Latin Literature

If I have understood David Wray's [B]★★*Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood*[1] correctly, the challenge he poses is best summed up in his own words (p. 67): 'Each age has its own morality and its own hypocrisies. Catullus' poems present a persona that manages to run afoul of those of his own historical moment as well as ours. It is hard to say which is the greater danger at the current juncture: to condemn Catullus too hastily on the grounds that he ought to have conformed to a modern liberal ethics (*sic*) of human rights and personhood, or to excuse him too hastily by the stratagem of positing, just behind the persona, the presence of a "poet" who *did* conform to it.' As his title suggests, Wray's most original contribution to our understanding of Catullus is to relate modern anthropological theories about masculinity and how it is expressed to the dilemma of the apparently mutually exclusive pictures we have of Catullus both as a tender lover and as a coarse and lubricious braggart. The book displays very wide reading from both within and without the discipline, including anthropology and modern poetry. The arguments are conducted with a high degree of courtesy; even when attacking the conclusions of a predecessor, Wray frequently suggests that they were necessary forerunners of modern understanding. Readers should, however, be warned that a distaste for jargon would be a serious handicap for anyone wishing to read this book. It is remarkable that in two successive issues I should review two different editions of [B]★★ Propertius I, the earlier by Robert Baker (*G&R* 49 no. 1 [2002], 115–16), and now, a German edition, by Bernhard Georg.[2] The two editions could hardly, however, be more different, and there is no indication that either was aware of the other. Baker offers text, translation and general exegesis in conventional form, whereas Georg, taking Tarrant's work on interpolation as his base, works his way through the book twice, once in an order dictated by his view (not very different from that of his predecessors) of the structure of book 1, except that he starts with 1.19–21 – three poems he takes to be spurious, an idea not even raised by Baker (nor by Hubbard, Camps or Goold) – and once in an order dictated by his typology of interpolations. Throughout, his only real interest is in identifying interpolations. Unfortunately, many of his judgments are based on the flimsiest of grounds; certainly his harvest of interpolations is very much larger than that of any of his predecessors. The book has an extensive bibliography and a full index of passages cited. Ulrich Schmitzer's [B]*Ovid*[3] is a handbook of a very thorough kind designed for German speaking students. Chapters on Life and After-Life, Love Elegy, the *Metamorphoses*, the *Fasti*, the Exile Poetry and Later Reception follow one another in an orderly manner. There is a commendable tendency to keep Ovid's words in the very foreground of all discussions and a refreshing and lively interest throughout in Ovid's influence on later authors; a very humane work. Alessandro Barchiesi's [B]★*Speaking Volumes*[4] is a reissue of

[1] *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood*. By David Wray. Cambridge U.P., 2001. Pp. xi + 246. £40.00.

[2] *Exegetische und schmückende Eindichtungen im ersten Properzbuch*. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums 17. By Bernhard Georg. Schöningh, Paderborn, 2001. Pp. 211. Paper 48,00 DM.

[3] *Ovid*. Studienbücher Antike Band 7. By Ulrich Schmitzer. Georg Olms, Hildesheim, 2001. Pp. 242. Paper 17,80 euros.

[4] *Speaking Volumes*. Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and other Latin poets. By Alessandro Barchiesi, edited and translated by Matt Fox and Simone Marchiesi. Duckworth, London, 2001. Pp. 206. Paper £14.99.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

