

does point, for example, to the reservations felt in England towards the over-easy use of the *Gradus*, not only by dull or lazy schoolboys, but by poets, for whom it became ‘synonymous with a convenient epithetary’ (84).

S.’s own contribution, ‘Liddell and Scott: Myths and Markets’ (ch. 5), is a typically thorough and engaging piece of cultural history from one who has already done so much to record the place of Classics in British education and society over the past two centuries. He notes that lexicographical collaboration was unusual when Liddell and Scott were at work and speculates that they may have embarked on their project partially as an escape from the ‘currently controversial realm of theology’ (101). It is remarkable that their lexicon went through eight editions in Liddell’s lifetime, selling some 80,000 copies, and that their friendship ‘survived even the acid test of division of profits’ (100). S. carries the story through to the ninth edition; John A. L. Lee then (ch. 6) considers how to ‘releas[e] Liddell-Scott-Jones from its past’. For him it is a no-brainer that what is needed is an electronic data base, from which printed books might be created to meet the requirements of different types of user. He details the various categories for such a database (from ‘main entry’ via ‘syntagmatics’ to ‘secondary literature’); the tone throughout is upbeat. No whisper here of the problems which have beset the production of vast and complex databases in other spheres.

We then come to ‘AI-ZYTHUM: DOMIMINA NUSTIO ILLUMEA, or out with the *OLD* (1931–82)’ (ch. 7), John Henderson’s ample, subtle, quirky history (and prehistory) of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. He fulfils his aim, ‘to outline the chief lines of transition, torsion and tension between initial determination and final realisation’ (139), and spotlights personalities (e.g. Burn, ‘the indefatigably incompetent Scottish mountaineer’, 171) and sharpened pens (of a report on one specimen entry, ‘The speech of the Second Murderer is even bloodier than its predecessor’, 160). By comparison, the fare provided in the last two chapters by Patrick James on the *Cambridge Greek Lexicon* and Richard Ashdowne on *The Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* is plainer; there is more methodology in the former, more history in the latter, but each author has much to say that will be of interest to lexicologists.

The book is generally well produced; Crowley 1989 and Dowling 1986 (both on 101) are missing from the bibliography to ch. 5, as is Coats 1906 from that to ch. 7; ‘Henderson 1998, n. 173’ (170 n. 22) should be ‘Henderson 1998, 113 n. 36’, and there are minor typos (e.g. ‘othe’ for ‘other’, 159, ‘th’ for ‘the’, 185; ‘somnum’ and ‘1882’ for ‘somnus’ and ‘1982’, 183). And I doubt whether John Henderson wrote ‘... the terms is gives its slippery terms’ (143).

Southampton
ian.mcauslan@btinternet.com
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000858

IAN MCAUSLAN

A. T. REYES (ED.), C. S. LEWIS’S LOST AENEID. *ARMS AND THE EXILE*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011. Pp. xxiii + 208. ISBN 9780300167177. £18.99.

The publication of C. S. Lewis’ fragmentary translation of Virgil’s *Aeneid* is an event of significant interest to students of classical poetry and English literature alike. It is not every day that sees the release of a hitherto unknown translation of one of the most canonical works — for centuries arguably *the* canonical work — of antiquity by one of the leading literary critics of his age. In his introduction to the volume, A. T. Reyes relates the story of the rescue of Lewis’ notebooks containing his versions of the *Aeneid* from the posthumous bonfire (a curious parallel to the close escape of the poem itself from a similar fate, if the ancient tradition is to be believed) by Lewis’ secretary, Walter Hooper, who contributes a foreword to this edition. R. further provides a survey of Lewis’ engagement with and attitudes towards Virgil in his letters, autobiographical writings and academic works, and of his views on translation (including his well-known partiality for the sixteenth-century Scots *Eneados* of Gavin Douglas). There is also an enthusiastic endorsement from the Virgilian scholar D. O. Ross, comparing Lewis’ handling of Virgil’s description of the Libyan harbour at *Aeneid* 1.159–68 favourably with other twentieth-century translations.

