not a fraudulent denial of Augustus' earlier marriages, but a claim that Livia alone proved herself worthy to be/remain his wife. G. is cautious, but the procedure of using separate or later sections of the poem to reflect back on ostensible panegyric is not always equally valid. Thus he gives space to the favourite suggestion that the routine identification of *Aquarius* as Ganymede is intended to cast a subtle slur on Jupiter/Augustus (651 n.). G. is on stronger ground when he notes the glaring incongruity of Ovid's celebration (perhaps invention) of the matrons' successful blackmail by abortion in 619–30. This does not need to be juxtaposed with the celebration of the title *Augustus* to be a provocation, but it may be better interpreted as a defiant display of sexual libertarianism than a calculated slur on the Princeps. Strongest of all is the retrospective criticism of luxury and state blood-sacrifice which must strike any thoughtful reader of Janus's diatribe and the poet's own aetiology of *Agonia* and of various animal sacrifices. G. marks this condemnation as applicable to *Caesaris arae* (13) as well as to the opening consular sacrifice (85–6).

In fact, even a conservative who argues, as I still do, that there is no point in lacing panegyric with potentially subversive allusions, and that irony and subversion alike are the products of the modern reader, will acknowledge G.'s judicious restraint in this slippery arena.

G.'s text is conservative (twelve modest deviations from the Teubner), but he is always sensitive to generic and tonal diversity, notably in his analysis of the origins of animal sacrifice and the *Sementivae*. In exploring the literary tradition he goes beyond cross-reference within the *Fasti* to demonstrate in detail Ovid's creative variation of episodes treated in *Metamorphoses* (such as Janus and the hot springs, 259–76 = *Met.* 14.775–99) and his retelling of Virgil (Aristaeus, 363–80, the age of Saturn, and Hercules and Cacus, 543–82) and his construction of episodes and cults mirrored in *Fasti* 6. (It is good news that we can soon expect Joy Littlewood's commentary on this last book of the month.) We owe a debt to G. for this comprehensive treatment, which provides a valuable key to the pivotal rôle of *Fasti* in the enforced accommodation of poetry to the principate.

Toronto ELAINE FANTHAM
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni279

THE ANNALISTS

H. BECK, U. WALTER: *Die frühen römischen Historiker I. Von Fabius Pictor bis Cn. Gellius.* Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert. (Texte zur Forschung 76.) Pp. 384. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001. Cased, SFr 66.70, €39.90. ISBN: 3-534-14757-X.

H. BECK, U. WALTER: *Die frühen römischen Historiker II. Von Coelius Antipater bis Pomponius Atticus.* Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert. (Texte zur Forschung 77.) Pp. 384. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2004. Cased, SFr 66.70, €39.90. ISBN: 3-534-14758-8.

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

E. RUSCHENBUSCH: *Die frühen römischen Annalisten. Untersuchungen zur Geschichtsschreibung des 2. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Philippika: Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen 2.) Pp. 154. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004. Paper, €48. ISBN: 3-447-05015-2.

The last decade has been a good one for the fragmentary Roman historians, bringing us—to name but a few—M. Chassignet's Budé edition of *L'Annalistique Romaine* (1996–2004), scholarly editions of the fragments of individual authors (e.g. G. Forsythe on Calpurnius Piso Frugi, C. Santini on Cassius Hemina, S. Walt on Licinius Macer), and the promise of a re-edition on a large scale of H. Peter's *Historicorum Romanorum reliquiae* by a collaboration of scholars headed by T. J. Cornell. Stimulating works such as S. P. Oakley's magisterial survey of Livy's precursors (*A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X. Volume I: Introduction and Book VI* [Oxford, 1997], pp. 13–108), and collections of papers such as U. Eigler *et al.* (edd.), *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontext* (Darmstadt, 2003) have opened new horizons on the nature and purpose of these lost historians. The earliest historical texts in Latin to survive intact are Caesar's *Commentarii*, the earliest even remotely annalistic history, Sallust's *Bellum Iugurthinum*; what was Roman historiography like before the late 50s B.C.E.? The two titles under review approach this question in different but complementary ways.

