

S. GEIST, *DER GESCHEITERTE FELDHERR (DUX FEROX): DER BESIEGTE RÖMISCHE FELDHERR ALS LITERARISCHE FIGUR BEI RÖMISCHEN NIEDERLAGEN, DARGESTELLT AN AUSGEWÄHLTEN SCHWEREN NIEDERLAGEN VON DER FRÜHEN REPUBLIK BIS ZU AUGUSTUS*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2009. Pp. 229. ISBN 9783631589083. £36.00

Geist's *Der gescheiterte Feldherr (Dux Ferox)* analyses the motif of the 'failed general' in Roman literature. Using evidence from a broad spectrum of ancient sources, ranging from Polybius through to Byzantine compilers like Zonaras, G. argues convincingly that in many instances unsuccessful Roman generals were reinterpreted by later authors so that they fit a certain form or stereotype which she has labelled the *dux ferox*. One of the main features of a *dux ferox* was obviously a tendency towards making bad tactical decisions, but the figure also featured important character flaws including *superbia et avaritia gloriae, neglegentia deorum*, causing *discordia*, and a degree of *ferox et temerarius* which in this instance should be interpreted as being 'barbarous' or 'un-Roman'. Once constructed, G. argues these figures became integral pieces of the historical narrative and were used by authors throughout Roman history not only as a scapegoats to explain defeats, but also as *exempla mala* and as tropes to help illuminate social and political conflicts within the context of the period.

This volume makes a number of important contributions as it clearly demonstrates the existence of this literary motif, defined by a number of key characteristics, which links together important historical figures from a number of different military scenarios across several centuries of Roman republican history. Indeed, G. is likely to be correct that many of the similarities which exist between the narratives of the various Roman defeats which were examined in this study owe more to literary artifice than to factual reality. G. is also convincing in her argument that these failed generals, although in many ways initially self-selected through their failure in battle, were often chosen based in part on developments which occurred off the battlefield in the social and political spheres.

However, the volume is also problematic in a number of ways. Beginning with the evidence itself, G.'s choices for examples of the *dux ferox* seem slightly arbitrary with no real explanation offered for why some defeated generals were included and others, who also suffered defeats for which they were famously censured by the community, were not. For instance, T. Veturius Calvinus and Sp. Postumius Albinus, renowned for the disaster at the Caudine Forks, and P. Valerius Laevinus, who was blamed for the defeat at Heraclea in 280 B.C., were not included while the more problematic M. Minucius Rufus, who never actually lost a battle, was. Additionally, it is unfortunate that G. gives virtually no treatment whatsoever to the long history of the figure of the failed general in the Greek historical tradition, which formed the obvious precursor to the *dux ferox* and which has been explored in a number of modern works. Further, G.'s attempt to create an antithesis for the *dux ferox*, a 'Retter in der Not' (white knight), by formulating comparisons with other prominent (and successful) figures in the narrative is not particularly successful. These comparisons often feel a bit forced, as these supposed 'white knights' lack any clear markers to distinguish them in the narrative similar to those which mark the *dux ferox*, and represent the weakest aspects of the argument. Finally, although G. utilizes a wide range of ancient material to support her argument, the volume does not take full advantage of the vast amount of modern literature which is available on the authors and passages discussed. Specifically, while G. demonstrates a very sound grasp of recent work in German on the subject, the volume's use of Anglophone scholarship is minimal and misses many important works (Oakley's recent commentaries on Livy, much of Walbank's work on Polybius, etc.).

University of Auckland
js.armstrong@auckland.ac.nz
doi:10.1017/S0075435812000627

JEREMY ARMSTRONG

E. SCIARRINO, *CATO THE CENSOR AND THE BEGINNINGS OF LATIN PROSE: FROM POETIC TRANSLATION TO ELITE TRANSCRIPTION*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2011. Pp. xii + 239, illus. ISBN 97808142116566. €44.95.

