in the sense of 'guidare verso un fine' lacks just that. Explaining 'imperium' is unnecessary here, as is the note on 'hoc'. The prayer for Drusus and Germanicus, who occur nowhere else in the poem and could do with a brief sketch, is part of the 'vota pro salute principis' rather than an expression of Augustan ideology. Notes on hyperbaton like 'tui . . . nepotis' are unnecessary. 'Sidus' is indeed a panegyric metaphor as C. proves. Referring to Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.47 would not have hurt here. The fact that 'iuuenalis' denotes youth is self-evident. 'Ut faciuntque' is said to suggest that the youngsters are already doing what their elders are exemplifying. That is true, and it is a topos of encomia (cf. my note on *Pont.* 2.3.47–8). C.'s parallels show that 'ire per' plus acc. means 'follow an example', but for her final two observations, namely that 'factum' here denotes something positive and that 'parens' is elevated in style, C. again withholds any support.

This takes me to the bibliography. Commentaries generally avoid endless citations of secondary works but concentrate on the most important. It is quite realistic tacitly to admit that no one can read everything and that some publications prove not to be useful to the commentator. Nonetheless, it simply escapes me how one can write a commentary on Ovid's exile poetry without ever referring to Walter Marg's crucial article 'Zur Behandlung des Augustus in den "Tristien" Ovids', in *Atti del convegno internazionale Ovidiano* (Rome 1959), II.345–54, repr. in M. von Albrecht, E. Zinn (edd.), *Ovid* (Darmstadt 1982), pp. 502–12, or Josef Hellegouarc'h's book on the language of patronage, *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la république* (Paris 1972^2), or Jeffrey Wills's on repetition in Latin poetry, to name but a few.

I will regularly refer to C.'s work, but, for the reasons given above, never without checking Luck as well.

Case Western Reserve University MARTIN HELZLE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni076

ROME IN OVID

A. J. BOYLE: *Ovid and the Monuments. A Poet's Rome*. (*Ramus* Monographs 4.) Pp. xviii + 318, maps, pls. Bendigo: Aureal Publications, 2003. Paper, Aus$70, US$49, £32, €45. ISBN: 0-949916-13-7.

A. J. Boyle has collected, edited, translated, and commented on all passages from the Ovidian corpus which refer to monuments or sites in the city of Rome. The Latin text has no apparatus, but a list of B.'s emendations is provided where his readings diverge from the Oxford or Teubner editions. The English blank verse, on the facing page, is more literal than elegant. This is an advantage for students who are not up to reading the Latin unassisted. It is a disadvantage for those who do not read Latin at all, as a sense of the sonority of the original is not conveyed.

The book is divided into three parts. Part I is a sixty-two-page introduction. Part II comprises texts and translation, with the Ovidian excerpts organized under topographical headings. Part III comprises over 100 pages of factual and interpretive commentary. There are thirty-two black and white plates, one appendix, a select bibliography, and four indices, including an excellent general index with sub-headings.

B is erudite and impassioned. He makes it plain from the outset that he is no disinterested observer. His preface begins:

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> This is a book about things which matter: poetry, cultural identity, urban space, political authority, political power. It deals with one of the most discussed moments of the history of ancient Rome, the movement from republic to empire at the end of the first century bce and the beginning of the first century ce, to which Ronald Syme gave the famous title, 'the Roman revolution'. It attempts to add new perspectives to that discussion.

It is Syme indeed who exerts the greatest influence on B.'s approach to his subject. Syme's was one of the greatest intellects applied to Roman history last century. However, historians have long moved on from his dramatic and hostile reaction to 'Augustus as the Great Man' in early twentieth-century historiography, and the constitutional and façade theories separating 'Republic' from 'Empire' which were such important props in the construction of his 'Revolution'. (The editors of *CAH*[2] [1996], X.xix state: 'there is no period in Roman history on which the views of modern scholars have been more radically transformed in the last six decades'.) B. is either ignorant of this fact or has chosen to overlook it (p. 31). Syme devoted a political study to Ovid in 1978 in which he predictably cast the poet in opposition to Augustus. He did not analyse Ovid's Rome, however, and this is what constitutes the 'new perspectives' which B. addresses. B. continues:

> The literary and historical introduction and the detailed literary, historical and cultural commentary focus not only on 'factual' information relating to the buildings themselves but on the semiotics of Ovid's descriptions, his representation of the physical city not simply as an embodiment and monumentalization of past and present but (increasingly) as the site of an ideological struggle between Roman cultural identity (*romanitas*) and its contemporary usurpation.