The Greek historian E. Ruschenbusch has turned to a subject on which he has occasionally published (e.g. in *Historia* 27 [1978] 232–4 and 46 [1997] 185–95), that is, the eight historiographers from Q. Fabius Pictor to C. Sempronius Tuditanus. Evoking the memory of his teachers B. Snell, K. von Fritz, and A. Thierfelder (among others: p. 7), this monograph comprises a series of short chapters on topics associated with the fragmentary texts, e.g. book numbers and distribution of material (pp. 16–17), Cato's *Origines* and the 'tabula apud pontificem maximum' (pp. 34–7). These chapters are followed by the fragments and *testimonia*, arranged in chronological order of the events themselves (an outline overview precedes, pp. 54–66), and including both Peter's fragments (using his text) and supplementary text from Ennius and Diodorus, together with material from Polybius and Livy derived from but unattributed to named 'early annalists'. This attempt to give coherence to the lost narrative of early Roman history is a useful, though ultimately fruitless, exercise (how much of that narrative has been irretrievably reshaped by the surviving authors from whom our sense of it derives?). In some ways, this slim volume is a curiosity: the (relatively unannotated) thoughts of a distinguished ancient historian on certain aspects of early Roman historiography, together with a convenient text and translation of the relevant surviving material.

Beck and Walter also provide someone else's Greek/Latin text and their own German translation, but on a much expanded scale, going up through the Triumviral period and ending with Atticus' *Liber annalis*. They distinguish themselves from Chassignet's contemporaneous, multi-volume edition of many of the same texts by promising fuller annotation than is possible in the Budé series (though it must be said that Chassignet's notes are unusually full even for a modern Budé, and provide far more information than B. & W. imply). Their stated aim is to make these historians more accessible by providing translation, historical commentary, and an improved text (I: 7). Each volume begins with a bibliography of frequently cited works,

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reflecting the surge in recent scholarship on the historians and bringing the reissues (with bibliographical *addenda*) of Peter's Volumes I (1967) and II (1993) up-to-date through the end of the twentieth century. Historians included are (Volume I) Fabius Pictor (with whom B. & W. group the Latin text of 'N.' Fabius Pictor, deeming it to be a translation of Q.'s text; but see G. Forsythe, *BMCR* 2002.04.28), Cincius Alimentus, Cato, Postumius Albinus, Acilius, Cassius Hemina, Calpurnius Piso Frugi, Sempronius Tuditanus, Fannius, and Gellius; (Volume II) Coelius Antipater, Sempronius Asellio, Rutilius Rufus, Claudius Quadrigarius, Valerius Antias, Cornelius Sisenna, Licinius Macer, Aelius Tubero, Pomponius Atticus. The *OGR* is accepted as a legitimate source for fragments, as it is by Chassignet and other recent editors. B. & W. differ particularly from Chassignet in not including any fragments from the *Annales Maximi*; they also omit the shadowy Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus, Vennonius, Fannius, Procilius, and Scribonius Libo. They reverse Peter's order of Postumius and Cato (as, cautiously, does Chassignet), but follow him in dating Valerius Antias between Claudius Quadrigarius and Sisenna (contra Chassignet and, among others, Wiseman). Atticus has (probably wrongly) been moved back from his position in Peter alongside Cicero and Nepos, into a grouping with others whose works are the 'direct precursors' of the four major subgenres represented by the earliest wholly or partially extant Latin historiography, i.e. monograph, 'Zeitgeschichte', 'Gesamtgeschichte', and epitome (II: 17; but see N. Horsfall, *Cornelius Nepos* [Oxford, 1989], p. xvii, giving Nepos the clear 'formal priority' in the writing of *Chronika*). Each volume concludes with indices of Names and Things, though neither of words nor of source *loci*; consultation of Peter (for the former) and Peter or Chassignet (for quoting sources) will still be essential. B. & W. have conveniently and pragmatically adopted Chassignet's fragment numbering; but they have also given the ancient authors themselves numbers, *à la* Jacoby (so Peter's fr. 1 of Pictor is B. & W. *FRH* 1 F1). Since they do not give *testimonia* separately, however, there is no category corresponding to Jacoby's 'T'. Finally, there are concordances giving *FRH* numbers for those of *HRR*, but not vice versa.

Despite their claims to a 'verbesserten Textkonstitution', B. & W. have no critical apparatus. Instead, they use a text that is essentially Chassignet's, referring the reader to other editions for discussion of textual issues (I: 51–2). Despite their caveat that they offer 'keine Fragmentsammlung im philologischen Sinn', this is a curious, and curiously disappointing, decision. Nor are they concerned with stylistic and linguistic analysis (I: 53)—in the case particularly of the earlier authors perhaps reasonably so, not so much given the editors' research interests (style matters!), but because so many of these texts are not *verbatim* quotations. But their exclusively historical bent rather leaves those authors who (like Sisenna) were cited for their linguistic interest out in the cold.

