he comment on how Ovid tantalizes his readers by holding back the standard digression until such a late point in the book.

Sometimes G. does not even start to go in the right direction but totally ignores topics which do merit consideration. For example, he does not address an important point of Ovidian criticism at 59–78—the question of why Ovid goes on so long there (is this just an instance of the 'nimium amator ingenii sui' running on and on, or is he mischievously holding back the promised 'praecepta' by coming out with obvious remarks at length, or what?). G. misses some typically provocative flippancy too, in 86 (the conception of the revered founder of the Roman race used as an argument for promiscuity) and at 248 and 785–6 (jokes about the devastating tactics of the Parthians, who had killed so many Romans, and against whom a campaign was probably being conducted at the time of writing). He overlooks the diverting allusion with a twist to 1.509 ('forma viros neglecta decet') at 3.153 ('et neglecta decet multas coma'), where what seems initially a parallel in the case of females is suddenly turned into simulated neglect in the rest of the couplet, with the 'praeceptor' now actually recommending artifice rather than decrying it, as at 1.505–24. Another bit of cleverness escapes G. at 535, where Ovid, while recommending poets as lovers, speaks highly of a great benefit that they bestow on women: 'nos facimus placitae late praeconia formae'. This represents a pawky reversal, a positive spin to the earlier use of this phrase at *Amores* 3.12.9 ('quid enim formae praeconia feci?'). There the poet had depicted such a proclamation of female beauty as a bad thing (because it brought his girl many lovers), and he did so in a poem in which he doubted the value of verse, claiming that poets are liars and should not be believed (so there is subtle undermining of his point here and of his claim in 539 that poets are not underhand).

It would be churlish and unfair to continue with niggling criticisms when G.'s commentary has so very much to offer. Let me conclude by stressing the immense value of what is in fact a major piece of research and an indispensible addition to scholarship on Ovid.

McMaster University P. MURGATROYD
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni075

TRISTIA II

I. CICCARELLI: *Commento al II libro dei* Tristia *di Ovidio*. (Scrinia 21.) Pp. 304. Bari: Edipuglia, 2003. Paper, €16. ISBN: 88-7228-362-0.

This handsome and inexpensive commentary on Ovid's 'apologia operis sui' contains a seven and a half page introduction, Luck's text with some variations, 235 pages of commentary, a brief bibliography, and an index of passages cited. The obvious question to ask of any commentary on the Tristia is 'does it replace Luck's standard work completed in 1977?' While C.'s *oeuvre* is in many ways a solid piece of work, I cannot say that it does. It goes far beyond Luck in that it interprets more, it deals with more individual word meanings and tries to evaluate all the rhetorical figures found in the text. Still, that does not mean that the information provided is more useful than what Luck gives.

The introduction is as sparse as the commentary is long. The largest section deals with the contradiction between adulation and polemics *vis-à-vis* the emperor, a theme which recurs in the commentary, e.g. p. 107. Contradictions are part of life and hardly reason for the rampant over-interpretation to which they give rise these days. Besides,

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni076 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as Garth Tissol showed in *The Face of Nature. Wit, Narrative, and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Princeton 1997), Ovid sees the world as something constantly in flux. One minute you see a tree, the next minute a young woman; now a word means one thing, half a line later something else. One minute Augustus looks like a god on earth, the next like an autocrat. Any introduction to Tristia II should also not omit S. Georgia Nugent, 'Tristia 2: Ovid and Augustus,' in K.A. Raaflaub and M. Toher (edd.), *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*, (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford, 1990), 239-257.

C. made the wise choice to print Luck's text. It would be helpful if she supplied a list of where her readings differ from Luck's. Textual matters in general are discussed in the commentary. What is missing is any reference to Hall's 1995 Teubner text which is far more significant than Owen's 1924 edition.

As far as the meat of the commentary is concerned, I think it would have benefitted from a little self-reflection about commentaries along the lines of Don Fowler's seminal article 'Criticism as Commentary and Commentary as Criticism' in G. Most (ed.), *Commentaries—Kommentare* (Göttingen 1999), pp. 426–42. At times I found the lemmata unclear. C. usually gives line-numbers as lemma, then deals with those 4–6 verses in paragraphs. I had to keep turning back to the text to see what was being commented on.

In the notes, I found C. to be consistently good on the whole complex of Callimachean poetics and the register of poetics (e.g. pp. 37–9 on 'studium', 'labor', 'cura', and others). She also regularly illuminates the meaning of individual words, even if one often misses some proof for her argument, such as a reference to *OLD* or the Latin *Thesaurus*. Quite admirable is her deliberate effort to evaluate rhetorical figures wherever she finds them, although hyperbaton and enjambment are too widespread to warrant a comment every time they occur. It is also very heartening for me to read e.g. on pp. 47 and 222 that C. has independently come to my own view that Ovid in many cases 'riconverte il motivo elegiaco' (p. 47). I called that 'Enterotisierung' (e.g. on *Pont.* 1.1.57–8, 1.2.23–4, 1.3.21–2, 29–30, 35–6); C. speaks of 'ricodificazione' (p. 222).

