

JULIA DYSON HEJDUK, *THE GOD OF ROME. JUPITER IN AUGUSTAN POETRY*.
 New York: Oxford University Press, 2020. Pp. xii + 340. ISBN 9780190607739. US\$78.00/
 £53.00.

‘Roman poets found Jupiter, but they also made him.’ From this more than sound premise, Julia Hejduk revisits the arguments of her earlier article ‘Jupiter’s *Aeneid*: *fama* and *imperium*’ (*Classical Antiquity* 28 (2009), 279–327), to which she frequently draws attention in this book. The book nuances her position on the two key concepts addressed there. The evaluation is here set in the context of a fuller investigation of the panoply of Augustan poets’ treatment of Jupiter, with chapters on each of Virgil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid. The work aims to probe the contribution of poetry, to be understood alongside theology, philosophy and cultic practice, in shaping ‘the god of Rome’ through the Augustan period. This is an ambitious and potentially immensely rewarding project, the best structure for delivering which, its author concedes, was the cause of much deliberation on her part. Although any choice ineluctably risks attendant frustrations for readers who come to the work primarily interested in Jupiter, in Augustan history or in Augustan poetry, what is valued most is clear from the choice of poet-by-poet approach. Context is key. The potential rewards of a thematic treatment are largely overridden by the importance of exploring individual poets’ choices, with due attention to the tone, genre, and literary and historical context of individual passages. That said, some chapters, such as that on Ovid, who engaged with Jupiter more frequently than did some other poets, take the form of more thematic groupings rather than exhaustive exploration of examples sequentially within the poet’s oeuvre. Despite the laudable attempt to allow poets’ engagements with Jupiter to illuminate their age and vice versa, H., who is mainly known for her work on Virgil and Ovid, is ultimately more interested in the poets than in Jupiter, who serves rather as a key — albeit a very carefully chosen key — to unlock their engagement with the Augustan world. Her rather jarring description of the poets in question as ‘my friends’ (34) seems to seal this point.

The result is a very clear exposition, in part aimed to be accessible to students and more general readers, of the dazzling variety of roles and guises of Jupiter in poetry of the age. In the introduction, H. seeks to set up a context for what follows, exploring ‘Greek Zeus’, who is rightly presented as source of ideas and material for the Augustan poets rather than as a straightforward counterpart to ‘Roman Jupiter’; Roman religion; and the rise of Augustus, whose varied associations with Jupiter underlie questions of interest in the work as a whole — though H. rightly eschews simple equations of the two throughout the work. The overview will be useful to readers less familiar with any of these contexts, though the summary nature of the discussion inevitably brings some generalisation.

There is much of value in the book, both in specific readings and whole-text analyses. Worth noting *inter alia* are the reading of *ruit per vetitum nefas* in Horace, *Odes* 1.3.26; the exploration of the consolation of Hercules in *Aeneid*, where H. engages effectively with Jenkyns’ analysis; the attention drawn to acrostics, in which H. has a particular interest; the examination of all the examples in different books of Virgil’s *Georgics*; and the juxtaposition of treatments in works of different genre and time of composition (again particularly fruitful in the chapter on Virgil).

In considering the tightness of the relationship between particular passages or texts and historical context, H. treads a careful line, illustrating the variety of positions taken by different authors and by the same authors in different works, and indeed within the same work. Nods to possible relations to Roman society and to Augustus are careful not to push beyond what can be defended. While to posit a stronger line would have been misleading, the value of the book for historians is arguably lessened to a degree by conclusions such as ‘Horace makes Jupiter neither a consistent locus for protest nor a consistent purveyor of “Augustan” values’ (155), although the importance of exploring Jupiter’s pivotal role in the relation of poetry and power that is key to *Odes* 1–3 has been effectively illustrated in the course of smaller constituent parts of the chapter to which this claim forms the conclusion.

Ultimately, *The God of Rome* is arguably most interesting in its treatment of Virgil and will be of most value to those interested in Augustan poetry and in individual passages and works, while having something to offer many other readers. The overall impression is indeed something akin to H.’s own interpretation of Virgil on Jupiter. She draws attention to an author who deliberately places hints that lead readers in opposite directions in order to push those readers to decide what it is that really makes the greatest impact. H. does not set out in this book to present her readers with a similar, deliberately disconcerting hermeneutic challenge. Rather, through her very engagement with so many individual

passages, works and oeuvres, and through the careful evaluation of contextualised examples and viewpoints, H. ultimately creates a valuable framework from within which readers are supported to ponder further not only poetic treatments of Jupiter but the contribution of poetic engagements with a whole variety of deities to the societies from which they sprang.

Christ Church, Oxford
 anna.clark@chch.ox.ac.uk
 doi:10.1017/S0075435822000582

ANNA CLARK

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

SARAH H. LINDHEIM, *LATIN ELEGY AND THE SPACE OF EMPIRE* (Oxford studies in classical literature and gender theory). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021. Pp. x + 237. ISBN 9780198871446. £65.00.

The coincidence of the short-lived genre of Roman love elegy with an unprecedented expansion of the Roman Empire under Augustus is the rationale for Sarah Lindheim's book, which is a valuable contribution to the growing bibliography of the 'spatial turn'. To put it in a nutshell, L. explores the effect on the stability of the first-person subject of love elegy of an empire that is both expanding *sine fine* and prompting in response cartographic representations of a fixed Roman space. The ever-expanding *finis* of empire precipitate unease and disruption in the metropolitan subject and this produces various compensatory strategies. A Lacanian-derived account of the splitting, fragmentation and destabilising of the metropolitan subject's Imaginary under the influence of the shifting *différance* of the Symbolic provides L.'s theoretical underpinning.

L. includes Catullus as a proto-elegist, and a chapter on Catullus is followed by chapters on Propertius, Tibullus, Propertius again (Book 4) and Ovid (*Medicamina*, *Ars Amatoria* Book 3 and the exile poetry). L. shows what can happen to these poetic oeuvres when we foreground all those references to foreign places and products which are usually relegated to short explanatory notes, and the result is enlightening. She also draws our attention to some common words whose spatial meanings need to be taken seriously, *finis* and *via* most notably.

Of the four authors considered, Catullus and his addressees are more active participants in the Roman imperial project than the other three. There is a neat reversal in the relative positions of lover and beloved between Catullus and Propertius: Lesbia is fixed while Catullus roams; by contrast, a fixed Propertius needs to nail Cynthia down to anchor his subjectivity: 'Cynthia prima fuit, Cynthia finis erit' (1.12.20), Propertius declares, and L. argues that we should give the spatial meaning of *finis* full value. The seesaw between Cynthia's roaming and Propertius' attempts to enclose her is pursued through extended readings of 1.11–12 and 1.8a and b. In the case of Tibullus, it is the word *via* that is symptomatic: Tibullus simultaneously upholds 'a *via*-free Golden Age fantasy while embracing a world of love and desire that is overrun by *viae*' (97). An extraordinary use of *viae* to refer to a striped pattern on a Coan silk for Nemesis (2.3.54) expresses the word that has been unmentioned but implicit throughout the poem: for all his posturing, Tibullus cannot escape the expansionist project of empire. Another surprising usage to which L. gives full value is the reference of Propertius' Arethusa to 'worlds painted on a wooden panel' (tabula [...] pictos mundos, 4.3.37), on which Arethusa follows her soldier-husband's movements. L. speculates on what this panel might have been, and then pits the fixed boundaries of a cartographic representation of space against the dissolution of polarities manifest throughout the poem. A similar analysis is applied to the concern with *moenia* in the account of Rome's early history in Propertius 4.4.

One of the most interesting of L.'s discussions focuses on Ovid's approach to cosmetics in *Ars Amatoria* 3 and the *Medicamina*. Unlike the other elegists, Ovid, champion of *cultus*, does not complain that women spoil their natural beauty by covering it with exotic products imported from the empire and beyond. Far from taking a moralistic attitude to female beauty products, Ovid approves. However, this provides another example of the empire's destabilising effect on the metropolitan subject, which is emptied out by the centripetal force of these imports: scrape off the