

Unlike many earlier critics, R. is very much in step with Ovid, attuned to essential aspects of the *Fasti* and aware of it as a stylish, entertaining and erudite poem. He has a lively mind and comes out with lots of clever ideas and acute observations. He generally does justice to the important technical skills of this poet. But I would like to see still more on sound and style (for example, the elegance at 319–24, which fits with the elegant finery described, and is also deliberately incongruous in connection with the grotesque cross-dressing) and especially more on rhythm (for instance, the fluttering dactyls for the ghosts in 565 and the grave spondees in 675). R. is very alert to wit and humour, and points out many amusing aspects. But again he could have added more. So on p. 134 he misses the joke of Arion paying the dolphin a fare by putting on a musical performance for it; and on p. 204 he fails to note how daft the raven's excuse is (it could have gone to a different spring, and by bringing back the snake it shows how easily it could have dealt with that hindrance). R. is alive to intertextuality too, and perceptively probes the effects of such echoes. But in his enthusiasm he is sometimes ready to claim allusion where there are just not enough similarities in language and detail (especially on p. 191, of supposed reminiscence of Virgil). And he has not seen that 'vis tibi grata fuit' in 141 is very probably a subversive nod to A.A. 1.673, 'grata est vis ista puellis'. I would also like more on the implications of the similes. This is an already bulky commentary, but to accommodate this extra material quite a few of R.'s notes could be streamlined (e.g. on the celestial dolphin on p. 111; on references to the Arion story on pp. 115f.; on *Cynthia = Diana* on p. 170; and on Hercules' connection with Antony on p. 227).

With regard to interpretation there are lots of excellent notes (especially those on the comparison between Augustus and Romulus at 138f. and 149ff.; and on lilies in 706). Particularly useful is his employment of the 'suspicious' and 'supportive' reader in connection with reaction to references to Augustus. He shows good judgement in sometimes leaving the question of subversion open, and sometimes indicating that it is likely. His discussions generally are sensible, reasonable and full, and they are particularly enlightening *vis-à-vis* ritual, astronomy and the calendar. His assertions are almost always sound and backed up by strong arguments. However, on p. 84 he does make the unsupported claim that Alcmaeon's murder of his mother (in revenge for his father) was more impious than Medea's murder of her two innocent children (and Glauke and Creon). Elsewhere occasionally his arguments are not convincing. Most notably, in connection with Ovid's account of the rape of Lucretia, he states that Ovid's Lucretia is not Livy's archetypal Roman matron but rather has the voice of an elegiac female and is a combination of the beauty and passion of the elegiac *puella* with the *pudivicia* and *castitas* of the *matrona*. He nowhere defines what exactly he means by the 'elegiac female' or 'elegiac *puella*', but the distinction made between her and the *matrona* suggests that he has in mind the elegist's *domina*. But apart from being beautiful and inspiring lust, the Ovidian Lucretia does not possess the standard traits of a Cynthia, Delia, Nemesis or Corinna. R. maintains that at 746–54 there are echoes of Propertius' Arethusa, and of Laodamia and Penelope in the *Heroides*; but these are married women mentioned in elegy, not elegists' mistresses. The designation of Lucretia as *puella* in 810 is supposed to bolster his case, but that word is certainly not confined to young women in elegy. Lucretia's copious weeping in 820 is said to be expected from an elegiac figure; but it is expected also from a rape-victim who is upset and ashamed. He adds her blush at 828 as a confirmation of her elegiac qualities, but lots of females outside of elegy blush (like the epic Lavinia). What R. does manage to show is that Lucretia in the *Fasti* is like married women represented elsewhere in elegy (including Ovid's own *Heroides*), which is hardly earth-shattering.

But the above are only a few quibbles in connection with a vast mass of very sound scholarship. This commentary will be indispensable reading for anybody working on the *Fasti* in general and Book 2 in particular.

McMaster University
murgatro@mcmaster.ca

PAUL MURGATROYD

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000743

J. INGLEHEART, *A COMMENTARY ON OVID, TRISTIA, BOOK 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. Pp. 450. ISBN 9780199590421. £80.00.

