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/bni290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and not simply conqueror. When in *Fasti* 5 Mars Ultor descends to view his new temple in the Forum Augustum as an unabashedly stereotypical Ennian *bellicus deus*, for M. the effect of arid panegyric derives from this god's 'lack of narratability' rather than from Ovid's wish to reveal the emptiness of high-sounding propaganda (cf. C. Newlands, *Playing with Time*, pp. 87 ff.). In Chapter 1, 'Un dio elegiaco?', she argues (contra S. Hinds, *Arethusa* 25 [1992]) that Ovid's narrative of Ilia's rape in Book 3 does not style Mars specifically an elegiac *servus amoris* when the traditionally configured war-god is provocatively called *inermis* and *captus*. In this section Ovid is seen to aim for a middle ground between the overtly erotic and 'malicious' treatment of the story in love elegy (Tibullus 2.5, *Amores* 3.6) and the more sober version found in Virgil's epic, where the sexual motifs have been suppressed. The national calendrical elegy both reminds us of its generic parentage and asserts its distance from Roman erotic elegy. Reading in the opposite direction, M. shows how Ovid follows Ennius for the structure and other central characteristics of Ilia's dream but recasts that famous piece of archaic poetry in the modern terms of an epyllion. Book 3's other erotic narrative of Mars—Minerva and Anna Perenna at 3.645–96—shares even less with love elegy in its tonality. Here Ovid creates a 'transgressive space' within which to ridicule Mars without offense to the Princeps by staging the story in terms of a mime and by carefully bracketing the Fescennine obscenity.

Chapter 2, 'L'informante inutile', breaks the most new ground. As a respondent to the poet's antiquarian queries at the start of Book 3, Mars finds himself out of his depth: *nunc primum studiis pacis, deus utilis armis,/advocor et gressus in nova castra fero*. Displaying the bluster of a *miles gloriosus* and the impetuousness of the Homeric Ares, he is the only deity besides Janus to justify himself as a teacher of aetiology and to adopt the didactic persona of the Ovidian narrator. Other divine informants eschew a strongly didactic manner, which in the case of Janus reflects his clarity of approach and seems appropriate to the first god in the poem who holds forth on antiquarian matters. Mars' heavily didactic opening (3.177–78), in contrast, is pompous, making him a kind of inverted double to Janus, the model of efficient and clear divine teaching. Like Janus and Flora—but only those two divine interlocutors—Mars offers variant *causae* for the question posed by Ovid: why do matrons celebrate March 1, whereas you are more suited to male devotion? M. demonstrates convincingly that the relatively rare use of this common antiquarian procedure in the case of deities each time reflects the character of the divinity. Janus' double answer to Ovid's initial query underlines his dual aspect; Flora's multiple *causae* reflect her loquacity and licentiousness; the neophyte aetiologist Mars spouts an expansive list of *aitia* in a manner further suggesting his incompetence when compared both with other divine informants and with Ovid himself. Here M. sharpens the less differentiated approach to divine informants by Miller (*Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 3) and aims to correct Newlands' assertion (*Arethusa* 1992, 44) that Mars' behavior evidences that the gods are in general not necessarily omniscient. The reminder of the chapter sketches how, after Mars' incompetence as a teacher is called into question at the start, the rest of Book 3 marginalizes him by giving short shrift to his feasts in March and by highlighting instead Minerva and Bacchus.

Part II is '*Arma* in azione: presenze epiche nei *fasti*'. Ovid notes Caesarian and imperial victories very briefly, usually only in the space of a single distich, but he treats battles from the republican period more extensively. To two of these are devoted well-developed narratives, the Fabii at the Cremera in Book 2 and the Gauls attacking the Capitoline in Book 6. M. explores these episodes in great detail, analyzing their

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

style and structure, particularly in generic terms, and arguing overall that their contrast with the poet's programmatic declaration to avoid the topic of *arma* is only apparent: in fact both narratives confirm the pacifistic character of the *Fasti*—in neither does an intervention of arms succeed—and both conform to the elegy's style and ideolological direction. In the narrative of the Gauls' siege of Rome's citadel, which concludes with the *aition* of Jupiter Pistor, Mars is once again at the center of the poem's dialogue between epic and elegiac elements. After the traditional introduction of an epic *concilium deorum* (summons, gathering, formal opening by Jupiter) is condensed into a line and a half, Mars speaks at length, complaining in the manner of Virgil's Juno and Venus and asking that the Romans be given the opportunity to take up arms on a battlefield and, if they are unsuccessful, at least to die in glory. M. notes well how this typical heroic sentiment verges on the ridiculous in the present circumstances—what the god of war suggests is utterly impractical for a siege. Jupiter counters with the stratagem of casting bread at the Gauls—a minor part of the episode in the historiographical tradition which Ovid expands. The happy ending achieved by non-martial means contrasts sharply with the traditional epic values expressed by Mars; Ovid gives this added point by parodically evoking a martial encounter in the image of the bread loaves clashing against the enemy's helmets and shields. As he did in his attempt at antiquarian instruction, Mars again turns out to be a failure, this time more strikingly so in his own sphere of influence. And once again, as M. shows well, Janus provides an exemplary parallel: at 1.260–76 he too neutralizes the *arma* of an enemy assaulting Rome through a non-martial stratagem, for which he, like Jupiter Pistor, is honored with an altar.

As the *Fasti*'s most obviously epicized scene of warfare, the Fabii episode has attracted much critical attention—most notable for M.'s purposes are the discussions of B. Harries, *CQ* 1991 and A. Barchiesi, *Il poeta e il principe*, pp. 133–41. She again demonstrates at length how a typical epic feature, here the simile, is compressed and otherwise reorganized in accordance with elegy's style and ethos. There are also good comments on how the three similes operate in sequence against the background of sequential similes in epics. Next she explains what Ovid's presentation of the Fabii in battle owes to the epic *aristeia*, and in particular to the young inexperienced epic heroes who pathetically fall on the battlefield (Homer's Patroclus; Virgil's Euryalus, Lausus, and Pallas). Ovid is here seen to destabilize standard epic ideology from within the epic tradition. The appellation *simplex nobilitas* is ambiguous, both a compliment to the Fabian youths' lack of artifice and a critique of their impetuousness. The latter quality—and so, standard epic's ethos—is likewise highlighted by the antithetical military strategy of Fabius Cunctator featured in the epilogue. That the elegiac narrator credits the survival of the Fabian *gens* after the total massacre to one still a *puer non utilis armis* gives added programmatic point to the closing movement. So does the entry's aetiological frame, more varied and easy-going in its manner than the elevated enclosed narrative with its archaic Homeric and Ennian color, a structure which functions as implicit *recusatio*.

The final chapter, 'Un duello etiologico', takes a fresh look at the often discussed narrative of Hercules and Cacus in Book 1. Once again M. in the first instance builds upon—and critiques—Heinze's analysis. Her contribution is to show how in this case Ovid more carefully integrates a conspicuously epic episode into his new kind of elegy which aims to move *maioribus velis* (what M. calls 'an elegy *erster Tendenz*'). Quite in contrast, the two battle narratives show themselves in various ways to be foreign to the world of the *Fasti.* On the one hand, Ovid corrects Propertius' parody (4.9) of Virgil's version of the Cacus story in *Aeneid* 8, avoiding his reduction of the

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/bni290 Published online by Cambridge University Press