atmosphere from heroic epic to bucolic and replacing his comic leaps in register—from *Amphitryoniades* to a tired herdsman—with a more uniform 'tono medio'. What is more, he refocuses Propertius' rather superficial treatment of aetiology point by point—both here and elsewhere in the *Fasti*'s sustained dialogue with Propertius 4—with a less oblique, fuller, and more relevant treatment of antiquarian matters. The programmatic allusions to Propertius' fourth book in Ovid's proem should therefore be understood as polemical rather than as a signal that he will continue or complete the aetiological project of his elegiac predecessor (cf. Miller, *Ovid's Elegiac Festivals*, pp. 17–21). On the other hand, Ovid looks to Virgil's narrative of Cacus as a structural template but rearranges and otherwise adapts the material in accord with principles found in the historiographical tradition. At times Ovid reorganizes Virgil's narrative into a more linear progression of motifs; he styles Cacus more the human ogre than the horrendous beast encountered in Virgil; he otherwise draws on the rationalistic elements found in the historians' treatments of the episode. But Ovid is here redefining epic rather than parodying it as Propertius 4.9 did. Ovid's Cacus at first adheres to the rules of an epic duel before seeking recourse to his Vulcanic powers. At 1.563–64 the poet emulates Virgil on his own terms by alluding to a part of Homer's Polyphemus episode which Virgil overlooked in his own reference to that intertext. In general, the *Fasti* seeks a balance between the antiquarian prose writers and the epic tradition as a source for aetiology.

M.'s monograph makes an important contribution to our understanding of Ovid's calendar-poem. Students of Latin elegy will want to compare her characterization of Ovid's new kind of elegy with J. DeBrohun's recent argument for Propertius' fourth book as a 'third' entity positioned between elegy and epic (*Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy*, 2003). To what extent is epic a strong foil in each? To what extent is there a genuine dialectic between the genres? For the *Fasti*, M. greatly opens up the range of epic intertexts beyond the *Aeneid*, and in her detailed explications sheds new light on the work's peculiar style. Her discussions are at once always in touch with the relevant scholarship and refreshingly independent. One comes away from M.'s study with a more nuanced appreciation of the *Fasti*'s engagement with epic.

University of Virginia JOHN F. MILLER
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni290

ORATORS UNDER AUGUSTUS

A. Balbo (ed.): *I frammenti degli oratori romani dell'età augustea e tiberiana. Parte prima: Età augustea*. (Minima Philologica, Serie latina, 1.) Pp. 295. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2004. Paper, €20. ISBN: 88-7694-743-4.

Editiones fragmentorum occupy a privileged place in antiquarian scholarship, for these bits that cannot be put back together again ask most eloquently the question, 'What have we lost?' ('I have seen the mangled limbs of a beautiful body'—and Petrarch was referring only to corrupt and lacunose copies of Quintilian.) Of course, 'antiquarianism' has acquired something of a bad reputation in an era dominated by cultural studies (which tends to restitch the past's social fabric rather than fetishize its loose ends), though one suspects that the growing number of classicists who work on 'fragmentation' and who tend to invoke 'memory' more often than 'history' are the unwitting participants in an antiquarian turn. Andrea Balbo is somewhat aware

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni291 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of this backdrop, offering some discussion of the meaning of 'fragment' in his introduction, though his citation, for example, of Glenn W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente Sammeln* (Göttingen, 1997) simplifies the discussion there into rather pedestrian advice about editorial criteria. For the most part, B. presents himself instead as a rather straightforward continuator of Enrica Malcovati, *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta* (first published in 1930; fourth edition Turin, 1976, by which time the title had acquired the clarifying addition of *liberae rei publicae*), which replaced Henrich Meyer, *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta* (Zurich, 1842), but only up to the end of the Republic. B.'s volume, a revision of part of his 1999 doctoral thesis at the University of Turin, collects fragments and *testimonia* for twenty-two orators active under Augustus; in his introduction, B. promises a second volume that will cover the reign of Tiberius.

For each orator, B. provides a useful bibliography, followed by a brief biographical résumé. *Testimonia*, individually numbered, follow. Next come any fragments, isolated to the extent possible, likewise numbered individually, and given pride of place at the top of the page; a fuller citation of the text in which they appear is given below in smaller type that makes it clear what really matters here. Unlike Malcovati, B. offers a facing translation of all ancient texts. Each section ends with a commentary; some of these are fairly long, and the mountains they make are not always more interesting than the inspiring molehills.

Any such project occasionally seems a little ridiculous. Thus, for example, Lucius Arruntius pater F6 enshrines the fact that the man once said 'Ready'. The most memorable bits typically are jokes (this, of course, is why they were not forgotten in the first place), such as 'Galba's brain has a lousy apartment' (C. Sulpicius Galba T35), though this was said not by but of one of B.'s twenty-two. Does an aggregate of such things really offer a picture of oratory under Augustus? Probably not. Anyone in search of such is surely better served by reading, straight through, Seneca the Elder's *Suasoriae* and *Controversiae* (the latter are the source of many of B.'s fragments) or the later reflections of Quintilian (B.'s other major source)—or, for that matter, the invented speeches in Livy. Nevertheless, B. has offered a handy reference, useful, perhaps, more to prosopographers and historians than to Latinists, though the latter will surely find here moving evidence of how silent even Latin's Golden Age can be, as well as a reminder that Virgil (shown on the cover!) and others lived in a world of words that extended far beyond the edges of the literary page.

University of Pennsylvania SHANE BUTLER
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni291

TAKING DECLAMATION SERIOUSLY

E. GUNDERSON: *Declamation, Paternity, and Roman Identity. Authority and the Rhetorical Self*. Pp. xii + 285. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Cased, £45, US$65. ISBN: 0-521-82005-7.

Rhetoric and declamation have become increasingly popular in the past two decades, but Gunderson's monograph is the first on Roman declamation since that of Bonner (S. F. Bonner, *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire* [Liverpool, 1949]). G. is somewhat cautious about the popularity of his book, a recognition of the fact that declamation is a subject is often mentioned by scholars, but there are not

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni291 Published online by Cambridge University Press