and far-reaching study, places 'affermazioni di priorità' within the contexts of ancient narratives of progress and decline, and of the attempts in firstly the Republican, and secondly the Augustan, periods to construct a canon of Roman authors who were 'the first' to match the achievement of their Greek models in the several genres.

Arnd Kerkhecker focuses on one such claim to priority, the prologue of Ennius *Annales* 7, in his study of Ennius' literary-historical self-awareness, adding further nuances to the now generally accepted proposition that Ennius presented himself as a thoroughly Hellenistic, and hence 'newfangled', poet. Particularly valuable is Kerkhecker's trenchant response to Alan Cameron's attempt to demolish Ziegler's reconstruction of a substantial Hellenistic tradition of historical epic. Ernst Schmidt focuses on late Republican and early Augustan poets from the epics of Cicero to the satire and iambus of Horace, serving up a smorgasbord which cumulatively drives home the point that Roman poets are obsessed with fitting themselves into (their own versions of) a poetic tradition. Elaine Fantham argues that Latin elegy is trapped by the success of the Propertian Monobiblos into a narrowly erotic exercise ground, a burden of the past from which Ovid self-consciously devises a strategy of escape in *Amores* 3.

The pursuit of self-reflexivity has often led to the charge of a literary-critical practice interested only in what literature has to say about literature. Stephen Hinds, in a move reminiscent of his earlier work on the ideology of genre, takes as case studies Cinna's dedicatory epigram for a presentation copy of Aratus (fr. 11 Blänsdorf) and Statius' poem in praise of the villa of Pollius Felix (*Silvae* 2.2) in order to show that a highly aestheticist discourse may simultaneously offer rich pickings for the cultural materialist. This move from formalist analysis of generic and allusive play is matched in the conclusion to Barchiesi's piece, where the interference of elegy with epic in the generic system of Flavian epic is shown to speak to the tensions of *otium* within the

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.355 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cultural system of Flavian society. But then, literary history had been inseparable from a wider political and cultural history from the time that Ennius' boast of scaling the heights of the Greek Muses coincided with his patron Fulvius Nobilior's conquest of Aetolia and the importation into Rome of Greek Muse-statues as spoils, as Hinds also reminds us.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford PHILIP HARDIE

HISTORY AND THE POETS

D. S. Levene, D. P. Nelis (edd.): *Clio and the Poets. Augustan Poetry & the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*. (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 224.) Pp. xv + 396. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2002. Cased. ISBN: 90-04-11782-2.

The subtitle of this volume recalls the 1999 conference at the University of Durham out of which it developed. After a brief introduction by the editors, its seventeen chapters and contributors present themselves as follows: 'Clio exclusa' (C. J. Classen), 'Propertius the Historian (3.3.1–12)?' (F. Cairns), 'Actium and Teutoburg: Augustan Victory and Defeat in Vergil and Tacitus' (V. E. Pagán), 'Stepping Out of the Ring: Repetition and Sacrifice in the Boxing Match in *Aeneid* 5' (A. Feldherr), 'Archaism and Historicism in Horace's *Odes*' (E. O'Gorman), '*Ab inferis*: Historiography in Horace's *Odes*' (C. Damon), 'Vergil's Italy: Ethnography and Politics in First-century Rome' (C. Ando), 'Roman Archaeology in Vergil's Arcadia (Vergil *Eclogue* 4; *Aeneid* 8; Livy 1.7)' (M. Marinčič), 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Universal History' (S. Wheeler), 'The Historian in Ovid. The Roman History of *Metamorphoses* 14–15' (P. Hardie), 'The Alban Kings in the *Metamorphoses*: an Ovidian Catalogue and its Historiographical Models' (S. Kyriakidis), 'The Fall of Troy: Between Tradition and Genre' (A. Rossi), 'Epic Encounters? Ancient Historical Battle Narratives and the Epic Tradition' (R. Ash), 'The Structure of Livy's First Pentad and the Augustan Poetry Book' (A. Vasaly), 'A Varronian Vatic Numa?: Ovid's *Fasti* and Plutarch's *Life of Numa*' (M. Pasco-Pranger), 'The Extinction of the Potitii and the Sacred History of Augustan Rome' (H.-F. Mueller), and 'History, Poetry, and *Annales*' (T. P. Wiseman).

A few of these chapters will please, perhaps even excite a wide range of readers, and they deserve wide notice. Peter Wiseman, for example, in a characteristically learned and eloquent essay, challenges us to understand Livy's famous distinction between the pursuits of history and poetry as an exceptional, not a normative, idea in Augustan Rome. Ancient histories regularly admitted a significant element of what we would call the fabulous. Rhiannon Ash draws an astute connection between battle narratives in Virgil and Sallust, showing how a fixation on Homeric parallels has distracted Virgilian scholarship from meaningful connections much closer to home. Other essays will find their own more specialized niche in scholarly bibliographies: thus Francis Cairns, with what is essentially an extended textual note on Propertius 3.3.7, and Andrew Feldherr, with a richly nuanced explication of the boxing match in *Aeneid* 5. A few chapters, weak treatments of good topics or belabored explorations of poorer ones, will probably disappoint. Yet, as the editors rightly observe (p. x), all these pieces can and should be read not simply as individual essays but as chapters in a continuous

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.355 Published online by Cambridge University Press