The main body of the volume presents the text of Lewis’ translation, which includes the whole of the first book, the first five hundred lines of Book 2, and a little over 250 lines of Book 6; these passages are interspersed with synopses of the rest of the poem, and with smaller excerpts from the *Aeneid* culled from the translations that appear in Lewis’ critical writings and elsewhere. An appendix collects further discussions of and translations from the *Aeneid* in Lewis’ published

work. The presentation is clear and generous with space, marred only (for this reviewer) by a handful of questionable editorial decisions, most notably the choice of Gould's revised Loeb edition for the parallel Latin text, when it seems clear that Lewis used Hirtzel's Oxford text of 1900; the grounds given for this are that 'as a scholar, Lewis would surely have preferred Latin that was as true as possible to what Virgil had himself composed, so far as professional critics have been able to determine this' (30) — but the anachronism involved in this choice would presumably not have escaped Lewis the literary historian. Some differences between the two texts are listed on p. 183. The approach to orthography is inconsistent: R. alters Lewis' spellings of 'lightening' for 'lightning', 'comerade' for 'comrade', and 'hoards' for 'hordes' 'to avoid distracting the reader' (31), but leaves other non-standard spellings such as 'expells', 'buz' and 'pourtrayed', which are surely no less distracting — it would have been preferable in all instances to retain Lewis' own orthography, which is a significant element in the calculated archaism of his translation (an editorial admission of 'the neatening of some eccentric punctuation' (31) therefore also arouses suspicion). It is not clear why the subtitle 'Arms and the Exile' has been added: this expression encapsulates nothing distinctive about Lewis' translation, does not replicate exactly Lewis' text (which has 'Of arms and of the exile'), and is not even the opening words, since Lewis includes the so-called *ille ego* poem.

Lewis renders the *Aeneid* in twelve-syllable rhyming alexandrines; the rhyme at the end of each line never allows the reader to forget the formal structure of the verse, but the long, loose body of the line enables Lewis to achieve one of the most striking features of his translation, namely its ability to reproduce to a surprising degree the shape of Virgil's lines, even where the same word or phrase does not appear in the same position in the English as in the Latin (for just a few examples, see his versions of 1.46–9, 1.257–66, 1.292–6, 2.102–3 and 2.325–7). At times the translation is nothing short of brilliant, mirroring features of the text or even serving as an implicit commentary on the verbal texture of Virgil's verses: the rendering of 1.91 as 'And present death encircles every ship around' neatly points to the encircling word-order of 'praesentem ... mortem'; at 1.160–1 'broken thus' interrupts Lewis' line as the Latin word-order is itself broken, reflecting the meaning of the lines; might 'the Italian interdicted strand' at 1.252 reproduce the verbal disjunction in 'Italis longe disiungimur oris'? At 1.419, Virgil does not tell us in so many words that Aeneas' ascent of the hill was achieved 'with toil', but the implication is certainly there in the imperfect tense and in the scansion. The slightly archaizing compound adjective 'sail-besprinkled' nicely captures Virgil's *velivolum* (1.224), while Lewis' Shakespearean 'hurricanes' is an inspired touch to evoke the long sonorous syllables of *Aeneid* 1.53.

Lewis' echoes from classic texts of English literature are a characteristic feature of his translation, and serve to make an important literary point: although Lewis recognized the impossibility of recapturing a Roman audience's response to ancient poetry (see p. 16), the allusive quality of Virgil's poetic idiom, with its evocation of the iconic works of Greek and previous Roman literature, will surely have conjured up recognition of a kind similar to that offered to a modern English readership by Lewis' appropriation of the phraseology of Shakespeare ('go thy ways', 1.401) and the King James Bible ('the Trojan seed | Must bruise one day the progeny of Tyre', 1.19–20; 'how long, oh Lord, must they endure? How long?', 1.241; 'my unalterable will be done', 1.260). At times it is tempting to think that Lewis expects the reader to remember the original context of his reminiscences, as when the devilish devices of Sinon become the 'glozing lies' of Milton's Satan (2.80; *PL* 3.93), or Cupid's subterfuge at Dido's banquet instils 'new loves for old' (1.722), remembering that the discomfiture of those 'that do change old loves for new' is claimed in the old roundelay to be 'Cupid's curse'.

It must be admitted that not all of Lewis' translation is equally outstanding, possibly as a result of the lack of final revision: phrases and parts of phrases in the Latin are occasionally sacrificed to preserve Lewis' metre, and some renderings which could have kept closer to the original without injury to the metre are not easy to explain: it is not clear why *vani ... parentes* at 1.392 have been reduced to 'my mother'; *famuli* (1.701) are not — or at least, not exclusively, unlike *famulae* (1.703) — 'girls', although some manuscripts (not followed by Hirtzel) do read *famulae* here; and *tota ... urbe* (2.421) does not mean 'half the city'. At 2.433–4, Lewis translates as if taking *Danaum* with *vices* ('danger of the Danaans', reflecting Virgil's alliterative *vitavisse vices*), but as the text is punctuated here (and in Hirtzel: was Lewis using e.g. Conington at this point?) it must be taken with *manu*. Instances could be multiplied. There are relatively few misprints: James Hankins appears repeatedly as 'Hankin' (19 n. 58, 190) and Jan M. Ziolkowski as 'J. M. C. Ziolkowski' (26 n. 86, 190), and I cannot help wondering whether Lewis in fact wrote

(or meant to write) ‘king Acestes’ rather than ‘kind Acestes’ for *regem ... Acesten* at *Aeneid* 1.558 (as at 1.570).