B. has updated the language to give it a modern, theoretical ring, but the ideas it contains are essentially the same separatist theories of the past. B.'s *romanitas* comprises all Roman religion, history, festivals, buildings, or institutions which managed to escape contamination by Caesar Augustus. It is no foreigner but a Roman who usurps Roman cultural identity, in B.'s view. The ideological struggle he contrives between Ovid and Augustus as representatives of clashing Roman cultures is nothing more than Republic vs. Empire, liberty vs. autocracy, Urbs vs. Orbis. This is the agenda underlying B.'s study. Below I will summarize why it disqualifies B. as a responsible commentator.

B. does not provide information which has the potential to undermine his agenda. First, the word *romanitas* is not Ovid's. It is a word first attested in Tertullian's *De pallio* 4.1. B. says nothing about this to his audience, the student of literature, history, or archaeology (p. xi). The unsuspecting reader needs to know that what B. has done is to take a late Latin word often used in current studies of ethnicity and culture and impose his own meaning upon it to disguise an old-fashioned, Syme-influenced approach to his subject.

Other examples abound. B.'s assertion that Ovid's burlesque treatment of Romulus was a covert attack on Augustus (and the 'new' *romanitas*: pp. 168, 185, 220) is made without recognition of the complexities surrounding Rome's first founder. These had been created both by Augustus' political and Ovid's literary predecessors, and are an essential backdrop to understanding Ovid's portrayal. B.'s insistence that Ovid's omission of Tiberius' adoption in the *Fasti* was subversive (p. 57 n. 49) is made without discussion of the chronological discrepancies in the sources for the event, nor indeed without any acknowledgement of the fact that he got the idea from Syme's *History in Ovid*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

B.'s agenda depends upon creating boundaries and opposites, so it is not in his interests to investigate the common ground which connected erotica, military power, religion, history, politics, art, and entertainment in Roman life. Augustus could advertise his descent from the goddess of love on a temple glorifying Rome's military might in a Forum honouring gods and heroes who were equally famous for their fornications, bastardy, and rape, only in a society which was long used to the blurring of boundaries. Augustus as Cupid's cousin in the *Amores* might raise a smile but hardly a shocked eyebrow (p. 8), in a culture where a senator could advertise his affiliation with priapic gods such as Dionysus and still expect to be taken seriously.

Jupiter's philanderings were always productive, so unless we are supposed to imagine that Rome was populated with Augustus' progeny of divine destiny, Jove's bed at *Fast*. 1.650 (p. 192) evokes Livia as Juno, goddess of marriage, not the sexual prowess of a *princeps* incapable of begetting an heir. B. says: 'It is clear that throughout Augustus' reign sexual morality was central to the imperially sanctioned image of the new Rome and the new *romanitas*' (p. 3). He does not see the irony in his claim that Ovid reduced the temple of Venus Genetrix, with its frieze of cupids in the interior of the cella, to 'erotic topography' (pp. 203–4).

Many of Ovid's erotic themes may well have been a response to temples and theatres whose paintings, sculptures, and plays would have been vivid in the minds of his readers but are lost to us today. B. does not discuss phallic humour and divine rape as a common motif in theatrical comedy, or even as a reinforcement of patriarchal institutions, and relate it to the stories which are liberally represented in Ovid's poetry. He says Ovid's story of the rape and silencing of Lara represent the theme of 'the control of speech central to his poem and poetic life' (p. 181). This interpretation makes no sense when the female had never had a voice in Roman politics, even in B.'s idealized, pre-Augustan Rome. B. makes no connection between Augustus' special relationship with the urban plebs, his desire to entertain them with 'ludi scaenici' and pantomime (which B. knows had erotic themes and effects—p. 261), and Ovid's representation of both art forms, not least in his lavish celebrations of popular festivals such as Anna Perenna and the Floralia in the Roman calendar.

