

seems careful not to alienate potential collecting readers. She also reminds academic readers, who may be rather horrified at the attitude of some of the collectors (both individual and institutional) mentioned here, that they cannot consider themselves completely removed from the art market. In the conclusion, N. warns us that academic shifts of interest and growing disdain for collectors over the last thirty years have actually contributed to uncontrolled collecting. The art market, locked in a 'Beazleyian' framework, finds itself increasingly at odds with and thus released from the preoccupations of the academy.

In a way, the book ends up highlighting one of its own problems, the disjunction between the scholar, the museum and the private collector. Although the conclusion tries to bring these together, it does not have space to get very deeply into the concerns of the academy and wider, cultural and philosophical ideas of the collection, though it flirts with both these aspects. On the other hand, N. does attempt to get beyond these divisions, talking money, acquisition, and contemporary reception of antiquity, addressing topics which academics are often loath to do. It is clearly a monumental, cherished project, containing a great deal of useful material—a true collection of collecting.

University of Bristol

SHELLEY HALES

A HUMANIST'S MINI-ODYSSEY

C. MECKELNBORG, B. SCHNEIDER: *Odyssea: Responsio Ulixis ad Penelopen. Die humanistische Odyssea decurtata der Berliner Handschrift Diez. B Sant. 41. Eingeleitet, herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert.* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 166.) Pp. x + 190. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2002. Cased, €80. ISBN: 3-598-77715-9.

This curious poem was first discovered some twenty years ago by Dr Ursula Winter in the process of cataloguing the Diez MSS. It is now accorded the honour of this full-scale critical edition with translation and commentary. The attribution in the MS to 'Angelum Sabinum vatem egregium' is conclusively shown by the editors to be false; all that can be confidently asserted is that the text was copied—too carelessly for him to have been the author—by one Fatius around 1470. As a by-product of their enquiry, the editors discuss the authorship of the three replies to *Heroides* 1, 2, and 5, generally and, as they show, correctly ascribed to the humanist Angelus Sabinus. The ascription, revived as recently as 1996, to Ovid's friend Sabinus is firmly and, one hopes, finally knocked on the head.

The poem comprises 480 elegiac verses, purporting to be an answer to the Ovidian Penelope's letter but consisting for the most part of a résumé, by a narrator dodging uneasily between first and third person, of Ulysses' exploits and adventures. The poet does not appear to have been acquainted even with the Latin versions of the *Odyssey* available at the time, let alone Homer himself. His sources were the Latin poets, principally Virgil and Ovid, with occasional resort to Boccaccio's *Genealogie Deorum*. The result is a cento, a patchwork of phrases culled from the author's wide reading and tailored with varying degrees of success to their new contexts. The best that can be said of the writing is that it is fluent, the work of someone who really knew his texts. In its way, then, a *tour de force*, but as the editors remark, it is less as literature that it merits

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

attention than as a document of the humanistic reception of the classics, and in particular the part played in it by Ovid.

The text for the most part reproduces the copyist's orthography, not always to happy effect. It would, of course, have been quite wrong to correct the unclassical spelling of proper names (at 416 *laodomia*, the received medieval spelling, should have been kept). I am not sure that it was a good idea to retain purely arbitrary scribal variation between *a*, *e*, and *e*, or graphic conventions that to the modern eye look grotesque, such as *petijt* or *Jouj* (!). (I note that *sotii*, on the other hand, seems to have stuck in the editors' craw.) Fatus was a slapdash copyist, and the editors correct numerous errors, for the most part trivial and obvious, though at 323 *ropus* for (it would seem) *manus* is distinctly odd. A few more emendations suggest themselves. 133 *Hic nos emissi*: surely *Hinc*? 167 *Hei mihi, qualis erat iactatis puppibus uda! qualis* cannot, even in this author, stand for *quam*, and *uda*, picking up *classis* in the preceding verse, is very feeble. Read *unda* and repunctuate. 174 *Liparj* [*sic*] cannot be the ablative of *Lipare* (cf. 143n.); read *Lipare*. 295–9 The problems with which the editors make no less heavy weather than that described in the text are simply disposed of by reading *Qua* for *Que* at 296 and repunctuating.

The documentation in the commentary of the poet's sources and *modus operandi* is admirably full; an uncharacteristic lapse at 200n. '*petijt rura aliena seges*: Dies Detail ist in den antiken Zauberkatalogen nicht belegt'. The practice was forbidden in the Twelve Tables and is well attested by the poets: Virg. *E.* 8.98, Tib. 1.8.19, Ov. *Rem.* 255. A few miscellaneous points. 12 *Lictera sed saeuo reddita cara mari*; 'ich . . . habe deinen lieben Brief von dem tosenden Meer erhalten'. In a bottle? Surely 'auf See' (cf. 14 *fluctibus in mediis*)? 216 *Laertiade*: this was indeed what the poet would have found in his text of the *Metamorphoses* (12.625), but it was not, as the note implies, what Ovid wrote; see *CR* 34 (1984), 34. 245 *Acheloïades*: the plural is indeed attested only at *Met.* 14.87, but the form is not hapax (Sil. 12.34). 312 The dactylic scansion of *Nereus* ought to have been noted, as spondaic *Nereis* is at 347; cf. *Aetölia* overlooked. 417 The reference is not to the episode of the snakes sent to attack Hercules in his cradle, but to the Labours; the relevant passage is Ov. *AA* 2.217.

These and other inadvertencies do not seriously detract from the substantial merits of this interesting contribution to our better understanding of the Revival of Learning.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

ROME IN POPULAR CULTURE

S. R. JOSHEL, M. MALAMUD, D. T. MCGUIRE (edd.): *Imperial Projections. Ancient Rome in Modern Popular Culture*. Pp. viii + 299, ills. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002. Cased, £31. ISBN: 0-8018-6742-8.

Scholarly interest in popular culture's re-imagining of the ancient world has grown rapidly over the past decade as a number of classicists have turned to the Ancient Greece and Rome presented in sources such as the sword and sandal film, popular novels, theatre, and television. The interrelationship between representations of Rome and their ideological context has been a prominent concern of such scholars. As the title suggests, *Imperial Projections* reads the Romes of popular culture as

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved