

at 557ff. (how pleased would Daphne in her laurel form be to be in such close contact with the lover she has resolutely shunned?) and 564–5 (is being evergreen something desirable or exciting, and would Daphne want to be linked thus with her despised suitor?). So too on pp. 324ff. he sees only some of the fun that Ovid is having with Apollo's intervention at *Ars* 2.493ff., not noting that there is an elaborate build-up to make readers expect from the deity something of significance and importance, only for Phoebus to come out with some lightweight and self-evident remarks on the subject of love, or that the god, who appears solely as an advisor on casual affairs, and who shows an amusing fondness for a levity and expression very similar to Ovid's own, is used in an extensively flippant fashion in this trivial context. And there is a bigger issue here, one that has a bearing on M.'s study as a whole. He opines that there as elsewhere 'Augustan' Apollo is not alluded to, so there is no enduring hit at that Augustan symbol. However, given that the *princeps* has appropriated this divinity, surely if Phoebus in any function, guise or context is mocked or criticised in contemporary literature in Rome, then Augustus' Apollo (who is after all the same god) is also diminished, whether or not there is direct reference to him in his 'Augustan' role.

In conclusion, and so as not to end on too negative a note, if the above reservations are kept in mind, readers should find that this book is a useful treatment of Phoebus generally and in particular of 'Augustan' Apollo in contemporary verse.

McMaster University

P. MURGATROYD
murgatro@mcmaster.ca

THE *RES GESTAE*

COOLEY (A.E.) (ed., trans.) *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Pp. xviii + 315, figs, maps. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. Paper, £16.99, US\$29.99 (Cased, £45, US\$90). ISBN: 978-0-521-60128-3 (978-0-521-84152-8 hbk).

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10002210

For some 40 years, the edition of the *Res Gestae* by Brunt and Moore with its concise and informative commentary has been the most valuable resource available in English. It included only the Latin text without editorial marks or apparatus. In 2007, John Scheid's Budé edition became the new foundation for any subsequent work as it contained the critically edited Greek and Latin texts from Ankara, supplemented by the Latin and Greek fragments from, respectively, Pisidian Antioch and Apollonia, plus an up-to-date commentary of some 65 closely printed pages.

C. has taken the next step and the result is splendid. She is building on Scheid's texts; the Greek and Roman versions of the *RG* from Ankara, incorporating redactions on the basis of the other fragments, are laid out side by side with a translation for each. User friendliness continues in an attractively printed commentary of some 175 pages, which includes numerous illustrations. In addition to the usual items, such as indexes and bibliography, there is a comprehensive introduction dealing with several aspects of the *RG*, including its discovery and its treatment by Mussolini. I have no doubt that this edition, too, will have a run of several decades, especially if it is updated periodically.

As for the text, there are no surprises. C. appends a lengthy tabulation of the differences between her composite text and Scheid's. In most cases, they are the

result of different perceptions of the legibility of individual letters, with the words remaining the same. There are exceptions; C. argues for [*interfece*]runt instead of the traditional [*trucidave*]runt in Chapter 2; while she correctly states in her commentary on the passage ‘the verb in the Greek version is not preserved either’, she follows the traditional restoration *φονεύσαντας* though marking only the second alpha as a restoration whereas in all previous editions only two of the letters are identified as discernible. A major change, also adopted by Scheid, is the reading, at *RG* 34.1, of *potens* (instead of *potitus*, going back to Mommsen) *rerum omnium* on the basis of the Antioch fragment, which makes excellent sense. Further, C. is to be commended for highlighting, as part of the Introduction, the special character of the Greek version as an adaptation to the mindset of the provincial audience in the east. So, for instance, Augustus’ role as a conqueror is toned down in favour of more emphasis on his euergetism. It is interesting to note that in the arts a different development would take place, even if not immediately under Augustus, with the Roman *ciuilis princeps* being replaced by more martial representations (see P. Zanker, *Provinzielle Kaiserporträts*, [1983]). In the *RG*, Roman nuance can get lost in the process; *factio*, for instance, at 1.1 is reduced point blank to the conspirators against Caesar whereas its Roman connotations are more comprehensive and, typically, left for each reader to determine.

The same is true of *arbitrium* at 34.1, one of my favourite benchmarks for commentaries on the *RG*. The Greek translator reduced it to *κυριεία*, and C. faithfully follows Brunt and Moore, and Scheid, by saying nothing. The term was not part of the standard constitutional and political vocabulary, and Augustus therefore chose it to help express his balancing act. It clearly invites, and deserves, comment.

