

Ovid' on reception of the exile poetry, held at Durham in 2009). Throughout, C.'s presentation of statistics suggestive of long-term changes of emphasis in Ovid's exile poetry is another notable strength; this holds true both in the case of Chapters 3 and 4 on stylistic devices and for Chapter 5 on Ovid's use of mythological references. C.'s interest clearly lies in overarching developments rather than in the specifics of individual interpretations; the examples of stylistic effects created by alliteration, assonance, rhyming, etc., are generally convincing when sufficient context is offered but less so when sound effects are merely listed; of course, this in itself suggests the usefulness of the type of analysis put forward by C. for further, in-depth interpretations building on this work.

The book is explicitly intended to appeal to a non-specialist audience (p. ix), and eminently sensitive and helpful translations of all Latin quotations have been included for this reason. Similarly, while employed very frequently due to the subject matter of some chapters, technical terms for stylistic analysis are carefully explained. However, some traces of the volume's history as separately published articles remain: the trained reader will on the whole have no difficulty in following C.'s terminology, but for students, it is especially unfortunate that the phrases used to distinguish between Ovid, the real-life author, and the various *personae* constructed in the exile poetry vary between (e.g.) Chapters 1 and 2. With the exception of Chapter 7, there is, moreover, only limited use of references to other scholarship, in-text references are given sparingly, and no bibliography is provided. Tables substantiating the statistical analysis of the volume's first five chapters are presented in appendices, along with an index of general content. Nevertheless, a more generous approach to the provision of references and bibliographical information would vastly have improved the volume's usefulness to specialists and non-specialists alike. Despite these minor problems, this new volume will make a welcome addition to the libraries of those interested in the exile poetry of Ovid and other writers.

University of Wales Lampeter

MAGDALENA ÖHRMAN
m.ohrman@lamp.ac.uk

OVID AND MILTON

GREEN (M.) *Milton's Ovidian Eve*. Pp. xiv + 235. Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009. Cased, £55. ISBN: 978-0-7546-6666-0.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X1000226X

This admirable study of Ovid and Milton begins with Leigh Hunt's remark that Ovid was 'the favourite poet of our great Puritan' (p. 1). The time is past when Ovid's poetic identity was only acknowledged to be that of 'the good natured libertine', as Hunt characterises him, whose influence extended no farther than Milton's early Latin elegies. In fact throughout his poetic career Milton reveals a profound appreciation of Ovid's entire corpus, not just the amatory elegies. The *Metamorphoses* in particular maintained a powerful hold on Milton's imagination. When old and blind, deep in the composition of *Paradise Lost*, he often called upon his daughters to read to him from 'Isaiah, Homer, and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', as his youngest daughter recalled.

G. aims to ‘demonstrate how Milton appropriates narrative structures, verbal echoes and literary strategies from the *Metamorphoses* – not least Ovid’s own central metaphor of continuous transformation – to create a subtly evolving portrait of Eve’ (p. vii). Her method is to examine the allusive alignment of Eve with a series of figures in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*: Narcissus, Pygmalion, Daphne, Flora, Pomona and Pyrrha. This is a progressive series, for each of these Ovidian figures becomes prominent for a time in Milton’s portrayal, then gives way to the next as Eve’s identity and function within the poem shift and change.

In G.’s view, Milton is never more Ovidian than when representing Eve to his readers: ‘when painting his portrait of Eve, Milton employs a technique peculiar to her in the poem: her character is not only presented directly, but obliquely, through the medium of a controlled and inspired evocation of figures from Ovidian myth’. Through this ‘strategy of deliberate allusion’ Milton endows Eve ‘with a mythic dimension that Adam almost entirely lacks’ (p. 17). ‘The mythological figurations that align Eve with myths from the *Metamorphoses* do not serve as merely incidental accompanying imagery, nor do they simply serve to enhance the aesthetic dimension – though they do that too – but are the result of a more significant level of association that demands interpretation and brings the reader into play’ (p. 19).

