critique of textual criticism, which Cozzo claims is both contradictory and viciously circular. These claims are not made good, partly because they depend on polemically convenient fictions such as the 'canonical critical text' (242f.) or the 'horror' which critics 'often' express over contaminated manuscript traditions (252, citing no examples). Cozzo points out that critical editions are themselves contaminated texts. But there is a functional difference: critical editions record hypotheses, in the framing of which manuscripts are used as evidence. Diagnosing contamination improves our understanding of which hypotheses the evidence will support; it does not expose a sin. Manuscripts are not necessarily worse evidence for being contaminated (they may preserve variants from otherwise lost lines of transmission); they are *different* evidence. Thus Cozzo fails to achieve, not only the distance necessary for genuine anthropological description, but also the sensitivity to participants' actual practices necessary for a responsibly engaged critique. The anthropological pose does help ease the introduction of Evans-Pritchard on Azande witchcraft into the discussion. Cozzo assures us that this is not tendentious: what is in question is a mechanism exhibited by *every* socio-cultural system (249). Readers may be unconvinced: was a comparison with witchcraft really the most effective and unprejudicial way to make the point that textual criticism is just like everything else?

doi: 10.1017/S0017383507000071 MALCOLM HEATH

Latin Literature

If you should want a book to refute the weary proposition that classical scholarship is irrelevant to the contemporary world, you might wish to consider Amy Richlin's translation of three plays of Plautus.[1] The three plays, the *Curculio*, the *Persa* and the *Poenulus*, were chosen because Richlin thinks them especially helpful for an account of how the Romans reacted to the very different cultures they encountered as their empire spread eastwards. Richlin's other great interest is in exploring what Romans found funny. The primary vehicle for exploring these questions is, naturally, the translation. Unfortunately, some may feel, the translation is avowedly based on the culture of Richlin's native New Jersey. Even readers familiar with that culture will find it hard to distinguish those characteristics which are helpful in understanding the Rome of Plautus and those which are redolent only of New Jersey. Richlin is not unaware of such problems and she has equipped her book with an introduction fifty-three pages long and subdivided into sections such as 'Why Translate This Way', 'Other Translations', 'Historical Background' etc. in which she mounts a vigorous and thoughtful defence of her approach. Purists will worry that the translation, notes and introduction will work together to produce an attractive and coherent picture which the reader will be unable to judge; though the extensive bibliography may help. The frequent allusions to Richlin's notions on which modern actor would play a particular part well will serve only to ensure that the work quickly dates itself. However, the book is capable of reminding (in too many cases of informing) the modern world that we have stumbled into a host of problems that are not remotely new. The Clarendon Ancient History Series now has a new addition which should be a model

