new experience for many, but it should not be dismissed. There is little on the relationship between declamation and rhetorical theory, although this is a fault G. shares with many scholars; at least he is open (p. 90) about eschewing such readings.

On p. 2, *POxy.* 2400 is third century A.D. rather than B.C., which damages G.'s argument somewhat; on p. 105, for 'Hermogenes' read 'Hermagoras'; also on p. 129, differentiating between the Augustan declaimer Hermagoras (a pupil of Theodorus of Gadara) quoted by the Elder Seneca and his namesake from Temnos, known for his innovations in rhetorical theory, would be a great aid to the general reader and thereby remove any possible confusion.

In Appendix 1, 'Further Reading', and the main Bibliography there is some bibliographic confusion: the survey article attributed to Fairweather is in fact by Sussman. Fairweather's article is entitled 'The Elder Seneca and Declamation' (which can be found in the same volume of *ANRW*). To further confuse the matter, the page numbers of the work cited are in fact those of Fairweather's article, whereas Sussman's bibliography appears on pp. 557–77.

Nonetheless, these quibbles should not detract from a work that, while occasionaly frustrating, is a worthy re-examination of the subject. Most of the book's shortcomings are best understood as a challenge to the scholarly world to take up G.'s baton, an outcome I am sure that he and others would welcome.

University of Leeds ADRIAN T. FURSE
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni292

ARATEA

D. M. POSSANZA: *Translating the Heavens. Aratus, Germanicus, and the Poetics of Latin Translation*. (Lang Classical Studies 14.) Pp. xiv + 279. New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 2004. Cased, €70. ISBN: 0-8204-6939-4.

In this study of Germanicus' *Aratea*, D. Mark Possanza endeavors to understand the poem not simply as a translation of Aratus' *Phaenomena* but as a 'second original', a work of literature in its own right. Drawing on the methodology of modern translation studies, he is interested not in determining the accuracy (or lack thereof) of the Latin poet's version of the famous Hellenistic work, but rather in describing and interpreting the ways in which Germanicus creatively transposes Aratus' poem into a new context, the literary discourse of the late Augustan period.

Germanicus was not trying to produce a literal translation of his Greek source (as P. points out, no Latin translator ever engaged in such a pedestrian pursuit), as is clear from the many changes he made *vis-à-vis* the *Phaenomena*. These range from small-scale adjustments and variations, through factual corrections (as a true *poeta doctus*, Germanicus used commentaries, from which he learned about the Greek poet's astronomical errors) to jettisoning Aratus' section on weather signs, which the Latin poet apparently replaced with a discussion of astrometeorology. Even if the resulting poem is still very close to the original and easily recognized as a translation, its tone and the worldview it presents are, as P. discusses in detail, greatly different from those found in Aratus. Crucially, Germanicus dispenses with the central idea of the *Phaenomena*, namely that the stars are signs put up by Zeus to give guidance to humans in the context of an orderly cosmos ruled by divine providence. Instead, the Latin poet views the constellations not as a divine semiotic system but as a world of

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni293 Published online by Cambridge University Press

recognizable figures that do not just resemble terrestrial beings (humans and animals) but are characters in their own right. Inspired by the contemporary interest in aetiology, Germanicus greatly increased the number of catasterisms found in Aratus and thus dramatized and romanticized the night sky in a way alien to his Hellenistic predecessor. The special emphasis on the topic of love in Germanicus' star myths is, according to P., a sign of the influence of the poet's older contemporary Ovid.

The book has four chapters, in addition to an introduction and two appendices. In Chapter 1, P. traces the history of poetic translation in Latin, showing how from the very beginning, Latin translators always more or less freely adapted Greek originals to their own purposes and cultural contexts. Chapter 2 discusses the poem of Aratus, paying special attention to the underlying message of Zeus' providence. Chapters 3 and 4 treat Germanicus' approach to translating the *Phaenomena*: in the former, P. in a number of analyses of passages examines the Latin poet's general technique of adaptation, while in the latter he focuses in particular on Germanicus' catasterisms and erotic myths. The authorship and date of the poem are the topic of Appendix 1, where P. asserts that Germanicus is indeed the author and suggests that he wrote the poem *c.* A.D. 4–7, in his 'student days' (the proem, in P.'s reading, is thus addressed to Augustus, not Tiberius, and ll. 558–60, on Augustus' apotheosis, were added at a later date). The brief Appendix 2 treats a related problem, the question of reading *parta quies* versus *tanta quies* in l. 9; P. comes down in favor of the former, which supports his Augustan date for the poem.

While the question of the date is bound to remain contested, most of what P. has to say in the main part of the book is entirely reasonable and convincing. In fact, many things strike me as so uncontroversial that it seems unnecessary for P. to discuss them as extensively as he does. This is especially true in the first two chapters: that it makes no sense to judge Latin translations by an anachronistic criterion of literality is quite obvious and need not be reinforced by an extended examination of Livius Andronicus' *Odusia* (which, as P. himself avows, is entirely derived from the work of other scholars); similarly, the claim that Aratus presents an orderly universe in which the stars act as signs from Zeus will hardly cause a stir and does not warrant a chapter-length exposition. Even the chapters on Germanicus himself sometimes rather belabor their points, many of which are already well known (note especially Peter Steinmetz's seminal article in *Hermes* 1966, to which P. repeatedly refers). However, if the book is thus not entirely original and is occasionally slow-moving, it is also the case that the market is not exactly glutted with monographs on Germanicus, and P. is to be thanked for having produced a lucid general treatment of the *Aratea* that synthesizes much of the previous scholarship.

It is not clear, though, that P.'s account (however appealing) of the Ovidian *poeta doctus* who revels in erotic star myths is really the whole story about Germanicus. Like every critic, P. emphasizes some aspects of his text while disregarding others, paying little attention to anything in the poem but the description of constellations and their catasterisms. What, for example, of the astrometeorological fragments, which P. mentions in passing as having been part of Germanicus' original design (p. 110), without any further discussion of this disputed issue? How can Germanicus the hardcore astrologer be reconciled with Germanicus the playful purveyor of recondite star lore? There is still work to be done on this mysterious Latin poet, who was anything but 'just' a translator.

Columbia University KATHARINA VOLK
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni293

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni293 Published online by Cambridge University Press