On Cato, *FRH* 3 F1,11 (= 11P, Serv. *ad* Virg. *Aen.* 6.760), B. & W. have little on the Alban king list and its associated problems either ad loc. or at Piso *FRH* 7 F28, to which they refer; no reference at either place to the Taormina fragment of Pictor (*FRH* 1 F1), though there B. & W. correctly note that we have here the first evidence for the fictive king list (I: 63). They seem not to discuss its ramifications for early chronography (see e.g. R. M. Ogilvie, *CR* 24 [1974], 65), and have almost nothing on the difficult problem of the authenticity of these fragments of Cato (I: 164, only a reference to Schröder, who deems F11 *not* pure Cato!). On the tribune 'Caedicius' (*FRH* 3 F4,7a [= 83P]) they are rather minimalist. They follow it with a new 'fragment' of Cato which they believe refers to the tribune story (*FRH* 3 F4,7b [= Cic. *Sen.* 75]): *legiones nostras, quod scripsi in Originibus, in eum locum saepe profectas*

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni280 Published online by Cambridge University Press

alacri animo et erecto, unde se redituras numquam arbitrarentur. Powell (ad loc.) parallels this with *Tusc.* 1.101 *legiones scribit Cato saepe alacres in eum locum profectas unde redituras se non arbitrarentur*, whose similar phrasing may indeed suggest a Catonian original; but the language is more 'historiographical' than specifically Catonian, and the similarity to (e.g.) Catullus 3.11 *illuc unde negant redire quemquam*, which can itself be paralleled from Greek literature (Fordyce, ad loc.), suggests that we have here a shorthand evocation of a stock scene (note the *saepe* in both Cicero passages). For this, as for the narrative of the tribune's deed itself, stylistic and linguistic considerations would bring greater understanding of historiographical technique, and hence of what is and what is not a bit of genuine Cato. Similar problems subsist in Volume II, e.g. with *FRH* 14 F12 (= 12P), the story 'quoted' by Gellius as coming from 'libri annales', where B. & W. do not really address the question of its authenticity (but see S. P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X. Volume II: Books VII and VIII* [Oxford, 1998], p. 231 n. 2 with bibliography)—again, many of the cogent arguments against Claudian authorship are based on stylistic considerations. Finally, it is nice to see the shaggy dogs from the *Paradoxographus Palatinus* make their way into one of these collections (*FRH* 3 F2,8a; to be F75 in the new text edited by the Cornell *équipe*), and B. & W. have a decent note, but one which just scratches the surface of the relationship between paradoxography and history and Cato's apparent predilection for *thaumata*, merely pointing (I: 152) to the 'ethnographically inspired' history of this part of the *Origines*. But the issue is much deeper, as brought out, for example, by E. Gabba in *JRS* 91 (1981), 50–62, and by A. J. Woodman in *Tacitus Reviewed* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 168–89.

It is hard to know for whom this collection is intended: it seems to this reviewer that it falls between stools, neither providing the desiderated revision/rethinking of Peter nor really meeting the need for greater accessibility of these texts on more than a superficial level. (*Non omnia possumus omnes*: it is a pleasure to thank Dr Horsfall and Prof. Woodman for learned help in preparing this review.)

Yale University CHRISTINA S. KRAUS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni280

CATULLUS

M. B. Skinner: *Catullus in Verona. A Reading of the Elegiac* Libellus*, Poems 65–116*. Pp. xl + 256. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2003. Cased, US$59.95 (CD-ROM, US$9.95). ISBN: 0-8142-0937-8 (0-8142-9023-X CD-ROM).

C. Nappa: *Aspects of Catullus' Social Fiction*. (Studien zur klassischen Philologie 125.) Pp. 180. Frankfurt, etc.: Peter Lang, 2001. Paper, £24. ISBN: 3-631-37808-4 (US ISBN: 0-8204-5387-0).

If the earlier part of the twentieth century saw Catullus as—above all—a poet of passionate and anguished love, and the middle decades of the century as a refined Callimachean artist (a view enshrined in Kenneth Quinn's famous, or infamous, doctrine of 'levels of intent', which relegated the invective poems to the margins of the poet's *oeuvre*), the pendulum has—it seems—now definitively swung in the other direction. Recent studies (notably the monographs by Brian Krostenko and David

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni280 Published online by Cambridge University Press