cope with the demands of living in such a turbulent and complex time. Moral and political schizophrenia was not only endemic at the time, it was a necessity for survival.

*Chapter 4, 'Worldly Affairs'*. M.'s chapter on Horace's political involvement as propagandist is sensible and well informed. More of the material that appears in the end notes should have made it into the main body of the text. This is a readable and stimulating account of Horace and the interrelationships between image and identity and audience. At times the references to the 'concentric rings' seem a trifle forced, but the book challenges lovers of Horace's genius to re-engage with the major questions raised by the life of that poet in the critical period of change and renewal that was the time of Augustus.

*University of Canterbury, Christchurch* ROBIN BOND
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni288

## NOT BY OVID?

W. LINGENBERG: *Das erste Buch der Heroidenbriefe. Echtheitskritische Untersuchungen*. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, Neue Folge, 1. Reihe, Band 20.) Pp. 334. Paderborn, Munich, Vienna, and Zürich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2003. Paper, €46. ISBN: 3-506-79070-6.

The claim that all of Ovid's *Heroides* are a spurious work had already been advanced by Otto Zwierlein in his bewildering book, *Die Ovid- und Vergil-Revision in Tiberischer Zeit. Band I: Prolegomena* (Berlin and New York, 1999), esp. pp. 354–400. There Zwierlein argues that a revisor of Tiberian age, whom he identifies as the very minor poet Julius Montanus, did actually write hundreds of verses of the *Aeneid*, the entire *Appendix Vergiliana*, about ten poems of Ovid's *Amores*, all the *Heroides*, the *Medicamina*, and *Ibis*, parts of *Ex Ponto*, and substantial portions of other Augustan works, including major parts of Propertius. Quite understandably, in the midst of such an apocalypse, Zwierlein's specific claim about the *Heroides* did not attract special attention from the reviewers: see esp. J. E. G. Zetzel, *Vergilius* 46 (2000), 181–91; G. K. Galinsky, *Gnomon* 74 (2002), 685–7. Now we have a massive book by a follower of Zwierlein, who argues in detail for the spuriousness of all the *Heroides*. (As L. reminds us at p. 21 n. 11, he has a predecessor in Karl Lehrs, 1863.) L. substantially accepts 'die Zwierleinische Hypothese'—and that implies that in his book we will find an enormous number of references to seemingly unobjectionable Virgilian and Ovidian lines quoted with asterisks marking their alleged spuriousness (e.g. the reference to 'Ps.-Vergil. AEN. *4,550', p. 167). As far as regards the specific authorship of *Heroides*, L. offers no names (in fact, Montanus is never named), and limits himself to saying that the author of the single *Heroides* (pp. 1–15) is a different one from the author of the double ones (p. 25). The motivations that inspired such poetic geniuses with the desire of keeping their names and personalities away from contemporary and future audiences are destined to remain an inexplicable mystery.

Claiming that all the *Heroides* are un-Ovidian means of course that we should fix the problem of Ovid's own references to them as his work (*Am*. 2.18.19–34, *Ars* 3.341–6, *Pont*. 4.16.13–6). But obviously from a Zwierlein-inspired perspective this

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni289 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cannot be a problem: those passages (in the case of *Am*. 2.18, possibly the whole elegy) can easily be declared spurious (Introduction, pp. 17–26). The reference to a 'first book' of *Heroides* in L.'s title reflects his conviction that the poems were originally published as a corpus of three books, each containing five epistles (pp. 18–20, with reference especially to the analysis of Stroh). This means that we should stop looking for the insertion of spurious epistles in an otherwise Ovidian collection: either the epistles are all by Ovid or they are all by some other poet. The belief in a single authorship for the corpus also explains why L. limits himself to the examination of *Her*. 1–5: if those are un-Ovidian, so are the others.