In the first chapter G. examines Eve’s initial presentation in Book 4 of *Paradise Lost*. Her account, delivered to Adam, of gazing at her reflected image in a lake draws unmistakably on Ovid’s Narcissus. For G., ‘The myth is clearly instrumental in articulating the experience – unique to Adam and Eve as the first human beings, and to Pygmalion’s bride too, of course – of coming to consciousness as fully formed adults, of being brought to life without self-knowledge and encountering the world with “unexperient’t thought” (IV.457)’ (p. 28). A few lines later in Book 4, Adam’s words to Eve allude to Apollo’s addressed to Daphne: ‘Return faire Eve; | Whom fli’st thou? whom thou fli’st, of him thou art’ (481–2). In Chapter 2, G. examines how these lines establish a series of correspondences between Eve and Daphne, especially in Eve’s initial flight from Adam. The two women’s fates are different, however, so Milton, drawing on *Fasti* 5, replaces Daphne with Flora as an allusive parallel: ‘Once the Daphne myth is no longer compatible with Eve’s expanding experience, another organizing image is secured to help amplify and articulate her role in the epic’ (p. 77). Flora likewise initially rejects Zephyrus, but he eventually makes amends for his initial violence by giving her the name of bride (*Fasti* 5.205). In Chapter 3 G. explores Milton’s developing representation of Eve’s married state through her correspondences with Flora, also touching upon Proserpina as a parallel, with a digression on the contribution that Ovid’s Scylla (*Met.* 14) makes to Milton’s personification of Sin (*Paradise Lost* 2). Chapter 4, on Venus, has little to do with Ovid; but 5 and 6, on Pomona, are of special interest, for here Milton alters Ovid’s account. Just before the Fall, Eve leaves Adam to garden alone, equipped with tools, and Milton compares her to Pomona: ‘To Pales, or Pomona thus adorn’d, | Likest she seem’d, Pomona when she fled | Vertumnus’ (9.393–5). Yet in Ovid’s tale Pomona did not need to flee Vertumnus. After his unsuccessful speech of seduction, he ‘prepares violence’, *uimque parat* (*Met.* 14.770); but his true appearance, when finally revealed, pleases Pomona, and the story ends happily. Milton ignores Ovid’s ending and gives the reference an element of foreboding not in the original, but appropriate to the context.

In Chapter 7, G. notes that after the Fall in Book 9, Ovidian imagery largely disappears; but the simile that opens Book 11 ‘marks a further significant adjustment of perspective on the fallen couple’ when Milton compares Adam and Eve

to Deucalion and Pyrrha after the flood (p. 182). This simile outwardly works to restore ‘the dignity and marital harmony’ of the first couple, while ‘inwardly and metaphorically it establishes their spiritual regeneration’ (p. 187). Eve, through her correspondences with Pyrrha, now has a new role in helping to bring about that spiritual regeneration.

G.’s aim ‘to demonstrate how Milton appropriates narrative structures ... and literary strategies from the *Metamorphoses*’ (p. vii) is a worthy one, but she does not fully recognise how much Milton owes to the Roman epic tradition. The progressive series of allusions that G. describes is likely to remind the reader of Virgil’s Dido, compared now to Homer’s Nausicaa, now to Apollonius’ Medea, now to Catullus’ Ariadne. For ironic allusion Milton had no better model than Ovid himself. In discussing Daphne, for instance, G. comments on Daphne’s request to her father to grant her perpetual virginity, as Diana’s father had done (*Met.* 1.486–7), mentioning the implicit irony in the attempt of Daphne – only a nymph – to rival a major goddess (p. 75). The observation is a good one, but missing from G.’s account is an awareness that Ovid established this irony through allusion to Callimachus’ *Hymn to Artemis*, wherein the goddess herself makes a similar request of her father (*Hymn* 3.6). Thereby Ovid expands his portrayal of Daphne by reminding his readers of a figure at once similar to Daphne and strikingly different from her. The very feature of Milton’s narrative technique that G. so ably describes – his subtle and shifting enrichment of a character through allusion – is remarkably similar to Ovid’s. G. gives neither Ovid nor Milton enough credit: Ovid for offering his successor a subtle and richly ironic allusive technique, and Milton for learning much from it. G. is well aware that in Ovid Milton found an author who ‘had pushed epic beyond its previous boundaries, while openly challenging comparison with Homeric and Virgilian epic’ (p. 10) and who in this respect offered Milton a model for his own work. It is also important, however, to recognise the extent to which Milton learned the nuts and bolts of his craft from Ovid.

Emory University

GARTH TISSOL
gtissol@emory.edu

COLOUR AND MEANING

BRADLEY (M.) *Colour and Meaning in Ancient Rome*. Pp. xvi + 267. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Cased, £55, US\$90. ISBN: 978-0-521-11042-6.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10002271

This reviewer must admit that his pulse quickened at the prospect of the antiquarian pleasures hinted at by the above title. Collecting, dissecting, displaying ancient colour-words – which is what I eagerly anticipated – promised something like the earnest hobbies of nineteenth-century gentleman etymologists (of the sort memorialised by Proust) or, better still, a satisfying substitute for the Renaissance collector’s curio cabinet of bits of coloured marbles, itself a consolation for the galleries of porphyry tubs and basalt sphinxes to which only a monarch or pontiff could aspire. Before even opening B.’s book, I was already looking forward to offering devastating public correction of my colleagues’ mistranslation of the colour, for example, of the eyes of Minerva.