Enrica Sciarrino's monograph is presented as an intervention in debates about early Latin literary literature, but it is ultimately much more than that. In effect S. reorients the study of

Latin verbal culture to encompass the subject positions of producers and consumers understood as recoverable perceptual, cognitive, and pragmatic regimes. Although argued in terms familiar to the philologist, and fully (and respectfully) engaged with a wide range of classical scholarship, the book derives its energy from an understanding of ‘being in the world’ that owes as much to phenomenology and cultural studies as it does to any prior work on Latin literature. By invoking embodied subjectivity as her governing trope S. is able to situate the production of literature in history without relying on narrow or unsustainable claims concerning intention. And by continually understanding mental and perceptual activity as embodied, she transcends simplistic dichotomies between oral and written or form and experience. As she observes near the outset of the book, ‘I understand generic inclinations, formal choices, thematic preferences, and modes of textual construction as practical manifestations of a shared sense of reality and as clear indicators of the authors’ different experiences of limitations and options’(1). With this shift in focus, S. is able to explore what we might call, with Nelson Goodman, the ‘world-making ways’ of early Roman writers and artists. The result is nothing less than a new cultural history of late third- and early second-century B.C.E. Rome, one that pays equal attention to prose and poetry, ritual and writing, slave and free, migrant and indigene, body and soul.

The opening chapter situates Cato the Elder and the poet Ennius as alternative models of the relationship between embodied experience and literary subjectivity. Ennius’ famous reference to his three hearts (*tria corda*) illuminates Cato’s advice against absorbing (*perdiscere*) Greek letters. In both instances, language activates and promotes scenarios that work to correlate social subjectivity and cultural agency. A second chapter examines the ‘migratory subjectivity’ and translational expertise of early Roman writers. Although their ability to convert others’ cultural productions into Roman possessions was key to their success, writers like Naevius, Livius Andronicus, Terence, and even Cato never quite abandoned their own bi- or multi-culturality. In S.’s view, even the familiar phenomenon of metatheatricality, especially in the plays of Plautus, can be linked to an interest in ‘bestowing power on multiple perceptions of reality’ (60). Ch. 3 offers a new interpretation of familiar evidence concerning rivalry and disapproval (Naevius and the Metelli, Ennius and Naevius, Cato and the poets) in terms of conflicting scenarios for literary production centred on different imaginings of conviviality and spectacle. The chapter culminates in a compelling discussion of the eroticization of Terence as an instance of the ‘possessive love that Roman elite males felt toward their “others”’ (116).

Having constructed a framework for analysing the relevant textual remains, S. turns in chs 4 and 5 to the subject promised by her title: Cato’s invention of Latin prose literature. For many readers, these will be the most immediately useful sections of the book, for they demonstrate beyond doubt the importance and value of integrating prose into early Latin literary history. Like poetry, prose is an embodied practice constituted by particular, historically-situated subjectivities, and like poetry it can be analysed in terms of a dynamic of appropriation and differentiation with respect to the cultural productions of others. Cato’s oratory and his encyclopaedic project (including *De Agricultura*) in different ways sought to authorize elite Roman males as autonomous users of linguistic, epistemological, and material resources. On S.’s telling, Cato’s experience as censor links various sections of his literary output, from ethical judgement in the oratorical fragments, through advice on ritual in *De Agricultura*, to the ordering of Italian history in *Origines*. In an ambitious discussion drawing on archaeological, historical, and philological research, S. argues that Cato’s representation of writing as transcription of a prior, ritualized performance fosters an ideal of textuality as a moveable yet inalienably elite possession. The ‘loosening’ implicit in the Roman identification of prose as *verba soluta* thus becomes a release not just from metrical constraints, but also from the social subordination or secondariness that, under pressure from prose, came to characterize poetry.

This is a complex and demanding book. The structure of the argument is not always clear, and there is an occasional tendency to digress. Less overt engagement with other scholars might have left more room for S. to develop and exemplify her own deep and carefully theorized approach. Yet the result of her intellectual generosity is to show that strident disagreements are sometimes due to different targets of attention and different modes of explanation rather than to genuine disagreements over the significance of the textual remains. S. suggests that there is more consensus than is usually acknowledged, but also that there are deep and pervasive misconceptions about the place of literary practice within embodied cognition and social interaction that must be revised before new types of understanding are possible. The book is a must-read for Latinists, whatever

their period of specialization, and highly recommended for anyone interested in the problems and prospects of writing the cultural history of Rome.

University of Southern California
habinek@dornsife.usc.edu

THOMAS HABINEK

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000639

M. AMBROSETTI, *Q. CLAUDIO QUADRIGARIO ANNALI. INTRODUZIONE, EDIZIONE CRITICA E COMMENTO* (Bollettino dei classici, supplemento 25). Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2009. Pp. 425. ISBN 9788821810145. €60.00.

