

his epistolary collection. Moreover, G. and M.'s reading strategies will significantly benefit readers embarking anew on (re)reading the letters.

College of Charleston, South Carolina
Carmichaeln@cofc.edu

NOELLE ZEINER-CARMICHAEL

doi:10.1017/S007543581400080X

C. A. WILLIAMS, *READING ROMAN FRIENDSHIP*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Pp. x + 378. ISBN 9781107003651. £65.00.

Friendship is a fluid concept. Not only does it vary in nature and prestige from culture to culture, but it is not to be identified by any legally recognized act or verifiable fact of birth or status. Rather than grapple with this Proteus, Williams has decided to limit his quest to Roman friendship in particular, and to the language employed rather than the social realities, 'reading *amicitia* as a system of labels and categories to be interpreted more than as a set of relationships and events to be reconstructed' (60).

In the long Introduction W. justifies his restriction to Latin-speaking areas of the Roman Empire, by noting that Greek *philia* has been more frequently studied, and by claiming that, via Cicero's *De amicitia*, Roman friendship has been more central than Greek to the history of Western friendship. He defends his concentration on the rhetoric of friendship, avoiding awkward questions of definition, by construing *amicus* and *amicitia* as performative utterances: whoever is called an *amicus*, is one; whatever is labelled *amicitia*, counts as such. This project, described as a more modest but more attainable goal (28), certainly avoids a number of problems. It allows W. to disregard the idealizing tradition of Latin texts in which types of friendship, notably those that Aristotle characterized as utilitarian, and friendships between social unequals, are rebranded as 'political friendships' and 'patronage' and denied the title of 'true friendships'. But there are still difficulties in discussing the Latin vocabulary of friendship. Should one make use of English terms, or confine oneself to Latin terminology? In an interesting discussion (30–5) W. points to salient differences: there is no Latin equivalent of 'just friends' or 'best friend' (*optimus amicus* means 'the best kind of friend', not 'the best of my friends'). In the end he sometimes leaves the Latin terms untranslated and sometimes uses English paraphrases, for which inverted commas are always to be understood and linguistic self-awareness advised (35). Then there is the fundamental problem of recovering ancient usage. As we have no opportunity for live encounters, and no access to unmediated speech, W. has recourse to what Bakhtin called 'secondary speech genres', ranging from traditional literary genres to inscriptional texts (37), adding a reassurance that there was no significant change in the vocabulary of social relations or in the ideal associated with them, between Republic and Principate.

The Introduction ends with an outline of the book's structure (60–2). Chs 1 and 2 deal with overall themes and problems. Ch. 1 shows that, whereas friendship is often represented in literary texts as a masculine prerogative, inscriptions and the letters from Vindolanda correct that impression. Moreover inscriptions use *amicus* and *amica* symmetrically, whereas in many literary genres, when a woman is linked with a man and called his *amica*, she is a sexual partner outside marriage (96). Ch. 2 explores the relation of love and friendship, showing that *amicitia* can be a subset of *amor*, which also covers erotic love, but that boundaries are very fluid between the two types of love. Chs 3 and 4 give closer readings of a selection of texts, both literary and inscriptional. The literary texts explored in ch. 3 are Catullus, Virgil, Horace, Propertius, Petronius, and the letters of Cicero and Fronto: Pliny, Statius and Ovid are not revisited. Particularly interesting is the discussion of *amare* and *amor* in Cicero and in Fronto's letters, where the differences from the usage of elegiac poets are clear. Benefiting from Hutchinson's 1998 study of the former's correspondence, W. points to *Att.* 9.10.2 where Cicero, explicitly invoking the Greek term τὰ ἐρωτικά, compares, in a simile, his disillusionment with Pompey to disenchantment with the tactless behaviour of a lover. The lavishly affectionate language that Cicero sometimes uses to his friends would not have been misunderstood as erotic by his readers; Shackleton Bailey is right to translate *amor* and *amare* in terms of affection, fondness and admiration (220). Fronto's correspondence with Marcus Aurelius surpasses Cicero in the use of such language, but W. succeeds in showing that here too what is really involved is affection and devotion (238–58). Not only are erotic relations sometimes marked as comparisons, explicitly

(*M.Caes.* 3.14) or implicitly (*Addit.* 8 and 7), but *amor* here lacks passionate exclusivity. Instead, there is an emphasis on networks of friendship, while other members of their families, such as Fronto's wife, the emperor and Marcus' baby, are named as objects of *amor*, and of kisses desired and given, along with the correspondents. Then in *Ad Verum* 1.7 it is clear that kissing can be an envied mark of privilege. W. remarks that we learn here 'something important about kisses throughout the Latin textual tradition and, as far as we can tell, in Roman social practice as well' (257).