In conclusion, although Lewis himself acknowledged that ‘every translation ruins Virgil’ (see p. 15), this is a fascinating and valuable addition to the long and distinguished list of demolition jobs wrought on the *Aeneid* in English. Had Lewis completed his translation of the *Aeneid* in the same vein as the sections presented here, I would have no hesitation in recommending it above other currently available versions; as things stand, however, these tantalizing relics must remain — like another of Lewis’ works — an experiment in criticism.

University of Glasgow
luke.houghton@glasgow.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S007543581200086X

L.B.T. HOUGHTON

III. LATE ANTIQUITY

L. S. NASRALLAH, *CHRISTIAN RESPONSES TO ROMAN ART AND ARCHITECTURE: THE SECOND-CENTURY CHURCH AMID THE SPACES OF EMPIRE*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pp. xvi + 334, illus. ISBN 9780521766524. £55.00/US \$95.00.

Nasrallah juxtaposes texts and artefacts to explore how Christian apologists responded to the Roman world and its claims of ethnic identity and religious piety. Part One begins by assessing the problems with the modern classification of ‘apology’ as an ancient genre that did not have such a characterization in antiquity. Here N. seeks to contextualize the Christian works within the broader political and cultural concerns that came out of the so-called Second Sophistic. She contends that, just as the apologists addressed emperors about issues of piety, so too did such Roman archaeological remains as the Fountain of Regilla and Herodes Atticus ‘speak’ about the value and acquisition of Greek *paideia* in high Roman society. N. does well to re-align the apologies not as works held in opposition to other religious traditions but as works involved in broader ‘cross-cultic and cross-ethnic conversations about the nature of true religion and right ritual’ (50). N. then looks at how the ‘truth-seeking’, ‘barbarian’ travellers Justin Martyr, Tatian, and Lucian (re)assessed Roman authority and the appropriation of Greek *paideia* in their movements through the Empire. The subservience (even feminization) of the natural world and nations (*ethnē*) to Rome on the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias are presented as a visual example of Roman claims to geographical, ethnical, and cultural authority over the *oikoumenē gē* (‘inhabited world’) in the second century A.D. Though N. offers an admirable discussion of how the ‘barbarian’ travellers, representing vulnerable, feminized bodies, questioned such claims of Rome as the cultural and ethnical epicentre of *paideia* in the Empire, her juxtaposition of texts and artefact feels somewhat disconnected.

Part Two moves into the cities and tackles the geographical attitude of Luke-Acts. N. proposes that Paul’s travels to Greek cities are best understood in light of political and cultural discourses about ‘being Greek under Rome’ that characterized much of the imperial actions during the so-called Second Sophistic. N. goes to lengths to draw similarities between the formation of a pan-Christian league brought about by Paul’s travels and the formation of the Panhellenion by Hadrian. But while Hadrian sought to reconfigure Greek identity and Greek *paideia* with Roman culture and ideologies, Luke’s use of Paul’s movement through the Greek landscape offered a Christian *oikoumenē* that spoke of a universal religious identity. Ch. 4 discusses Justin Martyr’s *Apologies* as a second-century text produced during a crisis of representation, in which *mimēsis* or imitation, an accusation typically directed at Christianity, was used by Justin to illuminate the gap between true representations and deceptive mimeries. N. presents an interesting contrast to the claims about true piety, justice and power by the Roman imperial family as made on the Column of Trajan and Justin’s reaction that such claims of self-representation served only to propagate the confused pagan imitation of true religion (Christianity). She explores how Justin used the purest form of Greek philosophical thought (Socrates) to show that Christians were not atheists, as wrongly named by the Roman judicial system, but ‘the new height of classical Greek courage, philosophical depth and integrity’ (146).

Part Three delves into the blurred boundaries between representations and their referents. N. begins with Athenagoras’ concern in his *Embassy* with the potential for images to be