There are some unexpected omissions: p. 19 reproduces the traditional belief that even private reading in antiquity was normally reading aloud, in spite of A. K. Gavrilov, *CQ* 47 (1997), 56–73; Laevius is labelled a 'Neoteric' on p. 116 and not included among the 'Preneoterics' on p. 453: whatever view one takes of his date, he surely should have been put in this rather than the next volume on chronological grounds; p. 194: the *Dis Exapaton* papyrus was published as *POxy.* 4407 in 1997; on p. 228 it seems a pity not to have mentioned *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum*, which has done more to bring archaic Latin literature alive for the modern public than any work in the entire volume.

On p. 176 Cicero and others are said to use the Greek terminology for the division of plays into acts; but the Latin for *meros* would be *pars*, not *actus*, and it would be interesting to know where the term *actus* came from. P. 180 fails to make clear that what we call *Langverse* were called *cantica* in antiquity; at the foot of p. 219 we are wrongly told that only polymetric cantica are marked with C in the manuscripts and all other metres marked DV (in fact only iambic senarii are marked DV); and p. 220 seems to imply that the Reizianum was not a Greek metre. On p. 253 Corneille's *Illusion Comique* is said to be influenced by *Eunuchus*, but the influence of *Miles Gloriosus* is more obvious. P. 258: Menander's *Leucadia* has nothing to do with the Sappho legend; is it likely that Turpilius' had? If you are reading p. 393 and want to know the name of the elephant recorded by Cato in his *Origines*, it is to T. 20 (on p. 380) that you must turn, not T. 2.

Trinity College, Oxford P. G. McC. BROWN
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni278

FASTI 1

S. J. GREEN: *Ovid,* Fasti *1. A Commentary.* (*Mnemosyne* Supplementum 251.) Pp. xii + 365. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004. Cased, €90, US$119. ISBN: 90-04-13985-0.

A separate commentary on *Fasti* 1 has long been needed, both to evaluate Ovid's choice of introductory material for the projected poem and to analyse the implications of his rededication and remodelling of the Augustan poem for Germanicus. While Green's commentary itself is both literary and historical, he has wisely focused his introduction on two topics unique to this book: first on Ovid's selection of material and the extent to which the contents of Book 1 (presented in tabular form on pp. 5–6) meet expectations aroused in the reader by Ovid's preliminary matter (1.1–62). Here G. focuses on star risings and settings, and the *laudes* of astronomers (cf. 295–310 n.) and on the variable *feriae conceptivae*, both elements absent from inscribed calendars. As he notes, the *Sementivae* provides the only ritual presented in Hellenistic fashion by the poet as master of ceremonies; in contrast, the inauguration of the consuls on 1 January is stripped of its central human participants and reduced to the silent setting of incense, flickering flames, colour-contrasted white and purple garments, and the Capitoline sacrifice of oxen in a world now entirely Roman (71–86).

The second section (Textual and Temporal in *Fasti* 1: Exile, Revision and the Reader, 15–26) turns to the remodelled text as we know it, with dedication and other passages clearly postdating the death of Augustus. G. distinguishes the processes of

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni279 Published online by Cambridge University Press

continuation (politically neutral additions to the text), updating (to incorporate new anniversaries etc.) and revision in response to the changing political (or better, dynastic) situation, and divides the periods of composition not just between pre-exilic and post-Augustan phases, but to include the intervening years of exile from A.D. 9 to A.D. 14.

He is right to challenge the way I and other Ovidians have overlooked the possibility of continued composition during these middle years: this neglect springs from two unvoiced assumptions: (1) that the poet was too shocked by relegation to continue a poem whose prime function was to conciliate the Princeps; and (2) that his time was fully occupied by five books of *Tristia, Ibis*, and the first three books *ex Ponto*. It is more problematic to detect passages written before the death of Augustus. Certainly Ovid might have begun to address Germanicus either in the year of his consulship (unlikely, given the absence of the consuls from Ovid's account of their inauguration) or even before. But *Tristia* 4.2 sees Germanicus only as one of *qui Caesareo iuvenes sub numine crescunt*, and even *ex Ponto* 2.5 finds Ovid timidly honouring the prince at second hand through Salanus.

To atone for past prejudices I searched *Fasti* 1 for passages that could have been written before 14, using G.'s own analysis. Besides the clear case of Tiberius' dedication of the temple of Concord in A.D. 10 (537–50), G. lists the less datable experience of exile implied by the dog-sacrifice of the Sapaei and the consolation of Evander's dominant mother Carmentis, with its affinities to the relationship of Livia and Tiberius. But what about 599–616? The verdict of G.'s careful commentary goes against a dating before 14, but the allusion to the Fabii (605–6) could be a pointer, since Paullus Fabius Maximus committed suicide in disgrace after betraying Augustus' confidence. A more elusive argument depends on what G. calls 'the sense of fluidity from one generation of the Julian family to the next'. There is the same ambiguity between Julius and Augustus in 599–600 that has bedevilled readings of *Aeneid* 1.286–8, and *Caesar* has to do duty for a number of princes of the line. Once adopted Tiberius could no longer be called *Nero* or *Claudius* (*Tiberius* itself is metrically inadmissible in dactylic metres). So who is—for it must be one person—*nepos natusque dei* (533)? Small doubt that it is Tiberius. And *tanti cognominis heres* (615)? This too must be Tiberius (also *nostri ducis* 613, and *dux venerande* 646, since Germanicus commanded under Tiberius' auspices). There is a further obstacle to construing these allusions as Germanicus, since he was not Tiberius' sole heir but co-heir with Drusus Gemellus, unmentioned by Ovid or by G. And the elder Drusus, honoured in 597–8, was Tiberius' beloved brother as well as Germanicus' deceased father. (Like 597–8, 705–8 on the dedication of Castor and Pollux in A.D. 6 is another courtesy to Tiberius.) While it is hard to believe Ovid would even have tried to conciliate the default heir (virtually co-ruler from A.D. 4) we may exaggerate his silence. It does however seem likely that in straining to compliment Livia as *genetrix tua* (649) Ovid may actually have increased Tiberius' resentment (G. ad loc., citing Herbert-Brown, *Ovid and the Fasti: an Historical Study* [1994], pp. 156–72), Perhaps then, G. could have been bolder in claiming intermediate composition during the years of exile before A.D. 14. His commentary has helped me to believe that the surviving text represents work from all three phases, just as the *Aratea* of Germanicus and *Astronomica* of Manilius still contain mutually anachronistic allusions to both Augustus and Tiberius.

So far I have avoided my usual protests at suggestions of subversive or ironic intent, but 650 itself offers a sample where G. joins the irony hunters. If Livia is *sola toro magni digna reperta Iovis* this and its recurrence at *ex P.* 2.8.29–30 (cf. 3.1.113–18) is

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni279 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/bni279 Published online by Cambridge University Press