[1] *Rome and the Mysterious Orient. Three plays by Plautus*. Translated with Introduction and Notes. By Amy Richlin. University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 2005. Pp. xiv + 288. Paperback £8.50.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383507000083 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for how this kind of work should be presented. Robert A. Kaster[2] has produced a monumental translation of Cicero's *Pro Sestio*. Simple statistics will give some impression: the translation itself occupies 63 pages, the Introduction 41 pages, the Commentary 285 pages, a Chronology of Cicero's career 16 pages, and various other appendices, bibliographies etc. 84 pages. The Introduction offers a full account of the history of the late Republic written in a clear and attractive style. The translation is faithful to the Latin to an unusual degree. Not only is Cicero's sentence structure almost entirely preserved but, even more important, great effort is expended to ensure that readers are neither encouraged to see imaginary repetition of concepts nor prevented from seeing true ones. This is achieved partly by almost always translating the same word or phrase in the same way and partly by means of two glossaries sixteen pages long, the first of which explains each repeated Latin word or phrase while the second records the way in which a particular Latin word or phrase has been translated, e.g. '*dignitas*: worthy standing'. The very full commentary explores in great detail everything readers could need to understand the text; it is especially good at explaining the details of Roman political and judicial practice. Ciceronians will also welcome J. G. F. Powell's new Oxford text of the *De Republica*, the *De Legibus*, the *De Senectute* and the *De Amicitia*.[3] A glance at the *praefatio* is all that is required to appreciate the enormity of the task. We are reminded that each work has a different textual history and Powell produces six different stemmata on which to support his edition. A work of this sort will inevitably kindle greater interest in Cicero's philosophical writings; but this text itself will, for a very long time, remain the acknowledged standard. Riggs Alden Smith, in a full length study of the *Aeneid*,[4] attempts to show that sight is far more important for Virgil, than sound, especially in connection with Aeneas. Many readers will have no problem with what is something of a commonplace in Virgilian scholarship; what, however, are they to make of some of the arguments deployed in Smith's book? He starts by quoting Keats' 'On first looking into Chapman's Homer' and then suggesting that Cortez' 'eagle eyes' contrast with Homer's blindness, although no other word in the poem alludes to it. There is a philosophical sub-structure to the central idea of the primacy of sight in the *Aeneid*. In his conclusion, Smith draws attention to the positive attitude to the Roman state once Augustus was well established and he goes on to suggest that his own strategy for improving Roman *morale* rested heavily on the benefits of the new building programme, itself utterly reliant on vision. There may be legitimate doubt, however, in the wisdom of underpinning that perception with sentences such as:

> The optimism that this visible message generated can be fruitfully considered in the light of Merleau-Ponty's ontology of vision, which gives sight the primary place in human kind's construction of reality.

[2] *Marcus Tullius Cicero Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius*. Translated with Introduction and Commentary. By Robert A. Kaster. Clarendon Ancient History Series. Oxford UP, 2006. Pp. xvi + 493. Hardback £70.

[3] *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Republica de Legibus Cato Maior de Senectute Laelius de Amicitia* recognouit breuique adnotatione critica instruxit J. G. F. Powell. Oxford UP, 2006. Pp. lxxvi + 390. Hardback £18.50.

[4] *The Primacy of Vision in Virgil's Aeneid*. By Riggs Alden Smith. University of Texas Press, Austin, 2005. Pp. xviii + 253. Hardback £28.95.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383507000083 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Laurel Fulkerson[5] rightly observes that Ovid's *Heroides* have attracted much less critical attention in recent years than has much of the Ovidian *oeuvre*. By 'Community' in the title she means to convey her idea that the Heroines of the *Heroides* behaved much as the circle of elegiac poets of Ovid's time and before. For instance, she argues that Hypermestra's success in writing a letter ostensibly for Lynceus, but skilfully composed so as to be suitable for Danaus' eyes also, owes something to Canace's letter written ostensibly to Macareus but plausibly read by Aeolus too. And the poignancy of the fact that Canace might have lived if only she had continued to write for a little longer, and had discovered that her father was far less unreasonable than he was in her imagination, is heightened by that fact that Hypermestra did survive because of her unexpectedly reasonable father. Other similar discussions on the alleged interplay between the various letters will, at the very least, oblige readers to re-examine their attitude towards them. However, they may find the writing of this book rather turgid, a fact caused partly by the modern obsession to reveal that the author has read everything published in recent years; this is so different from the lightness of touch with which Ovid and his contemporaries reveal their learning. Victoria Rimell's *Ovid's Lovers*[6] is not easy to paraphrase or describe, so complex and tightly drawn are its conclusions. A measure of the book can be gained from two extended quotations, the first from the end of the Introduction, the other from the chapter entitled 'Seeing Seers'. From page 40:

> . . . the figures of Narcissus, Orpheus and Pygmalion, the great illusionists and magicians who can bring statues and reflections to life, are the key archetypes for the Ovidian artist. Yet, as I have stressed, when Orpheus delves into mythological figurations and aetiologies of magic and make-believe, he confronts Medusa's metamorphosis, death and rebirth (and all the chaos, fury and creativity she represents) alongside the enchantments and grief of Narcissus (or of his artist-relatives Pygmalion and Orpheus). In Medusa, moreover, antiquity is not (just) a sweet and safe escape, not least because in her the past is immanent in the present, regression inherent in progress, cynicism in sorcery, death in life. This is not to say that Ovid is more or less in tune with an imperial agenda, however we might measure it, only to stress that his poetry encompasses and toys with desires and fears which cannot adequately be contained within the banks of Narcissus' pool.