eight of his essays first published between 1986 and 1997, six translated from Italian into English, two originally published in English. His influence has been deservedly great; he is a scholar who has been able to deploy the contributions of modern literary analysis not as a substitute for more traditional approaches but as a skilfully and judiciously deployed further resource. The work ranges widely over the Ovidian corpus and is probably even more useful for the methodologies it espouses than for the particular solutions arrived at. T. J. Leary's B⋆*Martial Book XIII The Xenia*[5] (oddly so titled given the editor's persuasive argument that Martial himself did not refer to it as *Liber XIII*) is a welcome and natural sequel to his edition of the *Apophoreta* (London, 1996, see *G&R* 44 [1997] 226–7). After a full introduction, his method has been to provide for each epigram a text based on Shackleton Bailey's Teubner and a translation 'heavily indebted' to Shackleton Bailey's Loeb, followed by a most penetrating commentary. For most modern readers, a translation of Martial can be no easier to understand than the text. With Leary's notes, however, the real substance of this book, all becomes clear. This is a work of exposition and is based on formidable learning, and Leary is to be congratulated on producing a work unlikely to be superseded for a very long time. Roland Mayer's edition of B⋆Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus*[6] is a welcome addition to the Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics series. As the editor rightly observes, this is a work that has been shamefully neglected; the relative shortness of the bibliography reveals that neglect quite sharply, and a closer examination shows that many of the works cited, though well used by the editor to illuminate some point important for the *Dialogus*, were not written with the *Dialogus* in mind. A full introduction, ranging over the whole of the evidence but making particularly good use of Pliny, gives a very clear picture of the fears and ambitions of the Roman *élite* under the Flavian emperors and after them, a good background for understanding Tacitus' deep disenchantment. The reasons why some scholars have doubted Tacitean authorship of the *Dialogus* are fairly presented and subtly dismissed. The text has no apparatus but the notes are generous in discussing all reasonable questions of text and exegesis in a way likely to be useful to a range of readers with very varied linguistic competence. The editor respects and admires his author, always a necessary condition for success. The chronological arrangement of these notices fortuitously leads on into a very different rhetorical author. Stephen Harrison, John Hilton and Vincent Hunink have co-operated to produce an annotated translation of BApuleius' rhetorical works.[7] After a general introduction by Harrison on the life and prolific writings of Apuleius, there follow the *Apologia*, the *Florida*, the work transmitted as the 'initial part of the *de Deo Socratis*' and the *de Deo Socratis* itself, each translated and furnished with a separate introduction and notes by, respectively, Hunink, Hilton, Hilton and Harrison, except to say that the introduction to the third element is not by Hilton but by Harrison. This interesting asymmetry appears to arise from the fact that there are broadly two schools of thought on the status of the work; some believe that it is a genuine introduction to the *de Deo Socratis*, others that it is part of the *Florida*; Hunink believes

[5] *Martial Book XIII*. The Xenia. Text with Introduction and Commentary by T. J. Leary. Duckworth, London, 2001. Pp. xiv + 209. £40.00

[6] *Tacitus Dialogus de Oratoribus*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Edited by Roland Mayer. Cambridge U.P., 2001. Pp. x + 227. £15.95.

[7] *Apuleius. Rhetorical Works*. Translated and annotated by Stephen Harrison, John Hilton, and Vincent Hunink. Edited by Stephen Harrison. Oxford U.P., 2001. Pp. x + 225. £40.00.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the former, Harrison the latter. Their solution has been to present it separately, to call it 'The False Preface to *On the God of Socrates*', and to furnish it with an introduction by Harrison which states both views in a style which makes no attempt to hide the contributors' disagreement. That there is a need for such a book on these hitherto most inaccessible works is undeniable; I am not, however, convinced that the author's brilliance, so often alluded to by, in particular, Stephen Harrison, fully survives the process of translation. For the next book, we stay with Apuleius. Stavros Frangoulidis describes his [B]★★*Roles and Performances in Apuleius' Metamorphoses*[8] as 'an analysis of selected embedded tales and longer narrative sequences in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* from the perspective of "roles" and "performances" as defined by the Greimasian discourse model.' For those unfamiliar with the model he explains: 'According to Greimas, the syntactical arrangement of narrative is based on a structure constituted by a model of interrelating actants, all of which lie below the discursive level. The term "actant" designates a syntactic position within a structure of reticular units devoid of any content. In this context actants may be understood as empty boxes.' I hope that these samples will give a fair guide to prospective readers as to whether they wish to investigate this work further. N. M. Kay's edition of [B]★Ausonius' *Epigrammata*, text, translation and commentary,[9] is a model for anyone who aspires to write a commentary on such an author. It is detailed, but never tedious, it is meticulous in amassing Ausonius' allusions but judicious in its treatment of them. Kay makes no unsustainable claims for his author: 'They [the epigrams] are a fascinating text, revealing much about Ausonius himself and his times, his literary outlook and methods, the literature of the fourth century and the development of epigram as a genre . . .they are a mixed bag ranging from the brilliant to the abysmal . . . On occasion they are not easy to understand, let alone appreciate . . .' This last, an understatement on any standard, is painstakingly and sympathetically solved by Kay whose consistent skill at elucidation is frequently much more rewarding than the text he is commenting on. He is also very appreciative of those who have gone before him, notably Roger Green, the scope of whose edition precluded, as Kay himself acknowledges, the luxury of the expansive, but necessary comment here provided. It was certainly provocative of Oliver Taplin to open his Preface to this collection of studies entitled [B]★*Literature in the Roman World*[10] with the words 'This is not just another collection of piecemeal essays . . .', provocative, indeed, but fully justified. In his Introduction, he goes on to say: 'The focus though . . . is on the receivers of the literature, the public, readers, spectators, and audiences. The six contributors . . . are united in the belief that it is valuable to ask who these works of literature were for.' And, indeed there follow nine essays, not on individual authors but with titles such as 'Forging a national identity: Prose literature down to the time of Augustus' or 'Creativity out of chaos: Poetry between the death of Caesar and the death of Virgil'. It is indeed not so much a history of literature as a history informed by literature. Taplin has assembled a distinguished team, Connors, Dewar, Hardie, Kraus, Leigh, Morgan, all of whom have written with verve and spirit, all with something new