Earlier too, W. had admitted that the realities and subtleties of interpersonal relationships among Romans sometimes come through the texts being scrutinized for language (60), and it is partly because this is particularly true of the funerary inscriptions, that ch. 4 is the crowning glory of the volume. As W. says, one would not be aware from the Latin literary tradition or from scholarship on it, that 'Romans were often buried in groups, individuals identified as *amici* not infrequently were members of these groups, and friends provided a key role in Roman commemoration of the dead' (260). 'More often than has been acknowledged, Roman burials and the inscriptions marking them perpetuated the memory of and thereby enacted the ties not only of kinship, marriage, or slavery, but of nothing more nor less than *amicitia*' (337). Of course, comparing inscriptions with high literature is difficult: many are undatable, and many fail to mention the legal status of the individuals named. But epigraphists have established that most Latin inscriptions were produced between the first century A.D. and the beginning of the third century A.D., and that freedmen and freedwomen are over-represented. In the absence of legal ancestors, parents or siblings, they commemorated relationships with their former owners (where the language of *amicitia* is avoided), with their own freed slaves, with *conliberti* of their former masters, and with *amici* and *amicae*, citizen and slave. Indeed, slaves figure among the commissioners of inscriptions as well, commemorating friends as well as spouses and children, whom they call, without legal warrant, *coniuges* and *fili*.

Ch. 4 ends with a typology of the uses of the language of *amicitia* on epitaphs (296–354). The group commemorations do indeed give us 'an indirect glimpse at the varieties of household structures that could arise in conjunction with slavery and manumission' (324); the joint burials of two friends in a single tomb show that Martial 1.93 is not describing something unusual (339).

Reading Roman Friendship is itself well worth reading for its insights into Latin literature and Roman social history. Let us hope that the large number of typographical errors will be corrected in the reissue that it certainly deserves.

Somerville College, Oxford
 miriam.griffin@classics.ox.ac.uk
 doi:10.1017/S0075435814000811

MIRIAM GRIFFIN

T. D. KOHN, *THE DRAMATURGY OF SENECA TRAGEDY*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013. Pp. 184. ISBN 9780472118571. US\$65.00.

In the mid-1540s, Westminster School put on the first performance in England of a Senecan tragedy, *Hippolytus*. The English were behind the times: the same play had already been staged sixty years earlier in Rome, under the direction of Pomponius Laetus. Yet while early modern readers of Seneca had no reservations about staging his drama, twentieth-century scholarship stressed the limited performance potential of Senecan tragedy. T. S. Eliot memorably identified it as 'drama of the word': Otto Zwierlein's influential 1966 monograph pursued this more fully, arguing for Seneca's plays as *Rezitationsdrama*. The tide is now turning again: in addition to the collection of essays on the topic by distinguished Senecans, collected in George W. M. Harrison's *Seneca in Performance* (2000), more recent critical commentaries, especially those by A. J. Boyle on *Troades*, *Oedipus* and *Medea*, have devoted serious space to the performance potential of the plays. Kohn's monograph — drawing not only on his status as classical scholar but also his experience as an actor and director — aims to build on this trend, offering a systematic 'performance criticism' of Senecan tragedy *in toto*.

An introduction rehearses the critical performance debate — covering issues of dating, transmission and imperial theatre culture along the way — and outlines K.'s own approach, which is to develop the work of Dana F. Sutton's *Seneca on Stage* (1973) by subjecting the Roman drama to the same kind of performance criticism Oliver Taplin has provided for Greek tragedy. A