Such omissions, however, are not the rule in C.’s commentary. Instead, it is richly informative, completely up to date on the scholarship (although Jochen Bleicken’s magisterial *Augustus* [1998] and Josiah Osgood’s *Caesar’s Legacy* [2006] should be included), and enhanced by some 30 excellently reproduced photographs. As for events between 44 and 30 B.C., the *RG* is not just Augustus’ version but a highly streamlined version, and C. does consistently good and, at the same time, concise work in providing the wide variety of information from other sources; her commentary on the battles of Philippi is an excellent example (pp. 115–16). Similarly helpful are her comments on Augustus’ claim to *clementia* where she sorts out one of the difficulties for the uninitiated reader of Suetonius, his undifferentiated presentations of Augustus’ cruelty, even if they were confined to the Octavianic incarnation. It is because of her treatment of issues like these that C.’s commentary will be useful to an audience of teachers and students besides the usual specialists. That concern is palpably reinforced by the constant referencing of items in the LACTOR volume *The Age of Augustus* (2003) by M.G.L. Cooley. Though well meant, this gets to be just a tad grating at times as that collection of sources, valuable though it is, is not easily available outside the UK and does not have the same standing as, for instance, Ehrenberg and Jones.

That sort of quibble, however, should not detract from the considerable merits of this work. Clearly, each specialist will look for some more commentary here and there and less on other occasions; one such passage, in my opinion, is *RG* 8.5, and especially Augustus’ choice of the wording *legibus nouis*, as it encapsulates a central aspect of his programme. While the commentary in general is remarkably full and should not be expanded, I would suggest adding another table to the current two that list, respectively, Augustus’ acclamations as *imperator* (which became his first name anyway) and, very usefully, the animal hunts organised by him. The latter

were part of his expenditures that figure prominently in the *RG*, as stated in its heading, but an even larger part was his many largesses to soldiers, veterans and plebeians, and a tabulation in this book would be appropriate (it can be found in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*).

One of the strongest points of this edition is the extensive Introduction. It reflects the shift that has taken place over the last four decades: whereas Brunt and Moore used theirs to focus mostly on the constitutional position of Augustus that had occupied a great deal of attention since Mommsen, C.'s, which is more than three times as long, deals with other important topics, all closely related to different aspects of the inscription. She has made a good choice; I do not mean to be dismissive of the constitutional issues, but, as Scheid has elegantly summed it up, Augustus did not 'restore the constitution of the Republic', but rather 'restored constitutional government' (2007, p. 89). The subjects discussed by C. include the Roman setting of the *RG* (right up to Fascist times) and, even more important, the three provincial contexts; the transmission and previous study of the texts; the characteristics of both the Greek and Latin versions; and, centrally, the 'messages' of the *RG*. As regards the latter, C. well characterises the *RG* as a multi-faceted creation – like so much else, I might add, in Augustan politics and culture. This aspect applies to both the precedents for this unique work – she does well to list Pompey among them – and its purposes. While she rightly cautions against looking for a single overriding message, she places the emphasis on Augustus' justifying his deification. To her reasons I would add that 'aspiring to the honors of his father' was his stated goal even from his Octavianic beginnings. He pursued it all his life; and the *RG*, written near its end, was the conclusion of that trajectory.

The University of Texas at Austin

KARL GALINSKY
galinsky@mail.utexas.edu

PROPERTIUS

JOHNSON (W.R.) *A Latin Lover in Ancient Rome. Readings in Propertius and his Genre*. Pp. xiv + 165. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2009. Cased, US\$29.95 (CD US\$9.95). ISBN: 978-0-8142-0399-6 (978-0-8142-9179-5 CD).

doi:10.1017/S0009840X10002222

J. has enjoyed a distinguished career as a sensitive critic of Latin literature, having made signal contributions to our appreciation of Virgil (*Darkness Visible*, 1976), lyric (*The Idea of Lyric*, 1982), Lucan (*Momentary Monsters*, 1987), Horace (*Horace and the Dialectic of Freedom*, 1993) and Lucretius (*Lucretius and the Modern World*, 2000). In the volume under review, he turns to Latin elegy and especially Propertius, the focus of several earlier studies (*CSCA* 6 [1973]; D.H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn, D. Fowler [edd.], *Classical Closure* [1997]; and M.B. Skinner [ed.], *Blackwell's Companion to Catullus* [2007]). He conceived of the present work, however, not as 'a kind of scientific investigation' into 'cultural practices', or anthropologico-linguistic study (p. 61) of 'the underlying structures of the poems [or] the rules that governed the poetic genres that the poets had chosen to write in [or] the formal and stylistic norms that a given genre demanded [or] the relations