[8] *Roles and Performances in Apuleius' Metamorphoses*. Beiträge zum antiken Drama und seiner Rezeption 16. By Stavros Frangoulidis. J. B. Metzler, Stuttgart and Weimar, 2001. Pp. viii + 197.

[9] *Ausonius Epigrams*. Text with introduction and commentary by N. M. Kay. Duckworth, London, 2001. Pp. 315. £40.00.

[10] *Literature in the Roman World*. Edited by Oliver Taplin. Oxford U.P., 2001. £9.99.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.245 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to say even when treating the most familiar material. Undergraduates will enjoy this work immensely, but, I fear, will be tempted to use it not as a foundation on which to build but as the ultimate authority on the works discussed. Of course, all secondary material runs that risk but this does seem especially seductive from that point of view. There is one further oddity; at the end there is a useful collection of suggestions for further reading and a list of 49 suggested translations; of these, 25 were published by O.U.P., 14 are Loebs, seven are Penguins; the last three are from Baltimore, Leeds and Liverpool.

D. E. HILL

Greek History

Gambling, GBH, rent-boys and a cast of characters including 'Stammering' Demosthenes, Hegesippus 'The Hair' and Timarchus 'The Tart' (270): *Against Timarchus* has all the ingredients of a cockney gangster flick. (Minus the expletives but with the added bonus of cock-fighting and quail-tapping scenes.) Yet – or should that be therefore? – so far there has only been one English translation of this speech and no commentary 'in any language' (v). Nick Fisher's B★★*Aeschines: Against Timarchus*[1] fills the gap admirably, with a fluent translation, a 68-page introduction which offers, amongst other things, a significant contribution to the debate about Greek homosexuality, and a 239-page commentary which addresses a wide range of social, cultural and other historical problems, rather than primarily grammatical or literary issues. I hasten to add that Fisher does not indulge in the cheap sensationalism to which I so readily resorted in my opening sentences: he positively rejects 'rent-boy' as being 'in too low a register' (41) and chooses far more responsible translations of the nicknames bandied about (203, 265–7, 270). Notable features are a detailed treatment in the commentary (191–6) as well as in an appendix (357–62) of the organisation of gambling in Athens, and extended discussions of the role of honour in Athenian sexual and social relations. (See also Cynthia Patterson's account of the *moikhos* in the new paperback edition of ★★*The Family in Greek History*,[2] unchanged from the hardback reviewed in *G&R* 46 no. 2 (1999), 241.) The ethics of honour were a minefield in ancient Greece and their interpretation has become no less of a minefield in modern scholarship, but Fisher negotiates it by defusing rather than avoiding explosive issues such as the much-debated morality of buggery, and emerges unscathed. The fact that this commentary was created from scratch – unlike most modern commentaries, which can draw on a string of predecessors (see below) – makes its scale, depth and polish all the more remarkable. The only slip I noticed is the claim that 'the great majority of Attic vases . . . have been found in Etruria, not Greece' (33), a remark which I cite primarily as an excuse to pass on to you the results of a couple of hours of on-line fun with the Beazley Archive which I had the other day: actually only 5% of Athenian vases were found in Etruria, though at its peak in the second half of the sixth century the proportion did reach a whopping 10%. If Aeschines scored points off Demosthenes by having Timarchus con-

[1] *Aeschines: Against Timarchus*. Translated with introduction and commentary by Nick Fisher. Clarendon Ancient History Series, Oxford, 2001. Pp. xv + 397. Hardback £50.

[2] *The Family in Greek History*. By Cynthia B. Patterson. Harvard U.P., Hardback 1998; paperback 2001. Pp. 286, with 6 figures. Paperback £13.95.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gr/49.2.245 Published online by Cambridge University Press