Tristia 2 is a strange poem. Standing apart from Ovid's other exile poetry, this is the only book of his exilic epistles to comprise a single continuous elegy, and the only poem in the *Tristia* or *Epistulae ex*

Ponto addressed explicitly to Augustus, author of Ovid's exile. It is seriously and self-consciously concerned with issues of reading and reception, criticism and interpretation, problematizing through its own 'commentary' upon Ovid's poetic corpus the very notion and value of interpretation and commentary. *Tristia* 2, then, presents a unique challenge to any critic who would attempt her own commentary upon it. But Jennifer Ingleheart's new work is suitably outstanding in its own right and admirably squares up to that challenge. Building upon the recent studies of *Tristia* 2 by Gareth Williams (1994), Bruce Gibson (1999), and, above all, Alessandro Barchiesi (1993, 1994, 1997), I. presents her commentary as a close reading, an interpretation of the poem as a whole, which is no less consciously engaged in the interests and concerns of its contemporary audience than her Ovidian text. Her aim is 'to contribute to a diachronic dialogue about *Tristia* 2' and 'to provide a useful tool by engaging with the dominant concerns of contemporary Ovidian, classical, and more broadly literary scholarship, and thereby to contribute to (re-)assessments of the importance and value of Ovid's text' (1–2). This she achieves through careful reference to other views, other interpretations, and other conjectures and criticisms, throughout each section of her comprehensive, lucid and detailed commentary.

The work opens with a concise introduction, ostensibly too brief to offer much more than a brisk survey of the 'Background to composition', '*Tristia* 2's place within the exile poetry', 'Models', 'Literary past', 'History', 'Influence', 'Manuscript tradition', and 'Metre'. Across these short sections, however, I. manages not only to cover all the key material necessary to contextualize the poem, but also to introduce a number of original arguments and conjectures. So, concluding a succinct discussion of the contentious details of Ovid's '*carmen et error*', she speculates that 'since the [*lex Iulia*] punished not only adulterers but also those who encouraged adultery, the *Ars* teaching may have been considered equivalent to *lenocinium*' (4). And indeed, since Ovid's relegation to Tomis corresponds with the proscribed penalty for *lenocinium*, I. suggests that it is specifically this offence with which Ovid may have been charged.

In her analysis of Ovid's models for *Tristia* 2 (Horace's *Epistles* 2.1, Horace's *Epode* 17, Cicero's *pro Ligario*, and Ovid's own *Heroides* 21), I. first makes a persuasive case for noticing the emphatically didactic character of *Tristia* 2 — provocative indeed in a poem supposedly defending the didactic *Ars* against the *princeps*' misreading of its precepts. She then develops the significance of another Horatian intertext for our reading of *Tristia* 2, arguing convincingly that its allusions to *Epode* 17 create the impression that *Tristia* 2 may be read as 'a palinode of the *Ars*' (11) — an ingenious possibility which further complicates contemporary debates about the 'sincerity' of Ovid's renunciation and defence of the *Ars* in *Tristia* 2. I. goes on to show that the surprising literary precedents for Ovid's 'self-defence' in *Tristia* 2 include Cicero's *pro Ligario*, highlighting the pervasive use of legal rhetoric and forensic vocabulary in the poem and detailing its correspondences with Cicero's defence of the exile Ligarius 'addressed to a Caesar who holds sole power in Rome and who is also (at least in part) the party injured by the defendant' (13). Emphasis upon this legal intertext then allows I. to outline and summarize the rhetorical structure of *Tristia* 2 as comprising an *exordium* (lines 1–26), *propositio* (lines 27–8), and forensic *tractatio* (lines 29–578) — further subdivided into *probatio* (lines 29–154), *peroratio* (lines 155–206), *refutatio* or *confutatio* (lines 207–572), and epilogue (lines 573–8).

Here, as throughout her analysis, I. is mindful of the thorny question of the degree to which *Tristia* 2 should — or could — be read as either 'pro-' or 'anti-' Augustan, declaring (with Elaine Fantham) not only that the reader's neutrality on this issue is impossible but further, that, since '*Tristia* 2 forces its readers to take a position on its political stance ... neutrality is not even desirable in this case' (26). Whether or not I.'s view of Ovid as an 'outraged loyalist' (26) successfully addresses that question — or avoids that neutrality — is for her own readers to decide.

This comprehensive volume, complete with I.'s own text of the poem (adapted from Hall's 1995 edition) and facing translation, includes an extremely useful index of Greek and Latin terms and an index locorum (as well as general index and bibliography). An essential reference work for any Ovidian, it would make an ideal set text for an undergraduate class were it not for the prohibitive expense of the hardcover — my only reservation in recommending this outstanding study of a singular poem.

University of Bristol
g.liveley@bristol.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000755

GENEVIEVE LIVELEY