And from page 116:

> We might note that Medusa and Cerberus are analogous ogres: Medusa's snake-hair is akin to Cerberus' many heads, and both are ever-watchful threshold creatures of Hades which must be put to sleep by valiant epic heroes. Moreover, the initial instruction given to Orpheus at 10.51 (*ne flectat retro sua lumina* / 'that he should not turn his eyes backward) was itself a version of the taboo that masks Medusa, or outlaws looking on the spirits of the dead and underworld gods (Medusa's face is that of a bloated repulsive corpse, as Wilk argues). Like Perseus, Hercules and Jason before him, Orpheus succeeds in sending Eurydice-as-Gorgon/dragon/Cerberus to her (second) death, yet at the same time he is petrified by the not-quite-discernable gaze that comes to meet his own.

[5] *The Ovidian Heroine. Reading, Writing and Community in the Heroides.* By Laurel Fulkerson. Cambridge UP, 2005. Pp. xiii + 187. Hardback $75.00.

[6] *Ovid's Lovers. Desire, Difference, and the Poetic Imagination*. By Victoria Rimell. Cambridge UP, 2006. Pp. viii + 235. Hardback £50.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383507000083 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In a fresh, full length study, Molly Pasco-Pranger[7] invites us to look again at the assumptions normally made by scholars in their work on Ovid's *Fasti*. Chief among these, we are told, and in need of refutation, is the idea that the purely calendrical features of the work are, in some way, an embarrassment to the poet. Pasco-Pranger is also of the opinion that it is fruitless to pursue the question of whether the patriotic features of the work are sincere or a necessary nod towards authority, in short, whether the poem is 'Augustan' or 'anti-Augustan'. These are interesting premises to explore; it is, however, sometimes difficult to accept the argument. For instance, on pages 28–9, it is at least plausible that we are correctly advised that in Ovid's account of Romulus' establishment of a ten-month year (1.27–36):

> this passage is not militaristic, but decidedly domestic and feminine in its focus; it centers on significant time periods in women's lives, first as mothers and then as widows; it contains a neat resonance between the time it takes to produce a life and the time it takes to mourn a death.

But it is not easy to accept the analysis offered of Mars and Venus, dedicatees of March and April (1.39–41):

> *Martis erat primus mensis, Venerisque secundus; / haec generis princeps, ipsius ille pater* . . . Romulus' year started with March, named for Mars, his father. The next month, April, was named for Venus/Aphrodite, but not as 'mother' or as consort of Mars, but as *generis princeps*. The use of the masculine noun *princeps* rather than *mater*, as well as the implication of the goddess' masculine Julian descendants . . . does not entirely wipe out the pairing of Mars and Venus as male and female 'parents' of the Roman nation, but neither does it fully exploit the familial and erotic potential of that pairing . . .

Romulus is speaking; he wishes to draw attention to both of the Roman foundation myths, that of Aeneas and that of himself. Mars was his father but his mother was Rhea Sylvia; Aeneas' mother was Venus but his father was Anchises. The 'pairing' of Mars and Venus is irrelevant to the foundation of Rome. The meaning of *princeps*, in a society like Rome's, will guarantee that the word will be used far more in a male context than in a female one. However, Cicero uses the word in a feminine context (*De or.* 1.13); more significantly, the framing of line 1.40, *haec . . . ille pater*, seems to go out of its way to underline the sexual polarity of Mars and Venus. The remarkably large contribution to Latin poetry made by the three great women of Cretan mythology, Pasiphaë, Ariadne and Phaedra is the subject of a fascinating study by Rebecca Armstrong.[8] The arrangement of the myths is largely by theme or author; consequently, the reader continually encounters quite different feelings for the same myth. Literature from Homer to Seneca and beyond is examined in fine but sympathetic detail. The work is elegantly written, not least perhaps because of the claim made in the last sentence of the Introduction: 'I feel more confident in sticking to my own approach (perhaps eclectic, but at least true to myself), rather than sallying forth under the flag of any one particular theoretical stance.' The paucity of editions of the *Heroides* is as nothing when compared to the editions of Ovid's exile poetry. It