Interpretation is good, but on balance, C. gives too much exegesis and too few bare facts. Although Ovid's tendentious rereading of Greek and Roman literary history requires many 'Realien' to be explained, she never refers to *RE* or *Der neue Pauly*. This goes hand in hand with the sparse references to the *Thesaurus* already noted. By contrast, she routinely cites individual entries in the *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*. These are all listed as separate entries in her brief bibliography, in fact, they make up 26 of the 128 entries. The *EV* can be extremely useful, but cannot be one's main source of information in a commentary on Ovid.

As a representative example I have chosen pp. 140–2 on *Tr.* 2.165–8. C. summarizes as usual, then points out without any proof that 'sospes' is solemn. 'Sospite te' is identified as originating in prayer style with reference to E. Fraenkel, *Elementi plautini in Plauto*, Italian tr. of *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Florence 1960), p. 60. That is fine, but what is required is a note on 'vota pro salute principis' (cf. Luck on Trist. 2.159–60). The clinching argument on the text 'sic te sit' (**N**) rather than 'sic tecum' (**M²**) or 'sit tecum' (**Le**) is *Fast.* 4.525 'sic tibi, quam raptam quaeris, sit filia sospes'. 'Natus' is found to be more elevated than 'filius', which is true, but not supported by anything here. The polyptoton 'sospite sospes' is claimed to suggest that Augustus was Tiberius' physical father. I would rather call it, as well as 'seniore senex' in 166, a 'fraternal polyptoton' (J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry. Figures of Allusion* [Oxford, 1996], pp. 205–7). The note on 'olim' is fine because it is backed up by references, but 'regere'

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni076 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the sense of 'guidare verso un fine' lacks just that. Explaining 'imperium' is unnecessary here, as is the note on 'hoc'. The prayer for Drusus and Germanicus, who occur nowhere else in the poem and could do with a brief sketch, is part of the 'vota pro salute principis' rather than an expression of Augustan ideology. Notes on hyperbaton like 'tui . . . nepotis' are unnecessary. 'Sidus' is indeed a panegyric metaphor as C. proves. Referring to Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.47 would not have hurt here. The fact that 'iuuenalis' denotes youth is self-evident. 'Ut faciuntque' is said to suggest that the youngsters are already doing what their elders are exemplifying. That is true, and it is a topos of encomia (cf. my note on *Pont.* 2.3.47–8). C.'s parallels show that 'ire per' plus acc. means 'follow an example', but for her final two observations, namely that 'factum' here denotes something positive and that 'parens' is elevated in style, C. again withholds any support.

This takes me to the bibliography. Commentaries generally avoid endless citations of secondary works but concentrate on the most important. It is quite realistic tacitly to admit that no one can read everything and that some publications prove not to be useful to the commentator. Nonetheless, it simply escapes me how one can write a commentary on Ovid's exile poetry without ever referring to Walter Marg's crucial article 'Zur Behandlung des Augustus in den "Tristien" Ovids', in *Atti del convegno internazionale Ovidiano* (Rome 1959), II.345–54, repr. in M. von Albrecht, E. Zinn (edd.), *Ovid* (Darmstadt 1982), pp. 502–12, or Josef Hellegouarc'h's book on the language of patronage, *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la république* (Paris 1972^2), or Jeffrey Wills's on repetition in Latin poetry, to name but a few.

I will regularly refer to C.'s work, but, for the reasons given above, never without checking Luck as well.

Case Western Reserve University MARTIN HELZLE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni076

ROME IN OVID

A. J. BOYLE: *Ovid and the Monuments. A Poet's Rome*. (*Ramus* Monographs 4.) Pp. xviii + 318, maps, pls. Bendigo: Aureal Publications, 2003. Paper, Aus$70, US$49, £32, €45. ISBN: 0-949916-13-7.

A. J. Boyle has collected, edited, translated, and commented on all passages from the Ovidian corpus which refer to monuments or sites in the city of Rome. The Latin text has no apparatus, but a list of B.'s emendations is provided where his readings diverge from the Oxford or Teubner editions. The English blank verse, on the facing page, is more literal than elegant. This is an advantage for students who are not up to reading the Latin unassisted. It is a disadvantage for those who do not read Latin at all, as a sense of the sonority of the original is not conveyed.

The book is divided into three parts. Part I is a sixty-two-page introduction. Part II comprises texts and translation, with the Ovidian excerpts organized under topographical headings. Part III comprises over 100 pages of factual and interpretive commentary. There are thirty-two black and white plates, one appendix, a select bibliography, and four indices, including an excellent general index with sub-headings.

B is erudite and impassioned. He makes it plain from the outset that he is no disinterested observer. His preface begins:

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni076 Published online by Cambridge University Press