S. J. GREEN (ED.), *GRATTIUS: HUNTING AN AUGUSTAN POET*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. Pp. x + 286. ISBN 9780198789017. £60.00.

Didactic texts make particular demands on modern scholars. Scholars tend to suppose that women are best equipped to interpret texts about women's bodies; can a text about hounds and hunting be understood by scholars who have never held up a covert and think that a 'form' exists only in a grammar book and a 'slot' as a space for their lectures?

The contributors to this volume on Grattius, the Augustan hunting poet (the likely emendation of Ov., *Pont.* 4.16.34), show that it cannot. They omit discussion of the 'technical' material about hunting. Indeed, Grattius' poem is incomplete, covering hunting equipment but not drawing, casting or the kill (perhaps it is the first book of more?). Even so, they write about 'hunting with dogs' and a 'dog-master'. Hutchinson, discussing verbs of movement (ch. 5), stops to assure us that hunting is nowadays found 'tedious or abhorrent … I would go for "abhorrent" myself' (138). Contrast Mynors' excellent notes on Virgil, *Georgics* 1.139, 1.307, 2.471, and especially 3.43, 3.371–2 and 3.404–13 (his commentary is not even in the bibliography). Like Hor., *Epist.* 1.18.49–50, he understands the Romans' moral and practical esteem for hunting. Up front, in line 1, Grattius calls the arts of hunting *laetae*.

Six of the ten contributors run riot and need to be whipped back onto the scent. Gale (ch. 2) thinks that *Cyn.* 223–45 are 'notably open to metapoetic interpretation: the hound "reads the signs" as we read the words in the poem' and behaves like a 'good Callimachean' (90–1). Kayachev (ch. 3) airs the possibility that Grattius may have written before Virgil composed the *Aeneid* (a long process indeed). He can then suggest (103–8) that at *Aen.* 4.305–6 and 12.753–5 Aeneas is related intertextually to a type of hound which Grattius has presented as decidedly less than perfect. Tsaknaki (ch. 4) compares Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and its hunting references and persuades herself that Ovid and Grattius share a deep preoccupation with their status as artists and their *ars scribendi*. She reads Grattius' nets as 'complicated, interwoven and constructed from the fine-spun thread of Callimachean poetics' (124). Green (ch. 6) argues that Grattius' 'sustained anthropomorphism is at times suggestive of the figure of Augustus' and, wondrously, 'invites' readers to think 'how much more topical the poem would be if one reads into the instructions on tree-pruning tacit endorsement of Augustus's drastic handling of family affairs in the early years AD' (174). Whitlatch (ch. 7) offers a forced comparison with the *Eclogues*, especially *Ecl.* 5, and over-interprets *dotes* at line 252 (183: 'the dowry image underlines the role of the hunter in a sustainable environment'). O'Rourke (ch. 8) endorses 'the potential of Dercylos and Hagnon', Grattius' two rare inventors of hunting skills, 'to be read in the tradition of the embedded authorial surrogate' (204). Through them he is a 'supremely cerebral educator who buys into the system that produced him' (211).

So do these contributors. Nobody discusses the poem's structure and the conventions of listing, digression and resumption which it exploits. Oppian could have helped more, giving a hint of lost Hellenistic models. Moul (ch. 9) breaks new ground with a study of hunting in neo-Latin. Waters (ch. 10) presents Christopher Wase, the first English translator of Grattius in 1654, and suggests that he did so because he loved hunting, wished to please his hunting patron the Earl of Pembroke and to regain his lost Fellowship at King's, Cambridge. Times change.

Nobody discusses what Grattius' hounds are assumed to be chasing. Not hares, the *leve opus* (199–200). The spears and the wounds imply wild boar, as does the 'scare' at 75–93 (hares would run under it), but stags are likely too in the rocky Italian landscape at 509–10. Xenophon's main focus is thus different. Nowadays, *vidi* is not allowed to mean what it says, but at 435–6 it and *saepe* show that Grattius lived, for a while, in east Sicily. Lines 430–60 are not about 'petroleum' on Etna. Lava flows are said to chase individual wicked visitors, most interestingly (451–5). This moralising of the landscape is very different from the Aetna poem, its near contemporary. At 307–28 Grattius presents rejection of luxury as a key to the Romans' far-flung *imperium*. He advises a similar avoidance of luxury and a similar exercise of *imperium* when bringing up puppies.