[7] *Founding the Year. Ovid's Fasti and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar*. By Molly Pasco-Pranger. *Mnemosyne* supplement 276. Brill, Leiden and Boston, 2006. Pp. xiv + 328, with three plates. Hardback €113.

[8] *Cretan Women. Pasiphae, Ariadne and Phaedra*. By Rebecca Armstrong. Oxford UP, 2006. Pp. x + 351. Hardback £55.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383507000083 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is, accordingly, very exciting to meet a full scale edition of *Ex Ponto* 1 complete with full introduction, text, translation and copious notes.[9] The information collected in this book is astonishing and scholars will be ever grateful for the labour expended. Even so, any beginning-to-end reader will be sorely tried as the question 'so what?' will recur over and over again. For instance, in the Introduction, in the four and a half pages devoted to 'Metre and Versification', the most common caesurae and diaereses are identified thus: the (T)rithemimeral (after the first long of foot 2), the (P)enthemimeral (after the first long of foot 3), the K (after the first short of foot 3), the (H)epthemimeral (after the first long of foot 4) and the (B)ucolic (after the end of foot 4). We are then told that the commonest combination (23.7 per cent) is T-P-H, followed by T-P-H-B (17.7 per cent) and, much later on, T-P-K-H-B (0.3 per cent) so that, in fact, 41.7 per cent have T-P-H with or without K and B. Furthermore, as is admitted further down the page, P occurs in 96.7 per cent of the lines and H in 70.2 per cent. No attempt is made to draw any inference from these facts; if there were one to be drawn it seems unlikely that the method chosen to present the evidence would be particularly helpful. In the notes on 1.3.37, we are told that 'the comparative of *malus* is avoided in poetry' and we are directed to the note on 1.2.52 where we learn that 'the comparative of *malus* is avoided in Republican, Augustan and Silver Latin poetry' but we are also told that it occurs once each in Lucretius, Virgil and Silius, five times each in Statius and Juvenal, six times each in Lucan and Martial, ten times in Horace, fourteen times in Ovid and twenty-seven times in Seneca's tragedies. There may be room for disagreement on the precise sense of 'avoided'; more worrying is the collection of a very wide range of facts but, as is the case with *peior*, no question that they answer, no special insight that they disclose. Readers of Ovid will be only too aware of his love of wordplay and self-quotation. Irene Frings[10] has now produced a systematic study of the phenomenon. It is a great pleasure to welcome the first ever English commentary on the second book of Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*.[11] The pleasure is of course primarily excited by the interest, originality and quality of the work; but no small part of the pleasure arises from observing that it is still possible for scholars to hold work back from publication until it has fully matured. In this case, Michael Winterbottom's 36-year-old doctoral dissertation has finally been published much developed by the passage of time, the substantial contribution of Tobias Rheinhardt and the help of Donald Russell, the original examiner. Others too have contributed, so that we have a product of unusual maturity. Twenty-eight pages of very thorough introduction are followed by thrity-four pages of text and 360 pages of commentary. Because of Winterbottom's OCT of the whole of the *Institutio* and Russell's Loeb translation of it, the editors decided that they could dispense with an *apparatus criticus* and a translation. They have not, however, neglected the establishment of a text or any difficulties of translation; both issues are frequently encountered in the notes; the maturing process has meant that neither Winterbottom's text nor Russell's translation have been slavishly adopted. This work

[9] Ovid, *Episulae ex Ponto, Book 1*. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Jan Felix Gaertner. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford UP, 2005. Pp. xvi + 606. Hardback £90.