In addition to works aiming, wholly or partly, to replace Peter's *Historicorum Romanorum reliquiae* — Chassignet, *L'Annalistique romaine* in France; Beck-Walter, *Die frühen römischen Historiker* in Germany; a team, led by Tim Cornell and of which I am a member, *Fragments of the Roman Historians* (forthcoming) in Britain — there have been, particularly in Italy, a number of studies of individual historians — Forsythe on Piso, Santini on Hemina, Walt on Macer, Perutelli on Sisenna (cf. *JRS* 97 (2007), 300–2), Laconi, only four years previously, on Quadrigarius. Ambrosetti here presents a full-scale edition of and commentary on the fragments of Quadrigarius, comprising a wide-ranging introduction (9–74), a critical edition, preceded by detailed lists of manuscripts for each citing author (see further below) (77–118), commentary (121–374), bibliography (375–408), and a selective index (409–23).

In the edition A. retains both Peter's numeration of the fragments and his often arbitrary attribution to specific books of fragments for which a book number is not preserved, even though she sometimes argues a contrary case. Thus since frs 70–72 all come from Book 8 and A. believes that fr. 70 refers to the triumph of L. Aemilius Paullus in 167 B.C. and fr. 71 to either L. Valerius Flaccus, censor in 184–3 B.C., or Q. Fulvius Flaccus, censor in 174–3 B.C., and that fr. 72 corresponds to Livy 45.1.2, she assigns fr. 67, concerning the alleged Rhodian embassy of 169 B.C., to Book 8, though in the edition it appears under Book 7 (and frs 70–2 continue to follow frs 68–69, which relate events of 146 B.C.). In fact no fragment has both a certain or probable context in the second century and a book number until fr. 73 (137 B.C.) and the only safe course is to place frs 62–69 under the heading 'Books 7–9'. Worse, A. includes, with Peter, fr. 12, the account of Valerius Corvinus' duel with a Gaul, even though she agrees that it is not the work of Quadrigarius (thus, most recently, Oakley and Holford-Strevens) and relegates her commentary on it to an appendix.

Elsewhere A.'s ideas about the context of a fragment do not affect its position. She implausibly thinks that fr. 1 refers not to the battle of the Allia but to the participation of the three Fabii, sent as ambassadors to Clusium, in a battle with the Gauls. And her suggestion that fr. 46 refers to Fabius Verrucosus' campaign in Liguria is clearly wrong: Fabius' colleague M'. Pomponius Matho fought in Sardinia, not Liguria.

A. thinks that the letter of the consuls of 281 B.C. to Pyrrhus (fr. 41) is based on genuine archival material and shows that Quadrigarius made use of documentary sources. The whole story may be unhistorical, but in any case it is much more likely that the letter is Quadrigarius' own invention.

An editor of fragments cannot be expected to master the textual tradition and collate the manuscripts of each citing author (ten in the case of Quadrigarius) and for the most part must rely on existing editions. In three cases, however, A. has gone further. For Aulus Gellius she has collated Par. BNF Lat. 13038 (but not Cambridge, Clare College 26; see Marshall in *Texts and Transmission*, 177), for Nonius the photographs of the MSS used by Lindsay held at the University of Genoa (she also reports the citations, almost certainly fake, in the *Cornucopiae* of Nicolò Perotti), for Priscian all the MSS of the eighth and ninth centuries containing the fragments of Quadrigarius. For the rest her lists of MSS are taken, with suitable adaptations, from standard editions. This procedure can have unfortunate results, as is clear from the entry for Livy. For Books 6–10 and 25 she has used the OCT, for 31–40 my Teubner edition. In the sigla for Books 6–10 Walters and Conway cited their MSS just as 'Mediceus', 'Parisiensis' etc., without shelfmarks, and A. does the same; for the fourth decade, on the other hand, she virtually copies my list of sigla, but interprets my 'Fragmenta, Vat. Lat. 10696' and 'Fragmenta, Bamb. Bibl. Rei Publicae Class. 35a' as 'fragmenta codicis ...': the fragments are what remain of MSS of Late Antiquity; A.'s formulation implies that what were once MSS Vat. Lat. 10696 and Bamberg Staatsbibliothek Class. 35a have been reduced to fragments. And I wonder whether she expands some but not others of my abbreviations because she is unable to make anything of the latter.