B.'s agenda necessitates a reductive view of Ovid's work: he interprets *Fast*. 2.55–66 as meaning that Augustus, restorer of temples since 28 B.C., allowed the temple of Juno Sospita to remain in a permanent state of disrepair next to his house on the Palatine. B. asserts that in drawing attention to the ruin, Ovid was exposing Augustus' restoration program for the 'ideological rape' of *romanitas* that it was (p. 47). He registers no surprise that Augustus would choose to live next door to a pile of ruins for forty-two years, nor questions the plausibility of the idea. Nor does he advise his reader that some scholars have read the question and answer at 2.57–8 as meaning that the temple had ceased to exist before the time of Augustus. Such a reading explains why Ovid asks the question and relies on hearsay to find out that the temple once stood next door to the temple of the Great Mother, and why he does not mention the house of Augustus. The scrupulous commentator would have advised his readers of the problems associated with passages such as this.

We are given no sense that Ovid assumes a different pose in each of his works, that each poem addresses different social occasions, situations, and literary conventions over a period from 20 B.C. to A.D. 16. B. reads the entire corpus through the narrow frame of Ovid's exile. He does provide excellent factual information about Roman monuments such as the Temple of Concord (p. 191), the Circus Maximus (p. 199), and the Augustan Forum (p. 206), and the book is always an interesting read. But B. is no

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Syme. I sought in vain for provocative insight or thoughtful analysis. As an interpreter of Ovid's Rome, B. adds little to his black and white plates of the ruined ancient city.

Macquarie University GERALDINE HERBERT-BROWN
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni077

PUTNAM'S PROFESSIONALS

P. THIBODEAU, H. HASKELL (edd.): *Being There Together. Essays in Honor of Michael C. J. Putnam on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. Pp. xii + 301, colour photo. Afton, MN: Afton Historical Society Press, 2003. Cased. ISBN: 1-890434-62-0.

Michael Putnam, the dedicatee of these essays, is renowned for interpretations of poetic *libri* that read each book as a whole and uncover intricate webs of cross-references. This Festschrift is hardly a *liber carminum*, but its structure is subtle indeed. One is initially hard put to perceive what the blueprint could be, reading an introduction which first charts Putnam's career up until his *Aeneid* book in 1965, then, with a reference to his work as 'one of the most extensive and influential appropriations of New Critical techniques by classicists of his generation' (p. 6), interprets a modern poem. But linear reading soon reveals all: the contributions are arranged 'by rubrics', much like the middle section of a Suetonian vita. Where we would find there a synchronic account of *res gestae*, we have here Putnam's most notable activities as teacher and scholar, each represented by a contribution which it has inspired in a former student. Since *The Poetry of the 'Aeneid'* was Putnam's first masterpiece as a classicist, its publication corresponds to the assumption of office by an emperor in Suetonius. The 'rubrics' are, then, very appropriately framed as follows: J. Gaisser introduces the Apuleius commentator filippo Beroaldo, who stands for the particularly proficient teacher, then M. Munich reconsiders the subject Putnam examined in his first major article: Catullus 64. From there we traverse the book to S. Spence's epilogue, the point of departure for her thoughts on 'Lyric Irreducibility and the Cheshire Cat' being the passage probably most often explored by Putnam: the end of the *Aeneid* (12.938–52). Immediately preceding stands a contribution with a 'symbolic' significance that will be evident to readers who know how much Putnam enjoys being in Italy or, more particularly, at the American Academy in Rome: B. Redford's informative and amusing paper about 'The Society of Dilettanti on Classical Ground', which centres on the illustrious Sir William Hamilton.

Most Festschrifts tend to produce a mixture of genuinely important essays and others that are readable, but not overly valuable in terms of research. This one is no exception. S. Tracy has almost nothing new to say about Virgil's third eclogue, not least because he failed to consult E. A. Schmidt's groundbreaking *Poetische Reflexion: Vergils Bukolik* (Munich, 1972). A. Sens, by contrast, offers a pioneering contribution towards our interpretation of poems that are too rarely examined: the epigrams in the *Anthologia Palatina*. Analysing a tribute to a poet—Asclepiades' epitaph for Erinna (28 Gow-Page)—S. shows how an epigrammatist constructs the obviously fictional portrait of a dead poet by drawing on the late subject's work. Food for thought is also served by four contributors who, as Putnam has variously done, interpret the symbolism of 'epic designs': P. Bleisch on the hitherto largely neglected ekphrasis of

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni077 Published online by Cambridge University Press