HERZOG–SCHMIDT, VOLUME I

R. HERZOG, P. L. SCHMIDT (edd.): *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike. Erster Band. Die archaische Literatur von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod. Die vorliterarische Periode und die Zeit von 240 bis 78 v. Chr.* Herausgegeben von Werner Suerbaum. Pp. xlviii + 611. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2002. Cased, €98. ISBN: 3-406-48134-5.

In 1971 I published my first review in this journal, of Werner Suerbaum's *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter*. I there criticized S. for inflicting on the reader too much discussion of traditional scholarly debates. Whatever the justice of the criticism (I now regret at least the tone of my concluding remarks), both that book and his subsequent publications have shown S. to be outstandingly well qualified to act as editor of Volume I of the new *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, himself contributing two-thirds of the whole. This volume provides an exceptionally informative guide to the scholarly discussion of material that is for the most part pretty intractable, with much fuller documentation than is offered by *OCD*[3] or *Der Neue Pauly*, or by recent Histories of Latin Literature. I could not have written more than a very small part of it, and I must register my unbounded admiration for the care that has gone into its compilation and above all for the accuracy of its presentation. I do not agree with everything in it, but that does not matter: the book is designed for people who will make up their own minds, and who want to be pointed towards the evidence and towards the main discussions of it. Such people have been outstandingly well served, and S. has earned himself a long and happy retirement.

Herzog–Schmidt is, of course, the new Schanz–Hosius, planned to appear in eight volumes (replacing the original five) and covering the whole range of Latin literature from the beginnings to A.D. 735: Volumes V and IV appeared in 1989 and 1997 respectively, and Volume VI was expected to appear at about the same time as this one but has (I believe) not yet done so. In other words, the project is now nearly half way to completion. Since this is the first volume in the series, it includes a general introduction by P. L. Schmidt (Herzog having died in 1994), arguing that we still need such handbooks even in the age of the internet, and drawing attention to certain differences between Herzog–Schmidt and Schanz–Hosius. Several of the points made apply to later volumes, such as the insistence that 'Latin literature', not 'Roman literature' (as in Schanz–Hosius), is the appropriate label: 'Roman literature' appears in the title of the very next section and at many subsequent points, and that seems entirely reasonable for this volume. S.'s preface makes the additional point that this is a 'handbook', not a 'history'. There are several sections of overall survey, and it is not difficult to read through the whole volume skipping some of the detail; but the justification for the entire project is the generous provision of both testimonia and bibliography. That is its distinctive feature, and it is certainly as a handbook for consultation that it will be used. I suspect that it will be one of the most consulted volumes in the entire series, simply because the material is almost entirely fragmentary or even non-existent: the only works included here that have survived complete are the plays of Plautus and Terence (and not all the surviving plays of Plautus are complete), and Cato's *De agricultura*.

The first two volumes of Schanz–Hosius covered (1) the Republic and (2) Augustus to Hadrian. In the new version this period is to be covered in three volumes, with

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

divisions at 78 and about 15 B.C. This first volume thus covers in 611 pages considerably less ground than Schanz–Hosius covered in 654, though the layout looks a little more spacious to me. I was surprised to see S. regretting that he was not able to give more space to new developments, such as the growing interest in orality, because he was constrained to map his sections onto those of Schanz–Hosius: what on earth would be the point of updating a handbook without giving space to new developments? In practice, I could not have guessed that S. had been working within such a constraint, and I think he has been able to give quite enough space to orality, perhaps even too much.

The distinction between main text and small print has been preserved from Schanz–Hosius, the former giving an overview of the genre, author, or work in question, the latter providing relevant testimonia and bibliography. But a number of systematic subdivisions have been introduced into the arrangement of the material, making the work easier on the eyes and (I think) easier to consult. Sometimes the bibliography consists simply of references, sometimes it includes discussion of detail not included in the main text: you always need to read the small print in case it contains something important. But your patience will be amply rewarded. Indeed, the small print is generally the best part of the book. (The main text has some oddities, right from the start. I was puzzled to read on p. 5 that it was only in the Ciceronian and Augustan ages that Latin poetry progressed from close adaptation of Greek originals to creatively analogous formations: what about Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* and Ennius' *Annales*? Similarly on p. 7 it is claimed that the archaic authors fall short of later authors in their command of language and metre: did anyone ever surpass Plautus and Terence in these respects?)

Nowadays teams of scholars are needed to replace what was originally the work of one man. The other contributors to this volume are Jürgen Blänsdorf, Eckard Lefèvre, and Ekkehard Stärk, between them covering every aspect of Drama (except that Livius Andronicus, Naevius, and Ennius are dealt with separately by S. as 'Die Archegeten', before the division into genres takes over), Detlef Liebs on legal and juristic texts, Hubert and Astrid Petersmann on a variety of preliterary forms, and Gerhard Radke on further preliterary material and, above all, on various linguistic and metrical matters. It is sad to note that Radke died in 1999, and Hubert Petersmann and Stärk in 2001. Radke had submitted his work in 1994, and S. has left it essentially unchanged but added some further material of his own: I think it a pity that he felt obliged to retain Radke's eccentric discussion of the Saturnian metre, adding only a warning in the following small print that it 'can by no means be regarded as *communis opinio*'; but at least he has added the warning. Stärk was the youngest of all the contributors, and the quality of his sections on Tragedy, Togata, and Atellana must make us regret his early death all the more keenly.

Not surprisingly, the work has some imperfections, of which I can give only a sample. Occasionally details are included for which no references are given. Sometimes the documentation is inadequate: p. 150 refers to T. 17 (*Amph*. 65–8) for competitions between actors but fails to take account of *Amph*. 69–74 or *Poen*. 36–9; on p. 170 only *Asin*. 11 and *Heaut*. 4–5 are given as testimonia to the fact that the Palliata was based on plays of New Comedy; on p. 180 only two *didascaliae* are referred to as mentioning the composer of the music, on p. 219 only *Stichus* 758–60 for the fact that iambic senarii were unaccompanied. There are some internal contradictions: on p. 172 *Rudens* is said to be Plautus' longest play, on p. 204 *Miles Gloriosus*; on p. 236 the last Terentian revival recorded in the *Didascaliae* is said to be of *Phormio* in 141, but on p. 250 we are told that they record revivals from 146 to 134.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/bni278 Published online by Cambridge University Press