lay his thunderbolts by'. Best of all is James Lasdun's masterly 'Winter's melting', I.4, with one rhyme per five-line stanza. Without such neatness, too many of these versions are mere inventories (often woefully incomplete) of the contents of their originals, sometimes mere first drafts for proper translations, their screws not tightened. Rachel Hadas's painfully awkward quatrains omit all but the argument of *Odes* II.4, so beautifully 'imitated' by Christopher Smart. But sometimes, perhaps another point is being made: incredibly, the brilliant Richard Wilbur manages to plod through II.10 without a single flash—is he telling us that Horace sometimes plods?

So one's disappointment brings a curious pleasure—the reader is drawn away from the present imperfect version to question Horace's meaning more deeply. The last poem of all (IV.15), translated by the editor himself, contains what seems to be a cliché: Augustus' empire extends 'From where the bright sun first rises/ Even to its westernmost bed'. But what Horace wrote was that it extends 'to the rising of the sun/ from its western bed'—we are going the other way, perhaps like the sun underneath the flat earth. Is there something hidden here? I had not noticed this before, but was reminded of the very clever sequence at the beginning of the book (I.2), where Rosanna Warren's version made me see, again for the first time, the subtle flattery with which Horace wonders which god will come to save Rome: Apollo, Venus, Mars, or 'you, son of Maia' (Mercury): 'go slowly back to heaven, enjoy being called princeps and pater, . . . Caesar'. So Caesar Augustus segues into that sentence as a god. Could it be that the odd phrase there in IV.15 is meant to add the Underworld to Augustus' empire?

To sum up, this book is stimulating but not entirely user-friendly, even to Latinists—no notes or glossary of names, and the looser translations mean using other books to see how, if at all, the facing Latin connects with the English. I found all such questions answered in James Michie's single-handed, meticulously accurate, and often thrilling versions of all the odes. But Michie's book seems to be out of print, like the wonderful Penguin *Horace in English. Progeniem vitiosiorem* indeed.

Newcastle upon Tyne ALISTAIR ELLIOT

LIVIAN PORTRAITS

J.-E. BERNARD: *Le portrait chez Tite-Live. Essai sur une écriture de l'histoire romaine*. (Collection Latomus 253.) Pp. 482. Brussels: Latomus, 2000. Paper. ISBN: 2-87031-194-X.

'Si c'est la rationalité qui est à la base de la prosopographie de Polybe, il faut, pour Tite-Live, mettre en avant sa philosophie morale du devoir et son dessein de prouver la supériorité du peuple romain par les vertus et les *artes* de ses grands hommes . . . La première tâche que Tite-Live se donne est de ressusciter le passé, avant d'en proposer une analyse' (pp. 360, 363). One would like to think that Bernard, who is otherwise a sensitive reader of Livy, would have come to slightly different conclusions had he taken into account any scholarship after 1995, particularly recent anglophone work on the historian. *Le portrait chez Tite-Live* is a doctoral dissertation from 1996, and though B. ranges easily over secondary material in several languages, he ignores crucial scholarship that would have broadened and deepened his systematic treatment of Livy's characters, exempla, and use of rhetoric. His repeated assertions that Livy was following Ciceronian guidelines both in style and in philosophy (e.g. pp. 19, 21, 40, 48, 247); his insistence that Livy was out to create the 'ideal Roman'; and the

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.361 Published online by Cambridge University Press

belief that Livy's 'grands hommes' illustrate a single virtue (e.g. pp. 261–4 Scipio Africanus = *temperantia*, Fabius Cunctator = *prudentia*) are all depressingly familiar, and reduce Livy to his old, psychologizing, rhetorical, moralizing self. Which is a pity, because B. knows that each of these points can, and should, be nuanced (for instance, he later draws attention to Livy's own criticisms of some of his 'grands hommes': see pp. 361, 370).

Much of the book is devoted to close reading and typology, and there are some useful lists, especially a comprehensive appendix listing Livy's principal portraits and the method of characterization used for each (pp. 413–47). The three major sections of the book proceed logically: (1) Livian methodology (placement, narrative continuity, and length of character sketches; *euidentia* and anecdote, scene, or tableau; characterization via and within speeches; general typology of sketches, i.e. simple vs. complex, coherent vs. contradictory); (2) detailed typology (family traditions, social position, and nationality) and the rôle of moral persuasion within that typology (including an interesting section on Livy's rare use of physical features and gestures as a means of characterization: concentrated in portraits of soldiers and women); (3) an analysis of the tension between the rôle of the individual and the collective in Livian characters (with sections on Livian heroism, the tragic aesthetic, and the relationship of mimesis, poetic truth, and historical truth). B. argues that Livy's portraits form part of a (relatively) seamless narrative continuum, of which the argument of the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. Livy's pervasive use of *topoi*, *euidentia*, and the *locus comparationis* (a device whereby character is elucidated through comparison between types) causes 'historical individuality to pass from the particular to the universal plane' (p. 394); paraphrasing Boileau, B. concludes that 'l'art permet au vrai de devenir vraisemblable' (p. 376), and hence allows the unfamiliar particular to rise to the level of the intellectually—and historically—comprehensible familiar.