As a 'Prologue', in fact, L. prefaces a discussion of three passages from *Her*. 4 (Phaedra) that in his opinion should demonstrate, through application of Axelson's method, the spuriousness of that epistle (pp. 13–16). Since these are evidently supposed to be particularly strong points in L.'s view, it might be worthwhile to glance briefly at them, in order to give an idea of L.'s way of reasoning. (i) *Her*. 4.6 *inspicit acceptas hostis ab hoste notas* is composed later than *Ars* 3.514 *innuet, acceptas tu quoque redde notas*, because in the *Ars* passage *acceptas* is pointed, whereas it is superfluous in *Her*. 4. This kind of argument is extremely feeble. Why is *acceptas* more 'superfluous' in *Her*. 4 than in *Ars* 3? It is important for Phaedra to stress that Hippolytus must first 'accept' and then 'look at' the letter she sends him, as even enemies do at war. If we move from literal interpretation to a slightly more ambitious reading, we may note that in fact the *argumentum e maiore* in l. 6 is soon destined to lose its rhetorical point and to come literally true: the reader knows that 'accepting' and 'looking at' the letter is all that Hippolytus, literally a *hostis* of Phaedra (and of all women), will do, only to throw it away immediately afterwards (cf. *LIMC* 5.1.460), without reading it through the end (contrast *perlege*, 4.3); for 'accepting' and throwing away a similarly unwelcome letter cf. Caunus in *Met*. 9.575 *proicit acceptas lecta sibi parte tabellas*. (ii) 4.93f. *clarus erat siluis Cephalus multaeque per herbam/conciderant illo percutiente ferae* is later than *Ars* 3.727 *solitas iacet ille per herbas*, and esp. *Met*. 7.836 *uictorque per herbas*. This is quite a surprising allegation, since in fact, if there is a place where the phrase *per herbas* may be felt as problematic, it is precisely in *Met*. 7.836, where many editors of the end of the nineteenth century advanced various emendations in order to avoid the phrase *uictor per herbas . . . dixi* (see Magnus's apparatus ad loc.). Emendation is quite unnecessary in the *Met*., but this is a good example of how much subjectivity is involved in this kind of pretended 'objective' argument. Also in this case, one might even argue that *per herbam* in *Her*. 4 is the most significant instance of the phrase: in the context, it may hint, with tragic irony, at Cephalus' throwing his spear 'through' the vegetal curtain hiding Procne; cf. *PCPS* 41 (1995), 7. (iii) 4.138 *cognato poterit nomine culpa tegi* is later than *Met*. 9.558 (Byblis) *dulcia fraterno sub nomine furta tenemus*, because, according to L., *cognato . . . nomine* is different from such expressions as Catull. 68.98 *cognatos cineres* or *Her*. 14.81 *cognatae . . . mortis*, where the adjective corresponds to *cognatorum* or *cognati*, whereas in *Her*. 4 it corresponds to *cognationis*. The logic of this escapes me: I do not see why *cognato . . . nomine* should be equivalent to *cognationis n*., and not to *cognatorum n*. (so Palmer ad loc., 'nicht korrekt' for L., p. 15 n. 3), and in any case what would be the relevance of this point to an argument about the anteriority of *Met*. 9.558.

The approach exemplified in the prologue, and more fully explained in the introduction (pp. 26–40), is applied to the text of the first five epistles in the core of L.'s book, a sort of line-by-line commentary on *Her*. 1–5 (pp. 47–251). He quotes a distych or a group of distychs (reproducing Dörrie's text), and adds remarks mainly

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni289 Published online by Cambridge University Press

regarding lexical matters. L.'s main preoccupation is that of collecting parallels with passages from the sections of Ovid's and Virgil's works that have been declared spurious by Zwierlein, and secondarily with Ovid's usage in his later (authentic) works, and with other later poets besides Ovid. Since it is easy to imagine that very few people are ready to accept Zwierlein's authority in this field, the only usefulness of L.'s 'commentary' might lie in the sheer collection of material. But most of the material is scarcely interesting in itself, and the reasons why L. decides to comment on a phrase or word instead of another are not always easy to understand.

There follows a section on the double epistles (pp. 253–74). The book is closed by an epilogue (pp. 275–6) and two brief appendices: one discusses the title of the collection (pp. 277f.), the other presents arguments for the spuriousness of some other passages in Ovid and Virgil (pp. 279–92).

*University of Rome 'Tor Vergata'* SERGIO CASALI
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni289

## NARRATION IN THE *FASTI*

E. MERLI: Arma canant alii. *Materia epica e narrazione elegiaca nei* Fasti *di Ovidio*. Pp. 356. Florence: Università degli Studi di Firenze, Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità 'Giorgio Pasquale', 2000. L50,000.

Merli's stimulating book continues the critical tradition which has kept generic issues of Ovid's *Fasti* at the forefront—consider, just recently, the studies of Hinds, Barchiesi, Miller, Newlands, and Gee. Like Stephen Hinds in his pathbreaking *The Metamorphosis of Persephone*, she takes as her point of departure Richard Heinze's famous monograph, *Ovids elegische Erzählung*, which in 1919 launched serious literary study of Ovid's calendar-elegy by sketching an elegiac style vs. the 'epic' Ovidian style of the *Metamorphoses.* Hinds reconsidered the very centerpiece of Heinze's work, his generic analysis of the Ceres and Proserpina episodes in the two Ovidian poems, and reformulated the problematic with a new, dynamic concept of genre. M., in contrast, builds upon other parts of Heinze's study—in particular his acknowledgement of Latin elegy's adaptability—and with a critical sensibility which owes as much to Heinze as to more recent students of Ovid. Her subject is how the stereotypical epic theme of war is treated in the elegiac *Fasti*, whose primary link with earlier Roman elegy is for M. the theme of peace (cf. the programmatic 'recusatio' at 1.13 *Caesaris arma canant alii: nos Caesaris aras*). One may question her contention that the pacifistic dimension of earlier elegy harmonizes with Augustan ideology. But then M.'s chief concern is with style, not imperial ideology. In her reading the heterogeneous, sometimes contrasting, elements at play in the fabric of Ovid's aetiological elegiac experiment in the end coexist in equilibrium rather than sharply clash with one another in a strategy of syntagmatic tensions (Barchiesi) or of challenge to Augustanism's totalizing tendencies (Newlands).

M. does acknowledge the work's tensions, most notably in the book's first half, Part I, '*Deus utilis armis*: aspetti (e *débacles*) del personaggio Marte'. Where she would differ from some is on the source and the degree of the dissonances. Mars poses a problem in a poem explicitly concerned not with *arma* but with *arae.* Rarely treated in his own right after Ennius through the Augustan period, the war-god is an archaic bundle of cliches, thus potentially out of synch with his Augustan rôle as protector

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni289 Published online by Cambridge University Press