

JACOB (C.) *The Web of Athenaeus*. Translated by Arietta Papaconstantinou. Edited by Scott Fitzgerald Johnson. (Hellenic Studies 61.) Pp. x + 139, fig. Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2013. Paper, £14.95, US\$19.95. ISBN: 978-0-674-07328-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X13004034

Athenaeus has been neglected as an author in his own right for a long time. His *mega biblion* has been read in abridged rather than in the original form (of which we only possess one mutilated manuscript) from antiquity to modern times and has been considered (wrongly) to be no more than a kind of ancient Reader's Digest. Consequently, Athenaeus was long regarded as a collector rather than an author. This view gradually changed over the course of the twentieth century, and in 2000 the change was marked by the appearance of *Athenaeus and His World*, a series of papers edited by J. Wilkins and D. Braund. Shortly after that a new edition of the *Deipnosophistae* was published: *Ateneo. I Deipnosofisti. I dotti a banchetto* (edited by L. Canfora [2001]). The introductory chapter of this edition, written by J., far exceeded what one might call a preface. It was a groundbreaking study – and the first of its kind – of Athenaeus' context, method and aims. Many of us who consider ourselves members of the Friends-Of-Poikilography movement wished to have it on our desks as a separate monograph, preferably (for many of us) in English (the Italian edition, the first volume of which alone is priced at around €750, not quite being a book to be found on everybody's shelf). It takes time for wishes to come true but now, in 2013, they have, and J.'s study *Ateneo, o il Dedalo delle parole* has been finally translated into English.

J.'s important study is now obtainable for everyone interested in reading Athenaeus rather than using bits and pieces of the knowledge preserved in his *Deipnosophistae*. To catch up with what was written on the subject of Athenaeus and the *Deipnosophistae* after 2001, though, it might be useful to have a look at L. Rodríguez-Noriega Guilléns bibliography fortunately available on the internet: www.lnoriega.es/Ateneo.html.

Greifswald

DIRK UWE HANSEN
hansen@uni-greifswald.de

FABRIZI (V.) *Mores veteresque novosque. Rappresentazioni del passato e del presente di Roma negli Annales di Ennio*. (Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Pavia 125.) Pp. 252. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2012. Paper, €22. ISBN: 978-88-467-3454-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X1400095X

Interest in social memory has focused new attention on early Latin literature, which is increasingly appreciated for both the boldness of its aesthetic experiments and its power to shape Roman collective identity. The present study, derived from a dissertation supervised by G. Rosati at the University of Udine, is explicitly contextual, working from the premise that the Roman past as portrayed in Ennius' *Annales* was shaped by a particular vision of the Roman present. Full understanding of the poem therefore requires attention to its social function and impact on its audience no less than to its content. Given the

poet's well attested, if highly problematic, associations with the senatorial class of second-century Rome, this is a reasonable working hypothesis, and F. explores its ramifications with energy and skill, uniting literary and cultural approaches to the *Annales* that have to this point remained largely discrete. She teases out the contemporary implications of five storylines in the poem: the Trojan origins of Rome (Chapter 1), Romulus as Roman hero (Chapter 2), the war with Pyrrhus (Chapter 3), the wars against Hannibal and Philip (Chapter 4) and the conquest of Ambracia (Chapter 5). What emerges is a portrait of Ennius more richly nuanced than the traditional image of a client-poet in service to one or another political faction and a poetic analysis more historically informed than most contemporary literary criticism.

In another sense, however, F.'s study is deeply traditional, as firmly rooted in the old ways of Vahlen, Norden and Skutsch as the new ones of Flaig, Gildenhard and Rüpke. Its argument works from three implicit methodological assumptions: that the *Aeneid* is so deeply responsive to the Roman vision of the *Annales* that Ennius' intention can be deduced from Virgil's intention, that Ennius in fact *had* a single, consistent intention developed across the original fifteen books of his poem, and that its content – on which all judgements of function and impact ultimately depend – can when required be deduced from its structure. So, for example, F. (pp. 172–7), following Skutsch following Walbank, reads Ennius' description of the Cyclops (319–20 Sk.) as a portrait of Philip V, thus echoing both Homer (*Od.* 9.296–8) and a taunt by Alcaeus of Messene (*Anth. Pal.* 9.519). This appropriation of Homeric language to develop a Roman theme continues by other means Flamininus' philhellenic policy, implicitly supporting the claim that Rome was no barbarian interloper but a legitimate heir to Greek hegemony. Given so appealing a claim, we may forget (nor does F. remind us) that no direct evidence links Ennius' Cyclops to Philip. The source (Priscian on the perfect of *-geo* verbs) simply attributes these lines to *Annales* 9, a book that *might* have mentioned the Macedonian king. Does that foundation bear the weight of F.'s argument? Only time will tell. Significant challenges to such confident reconstructions are beginning to appear, and until they are either beaten back or a new consensus emerges, F.'s claims must remain provisional. She has, however, unquestionably performed a valuable service by putting them forward.

University of California, Los Angeles

SANDER M. GOLDBERG
sander@humnet.ucla.edu

GIORDANO (F.) *Percorsi testuali oraziani. Tra intertestualità critica del testo ed esegesi.* (Edizioni e Saggi Universitari di Filologia Classica 68.) Pp. 127. Bologna: Pàtron Editore, 2013. Paper, €12. ISBN: 978-88-555-3190-0.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X14000092

Of the seven Horatian explorations collected in G.'s *libellus*, four have appeared previously in other venues; the earliest of these dates from 1991, the most recent from 2011. Despite the attempt made in the introduction to provide an overarching theoretical framework for the studies assembled here, and although there are links between a number of individual chapters, few will be persuaded that there is a comprehensive unifying thread to these essays beyond their shared concentration on episodes in the reception of Horace's poetry; a better summary of the character of the volume is arguably offered by A. La Penna's