

L. CADILI, *VIAMQUE ADFECTAT OLYMPO: MEMORIA ELLENISTICA NELLE 'GEORGICHE' DI VIRGILIO* (Il Filarete: Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell' Università degli Studi di Milano 202). Milan: Edizioni Universitarie di Lettere Economia Diritto, 2001. Pp. 236. ISBN 88-7916-172-5. €22.00.

This penetrating study of intertextual relations between Virgil's *Georgics* and Hellenistic poetry (primarily the encomiastic poems of Callimachus and Theocritus) is both broader and narrower in its scope than the title might be taken to suggest. What Cadili does not in practice offer his reader is an interpretation of the poem as a whole: while ch. 2 presents interesting observations on a series of passages in *Geo.* 1 and 2 (the 'aetiology of *labor*', the weather signs, and the finales to the first two books), C.'s main focus is on the final part of the poem — the Aristaeus 'epyllion' and the *sphragis*. On the other hand, C. operates throughout with a much broader and more flexible conception of intertextual relations than the label *memoria ellenistica* might lead us to expect: his concern is as much with ideology and the dynamics of encomiastic poetry as with *arte allusiva* and the playful intellectualism with which Alexandrian poetry has been most commonly associated.

After a brief theoretical introduction, the first two chapters examine the encomiastic strategies of Theocritus and Callimachus in relation both to Hesiod's conception of the relationship between Zeus, the poet, and the *basileus*, and to Virgil's presentation of Jupiter and Octavian. C.'s own strategy in these chapters — shuttling back and forth between these three (sets of) texts — produces some striking and subtle readings of particular passages. C. finds in Virgil and in his Hellenistic predecessors a 'dialectic' of identity and diversity, informing both the representation of the ruler (likened to, yet distinct from Zeus/Jupiter) and the poet's self-representation (inferior to, yet interdependent with his *laudandus*). The role of both Jupiter and Octavian in the *Georgics* as guarantors of order can be traced back to Hesiod, but is once again coloured by Callimachus' conception of the monarch as a mediating figure between men and gods. C. tends to take for granted the idea that the *Georgics* functions primarily as an encomiastic work; this approach has its weaknesses (C. does not really succeed in dealing with the problematization of Jupiter's role which he rightly sees as operative in the closing sections of Books 1 and 2), but has at least the merit of moving discussion on from the rather sterile controversy over the poem's Augustanism or anti-Augustanism which has dogged Virgilian criticism for the last several decades.

The second half of the book centres on the Aristaeus 'epyllion'. Ch. 3 presents a rather rambling and digressive discussion of the narrative style of the Aristaeus and Orpheus stories: C. himself seems a little unsure exactly what he wants to say here, and ultimately has little to add to the 'subjective'/'objective' distinction originally formulated by Brooks Otis and subsequently refined by Gian-Biagio Conte. Long digressions on *Eclogue* 6 (130–5) and Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* (154–60) are imperfectly integrated, and do not make C.'s argument any easier to follow.

The final chapter looks again at the relationship between the Orpheus and Aristaeus stories, now analysed as functional and exemplary narratives. C. argues interestingly that Aristaeus' role as both pupil (of Cyrene) and *magister* (in that he 'discovers' the art of *bougonia*) makes him analogous to Octavian (as addressee and 'Muse'); less convincingly, the ritual correctness and efficaciousness of Aristaeus' actions in the closing lines is said to resolve the impasse created in Books 1 and 2 by Jupiter's apparent arbitrariness and inscrutability. C. goes on to consider Virgil's reworking of Homeric and Callimachean intertexts: here, he reaches some striking conclusions which offer a welcome complement to the metapoetic readings of the epyllion put forward in recent years by such scholars as Joseph Farrell and Llewelyn Morgan.

C. demonstrates a thorough and impressive familiarity with the voluminous scholarship on both the *Georgics* and Hellenistic poetry, citing work in English, French, and German as well as Italian. It is perhaps churlish to complain that his English quotations are frequently marred by typographical errors (e.g. 111, 142, 160, 194; I also note Kunstück on p. 148), but there is less excuse for errors in Greek (μένις for μήνις twice, 176). It is a pity that such careless lapses should have been allowed to mar a study which — if not always completely persuasive — nevertheless opens up striking new perspectives on this endlessly complex and challenging poem.

Trinity College Dublin

MONICA GALE