So far, so true. But B. goes on to mire Livy in an unsubtle, psychologizing didacticism that reduces immoral Romans to non-Romans (not bad Romans: the schema does not accommodate them, see p. 287), and that sees Livy's 'heroic' Camillus, Scipio, Cato, and, indeed, his *populus Romanus* as reflecting Augustan values, to the extent that Camillus is presented 'comme un modèle idéal du *princeps*' (p. 353). Yet, while it is true that Livy can assimilate bad behaviour to barbarian characteristics (the Romans at the Allia are a prime example), like Sallust he is intensely interested in complex, even faulty Roman characters; as for Augustus, I would rather agree with B.'s remark, three pages later (p. 356), that the *AUC* 'cannot be reduced to a work of propaganda responding to the immediate needs of the current regime' (B. compares it in this regard to the *Aeneid*). This tendency toward inconsistency, in fact, is one of the biggest problems in the book: running underneath, or alongside, the Livy-for-boys didacticism (cf. Quint. 2.5.19) is another, more grown up Livy, whom B. occasionally discusses with the sympathetic tools provided by T. J. Luce (*Livy: The Composition of his History* [Princeton, 1977]), R. Barthes ('Le discours de l'histoire', *Social Science Information* [1967], 65–75), P. Veyne (*Comment on écrit l'histoire* [Paris, 1971]), and A. Vasaly ('Personality and Power: Livy's Depiction of the Appii Claudii in the First Pentad', *TAPA* 117 [1987], 203–26), but whose portrait does not form the subject of this book.

In the end, then, I have to register slight puzzlement and some disappointment. Such a textually rich, methodically arranged book with a 2000 imprint ought to be a work of reference for anyone studying Livian characterization. It is indeed full of good points, useful parallels from rhetorical treatises, and interesting analyses of the Livian text. B. makes intelligent use of the work of L. Catin (*En lisant Tite-Live* [Paris, 1944]),

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.361 Published online by Cambridge University Press

J.-P. Chausserie-Laprée (*L'expression narrative chez les historiens latins, histoire d'un style* [Paris, 1969]), and J. Dangel (*La phrase oratoire chez Tite-Live* [Paris, 1982]); he writes clearly, uses copious examples, and manages to keep his typologies from drifting into inert lists. The absence, however, of T. P. Wiseman (should his and A. J. Woodman's work on rhetorical historiography be thought to have so permeated the field as not to need mentioning, then one might expect at least a mention of his discussion of the Claudii in *Clio's Cosmetics* [Leicester, 1979]), J. B. Solodow ('Livy and the Story of Horatius, I.24–26', *TAPA* 109 [1979], 251–68), C. Gill (e.g. 'The Question of Character-development: Plutarch and Tacitus', *CQ* 34 [1983], 469–87), R. von Haehling (*Zeitbezüge des T. Livius in der ersten Dekade seines Geschichtswerks* [Stuttgart, 1989]), F. Santoro-l'Hoir (*The Rhetoric of Gender Terms: 'Man', 'Woman', and the Portrayal of Character in Latin Prose* [Leiden, 1992]), J. D. Chaplin (*Livy's Use of Exempla and the Lessons of the Past* [Diss. Princeton, 1993]), M. K. Jaeger ('Custodia fidelis memoriae: Livy's Story of M. Manlius Capitolinus', *Latomus* 52 [1993], 350–63), D. S. Levene (*Religion in Livy* [Leiden, 1993]), J. L. Moles ('Livy's Preface', *PCPS* 39 [1993], 141–68), W. Schuller, ed. (*Livius: Aspekte seines Werkes* [Konstanz, 1993]), and G. Miles (*Livy, Reconstructing Early Rome* [Ithaca, 1995])—to name only the most notable, all published before 1996—means that the reader will have to supplement B.'s treatment extensively.

Oriel College, Oxford CHRISTINA S. KRAUS

PROPERTIUS ON VERTUMNUS AND ACTIUM

F. Boldrer: *L'elegia di Vertumno (Properzio 4.2)*. Pp. 167, ills. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 90-256-1133-8.

R. M. Lucifora: *Voci politiche in Properzio 'erotico'. Ideologia e progetto elegiaco in II, 16 e III, 11*. Pp. 130. Bari: Edipuglia, 1999. L. 25,000. ISBN: 88-7228-241-1.

B.'s book is a very thorough treatment of Prop. 4.2 from every conceivable angle. My main criticism is that it tends towards the excessively doxographical and the needlessly repetitious. Everything relevant is mentioned, often in both the introduction and the commentary proper. Though the author usually shows good sense in her conclusions, she gives too much space to those she eventually rejects. As a compendium the commentary is careful and reliable. In the commentary proper B. is generous in her quotation of parallels and discussions of stylistic matters. The book contains a comprehensive bibliography.

Chapter 1 of the Introduction deals with the Etruscan provenance of the god Vertumnus and the location of his statue in the forum—on the corner of the crossing of the Vicus Tuscus behind the Aedes Castorum (p. 9, Tav. I). In Chapter 2 B. discusses the etymologies of the name Vertumnus and how they relate to various interpretations of the god's nature. Essentially, she concludes, he is a god of transformation, as Propertius portrays him (pp. 22–5). Incidentally, Hor. *Od.* 3.8.5 *docte sermones utriusque linguae* has nothing to do with any supposed knowledge of Etruscan on Maecenas' part, as B. would have it (p. 26 and n. 59). The aetiological dimension, both literary and political, is explored in Chapter 3. Apart from pointing to the more

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.361 Published online by Cambridge University Press