J. Henderson/Hounderson, *PCPhS* 47 (2001), 1–22, combined glittering puns, exaggeration and insight and laid several false trails here down which the contributors gleefully run heel. A kennel huntsman is often a *iuvenis* (332) without thereby being Augustus. A bitch on heat is indeed promiscuous (*adultera*, 285) without evoking Augustus' moral legislation. Grattius exploits Lucretius and Virgil's *Georgics*, without their pessimism. His survey of horses, not discussed here, includes an under-remarked *laus Italiae* (539–41).

Grattius is erudite: Hagnon, Dercylos, Glympis (103, 214). The *metagon* (209) is actually a tracker dog, with an appropriately Greek name referring to its function. The *pauper custos* (46) of the well-watered garden at Alabanda is not Priapus (as in 21 n. 14). Hemp at Alabanda flourished

in the damp plain, thanks to the river Marsyas and its tributaries. Is *pauper* ignorant or a touch of Hellenistic social pathos or a playful reversal of the Alabandans' reputation for luxury and decadence (Strabo 14.2.26; Juv., *Sat.* 3.69–78)?

The text as printed is only indicative. Problems abound, also in the translation. Line 212 does not even scan: read *Sparta suos et Creta suos* at 212 and translate *promittit* as 'sends forth', not, impossibly, 'declare'. At 532, *Pellaei Cerauni* are not a place name in Macedon, none such existing: *Cerauni* is a name for the horses, fast-moving 'Thunderbolts'. In the horse-list, non-Italian horses are extolled, but not recommended for hard hunting. In 530, therefore, instead of *vix* transposed from 531, read *bis*, meaning 'earned twice over', in two types of race, charioteering and plain galloping. For other corrections see D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Phoenix* 32 (1978), 311–15. His emendations have all been overlooked.

Grattius' huntsman, in his cap of badger-fur (340: grey, not 'white'), would wince at most of this book.

New College, Oxford R. J. Lane Fox
robin.lanefox@new.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435819000753

J. SCHRADER, *GESPRÄCHE MIT GÖTTERN. DIE POETOLOGISCHE FUNKTION KOMMUNIKATIVER KULTBILDER BEI HORAZ, TIBULL UND PROPERZ* (Potsdamer altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge Band 58). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2017. Pp. 314. ISBN 9783515117005. €54.00.

This revised dissertation is a learned and pioneering study of the cult images of gods as a means of communication in Augustan poetry. Are the poets of the Augustan age able to exploit cult images for propaganda purposes? In her book, Jessica Schrader deals with three cases: the representation of the god Priapus in Horace, *Sat.* 1.8 and Tibullus 1.4, and the figure of the god Vertumnus in Propertius 4.2. According to the author, these three Augustan texts represent a very peculiar case in the history of Latin literature. In these three texts, there is not a simple representation or description of the gods, but rather the gods themselves are embodied by their cult statues.

The present book is divided into seven chapters, including the Introduction, where S. clarifies that the speaking statues of the gods represent a well-known literary topos in poetry. The aim of this study is to start a new field of research in Classical philology. Starting from the historical and religious studies of Jörg Rüpke, the director of the series in which this work is published, the practice of worship and its communicative function receive adequate attention. The view proposed is that the images of worship are a means of communication between men and gods, for example in a strong symbol such as prayer. The opening chapter explains the general content of the work and above all it traces the history of the studies on the topic.

S. emphasises several times in the book, especially in the Introduction, the main reason why the study of this topic is significant: incorporating cult images into a literary context has only been the object of critical attention for a few years, and this study proposes to fill this gap in Latin philology. For instance, she explains how recent research on Tibullus' Priapus has tried to approach the analysis of the text in a new way, namely through narratology. The god and his speech are considered unreliable and give the text a programmatic function, which relates to the content of Priapus' love instructions and central points of Book 1 of Tibullus' elegies more generally, such as attraction towards young boys and the role of bisexuality. Priapus assumes a humorous and undignified role, taking up the solemn pose of *praeceptor amoris*. Regarding Horace's *Satire* 1.8, the speaking figwood statue of Priapus is interpreted as a mask or role, an enduring model for Roman satirists, with a strong territorial sense and a mix of swagger and insecurity, including threats of rape against old women and pathics. Regarding Propertius, S. surveys several poetological approaches. The poetic function is assigned to elegy on account of the new programme of Book 4 and the emphasised qualities of the god: his changeability and polarity. More precisely, the speaking bronze statue of Vertumnus is an allegory of the evolution and the new features of Book 4. It can be assumed that cult images, as in these three examples, when made expressive in Augustan poetry could fulfill an instrumentalised programmatic function.