[10] *Das Spiel mit eigenen Texten. Wiederholung und Selbstzitat bei Ovid*. By Irene Frings. Zetemata Monographien zur Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 124. Verlag C. H. Beck, Munich, 2005. Pp. 302. Paperback €64.

[11] *Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria Book 2*. Edited by Tobias Rheinhardt and Michael Winterbottom. Oxford UP, 2006. Pp. lii + 435. Hardback £85.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383507000083 Published online by Cambridge University Press

will surely join that select group of editions that scholars will immediately consult whenever something in what they are working on occurs also, in this case, Quintilian 2. Following on from a previous paper on the preface to Martial's second book[12] and a book on his proemia,[13] Antonella Borgo has now produced a monograph on the Postumus circle in the second book of Martial's epigrams.[14] After a chapter on Martial's treatment of circles generally, she goes on to write chapters on 'The Postumus circle', 'The argument of the second book', 'Why Postumus?', 'A (possible) conclusion', followed by a text, translation and commentary on the five relevant poems, 10, 12, 21–3. Duckworth has produced a most elegant book to match N. M. Kay's equally elegant edition of part of the *Anthologia Latina*.[15] In the introduction, Kay gives a full account of what we know about the *Anthologia* and argues plausibly that the selection of epigrams he has chosen are all from the same author. The notes are full but they do not burden the reader with information irrelevant to the interpretation and appreciation of these short poems. A trilingual book on plurilingualism is not easy to sum up. After a Preface by Vincenzo Orioles and an Introduction by Renato Oniga there are thirteen topics addressed by thirteen different scholars; here a list of those topics will have to suffice:[16] Plautus' *Poenulus*, *Graphicus, -ice*, Lucilius' *Satires*, Varro's *Menippean Satire* together with Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, Cicero, Martial, Aulus Gellius, the Vulgate (Hebrew presence), Botany, Andrea di Bergamo, Dante, *Iliad* translations, and Pascolini. Roman satire has always attracted and repelled its readers in equal proportions. A new study by Catherine Keane[17] offers a novel way of approaching the satires of Horace, Persius and Juvenal. After a brief introduction, she devotes one chapter each to Theatre, Violence (or Attack), the Law and Teaching, with a final chapter of Conclusion. All of these she sees as quintessentially Roman thus supporting Quintilian's famous claim. The often neglected technical works of antiquity have attracted a new study, essentially a summation of the present state of scholarship, together with substantial bibliographies, on the Roman technical works of the first two centuries AD.[18] The topics discussed are: the *Agrimensores*, the military writers, Jurisprudence, Geography, the culinary writers, Civil Engineering, Agriculture, Astronomy, Mythography, Medicine, and Natural Science. This book would make an admirable starting-point for anyone interested in working on one of these topics. Those of us who encourage students to take the words of Latin sentences in the order that the author has placed them will receive strong support from a new work on Latin word order.[19] Imagine an enormous swimming pool. One end is so shallow that babies can

[12] '*La* praefatio *del secondo libro di Marziale*', in *BStudLat* 31 (2001) 497–506.

[13] *Retorica e poetica nei proemi di Marziale*, Loffredo Editore, Naples, 2003. Paperback €15.

[14] *Il ciclo di Postumo nel libro secondo di Marziale*. By Antonella Borgo. Studi Latini 59. Loffredo Editore, Naples, 2005. Pp. 127. Paperback €10.

[15] *Epigrams from the Anthologia Latina*. Text, translation and commentary by N. M. Kay. Duckworth, 2006. Pp. viii + 388. Hardback £45.

[16] *Il plurilinguismo nella tradizione letteraria latina*. A cura di Renato Oniga. Rome, 2003. Pp. 349. Paperback €30.

[17] *Figuring Satire in Roman Satire*. By Catherine Keane. American Philological Association. American Classical Studies Volume 50. Oxford UP, New York, 2006. Pp. viii + 182. Hardback £29.99.

[18] *El Panorama Litterario Ténico-Científico en Roma (Siglos I–II D.C.). Et docere et delectare*. By David Paniagua Aguilar. Acta Salmanticensia Estudios Filológicos 312. Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 2006. Pp. 507. Paperback.

[19] *Latin Word Order. Structured Meaning and Information*. By A. M. Devine and Laurence D. Stephens. Oxford UP, 2006. Pp. xii + 639. Hardback £38.99.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383507000083 Published online by Cambridge University Press

lie in it at no risk. The slope down towards deeper water is hardly detectable but it is inexorable so that, eventually, it is as deep as anyone could desire. So it is with this book which starts by demonstrating the most elementary features of Latin word order but eventually and imperceptibly draws the reader into the most technical discussion. All Latin quotations are translated so that the weaker swimmers are provided with water-wings. There is frequent humour throughout the book.

doi: 10.1017/S0017383507000083 D. E. HILL

Roman History

Anyone approaching T. Habinek's *The World of Roman Song*[1] expecting a merry scamper through the meadows will be given pause by its sub-title. What follows is a deep, wide-ranging study of how Rome kept men in line and moral (*mos* is measure), and going beyond that to what made Rome Rome. Not surprisingly, for *carmen* was ritualized speech, poetry, story-telling and even spells ('even' because they were outside the law). Habinek's purpose is to describe the system through the language and examine its significance. The first chapter concerns foundation, links between 'now' and what is distant, the Salian rite, and mimesis of nature in a cultural context, the second *sodales* and ritual (the convivial transcends the boundary between life and death, and comedy harmonizes discordant elements in culture), the third forms of utterance, the fourth play, the open-ended *ludus*, the fifth the body, birds and their voices – Habinek invokes the film *The Cranes are Flying*, and detects a shift in perception as the Principate emerges – the sixth magic, the *vates*, and the boundary figure Carmentis, entailing discussion of funerary practices and views of history. The author luxuriates in his astonishingly rich ancient and modern resources, most often Virgil, Plautus, Horace and Cicero. A plain reader might find a less virtuosic treatment more friendly (what is the point of referring to Domitian as 'Germanicus'?, 79; and his interpretation of Suet. *Aug.* 100. 2, *canentibus neniam principum liberis*, 235, is unconvincing), but this is as important a book as if it were on another means of control, Roman law; it will long be quarried, quoted, and discussed. With *Gender, Domesticity and the Age of Augustus*,[2] K. Milnor is in a corner of this universe. As part of the regeneration of society, women were to reclaim their status as caretakers of the Roman home. Yet the publicity accorded that role gave it a significant place in political discourse. The author offers comprehensive discussions, going down to what she calls Nero's burning down of the house, when the fundamental femininity of Julio-Claudian rule triumphed; and each section has independent value for scholars working primarily in the areas she scrutinizes (there is an *index locorum*). Milnor passes from Augustus' house on the Palatine to Vitruvius' conception of the house as a space of display. The absence of gendered spaces illustrates the blended state of Italian domestic life, and Octavia offers a glimpse of the proudly public function of femininity as a part of the imperial Roman home. Then, in her discussion of the social legislation and of Livy on the repeal of the *lex Oppia* (a framework showing both speakers' arguments erroneous), she suggests an adjustment in our

[1] *The World of Roman Song. From Ritualized Speech to Social Order.* By Thomas Habinek. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London, 2005. Pp. x + 329. Hardback £34.50.

[2] *Gender, Domesticity and the Age of Augustus. Inventing Private Life*. By Kristina Milnor. Oxford Studies in Classical Literature and Gender Theory. Oxford UP, New York, 2005. Pp. xii + 360, with 2 figs. Hardback £55.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383507000083 Published online by Cambridge University Press