

between the ‘clearly defined allusion’ and ‘mere accidental confluence’ of language. T.’s rebuttal (in a lengthy footnote) fails properly to address this essential point and consequently adds little to an important theoretical debate. There may well have been a plausible and constructive response to Hinds’s challenge, but this brief counter-blast, more notable for its sarcasm than its argumentation, was not it.

*Reading Virgil and his Texts*, then, might be said to exhibit both the great strengths and occasional limitations that have characterized T.’s scholarship over the years. Despite the scattered missteps mentioned above, this well-produced volume is sure to consolidate T.’s important achievement in raising critical awareness of Virgil’s profound and extensive engagement with his Hellenistic models. For this reason in particular it is an immensely valuable collection, and one that rewards re-reading as few others.

University of Texas at Austin

ANDREW ZISSOS

## HORACE

S. MARIOTTI (dir.): *Orazio: Enciclopedia Oraziana*. 3 Vols: pp. xxxiv + 946, xxi + 950, xxii + 1046, numerous ill. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1996–8. Cased.

The three volumes are sensibly divided into sections and subsections, as follows: Volume I: 1. Texts and Traditions; 2. Biography; 3. Composition; 4. MS Tradition; 5. Editions, Translations, and Commentaries; 6. Places and Peoples; 7. Individuals. Vol. II: 8. Literary and Philosophical Tradition; 9. Antiquities, Anthropology and Society; 10. Religion and Myth; 11. Concepts and Feelings; 12. Literary Forms and Motifs; 13. Language and Style. Vol. III: 14. Antiquity; 15. From the Middle Ages to the Present Day; 16. Horace Abroad; 17. Festivals in the Twentieth Century; 18. Music, Iconography, and Figurative Arts; 19. The Ancient Scholia; 20. Indexes.

I have been very slow to come to terms with these sumptuous volumes, despite a long relationship. I was confused about the function of a work which on the one hand contains an essay on the manuscript tradition by Cesare Questa (good) and on the other a text of the poems attributed to no editor (bad). There are also some Greek verses by Flaccus (i.214 and 316), where Kytzler, who seems unaware of Gow–Page’s edition of the *Garland of Philip*, in which all the other poems attributed to Flaccus are collected, does not say why these two are felt to be by Horace (unhelpful). Now the reason may be given in some item of his bibliography, but he had ample space in which to justify this improbable proposition (improbable, because Suetonius knows of no Greek verses ascribed to the poet). In §19 the text of Porfyrio’s commentary is simply reprinted from Holder, but account has not been taken of the numerous corrections he made on pp. 614–17 of his edition. Thus, as regards mere typographical errors, in the note to C. 1.34.14–16 we still find *flectibus* instead of *fletibus*, and at 2.1.9–10 *destinati* instead of *destinasti*. An emended text is retained on C. 2.17.5–6, whereas Holder expressly returned to the transmitted text at that point; likewise he repudiated the change of *saltus* to *saltatus* at 3.6.22, but the emendation is reprinted here. At 3.19.9 the tradition offers *sicut*, for which Holder printed Pauly’s emendation *scilicet*, but in the corrigenda he preferred Stangl’s *Siculi*; Pauly’s reading appears here. This reprint is thus a missed opportunity (regrettable).

I therefore turned to one of my *cari colleghi* for an explanation. It was alleged that books like this form part of the modern Italian gift or barter economy (so reassuring

that the EU have not yet eradicated all our national traits): a professional person tenders a bill below the going rate for services, so the client still feels beholden. One form of return is a gift, say, of books on this scale, which, displayed in a drawing- or waiting-room, proclaim that one is in the presence of a person of culture. This explanation, if true, goes some way to accounting for the lavish colour plates depicting, for example, 'Cupid and Psyche' (Pl. 38) or 'The Marriage at Cana' (I am not making this up!: see Pl. 41. Horace's invitation to that interesting occasion must have ended up in the 'dead letter' office of the *cursus publicus*). But it still cannot excuse a lack of oversight, especially when it is recalled that the volumes were produced by a professional *squadra*. Here are some examples of lack of editorial control.

§13 begins with an impressive essay by Frances Muecke, who discusses, for example, Horace's use of the 'apo koinou' construction (ii.778 for lyrics and 784b for hexameters). But there is also a separate article (in my view, under-researched and bibliographically meagre) on this important feature of the poet's style by C. de Meo (ii.795–7). Now, why was the feature dealt with twice? If twice, why no cross-reference? In the *Indice dei nomi e delle cose notevoli* we are referred to de Meo's article, but not to Muecke's discussions. This happens again, with archaism: there is a main article, *arcaismi* (ii.797–9), noticed in the index, but no notice is anywhere taken of Muecke's discussion (ii.773–4). This is especially regrettable, since the treatments are different, yet complementary: Muecke divides her material generically, Bartalucci morphologically (but there is inevitable, and from an editorial point of view, avoidable, overlap). Finally, there is a discussion of parenthesis (ii.839), unnoticed in the index, nor have the editors cross-referenced to the article on the subject, ii.936–8.

A similar lack of collaboration and cross-referencing is seen in the articles on Lipari (§6, i.508) and Ebro (§7, i.716–17), where a combined effort would have made more sense.

§7 needed an altogether firmer policy: too often there is nothing at all to be said about many of the individuals' names, and the writers of articles on them are therefore reduced to paraphrase of the poem (see e.g. s.v. Bullazio), or to speculation (see s.vv. Archia, Butra), or to repeating what has been said before (see s.vv. Arbuscula, Megilla). There are lapses too: the short essay on Ligurinus fails to make the point that this could be a Roman cognomen, unlike so many other off-the-shelf Greek names for young men. The notes on Lucilius (i.784–5) are quite insufficient for so important a model; while the essay on Plancus is good, as usual, the editors have not cross-referenced to Pöschl's discussion of *C.* 1.7 in §10 (ii.289), where the ode's myth is discussed for its relevance to the addressee.

There are other disappointments. In §14. s.v. Tacito (*A.* Michel), there is no reference to Aper's respect for Horace as a model for language (*Dial.* 20.5, but it is picked up by Calboli at iii.61a), or his remark about contemporaries who prefer Lucilius to Horace. Caesius Bassus, the first to write on Horace's metres in the reign of Nero, appears in this section s.v. Grammatici Latini (iii.32b), but his rôle is not explained (nor is he in the index). There is no article on Quintilian, or on Pliny the younger who, at *Ep.* 9.22.2, tells us of the illness of Passenius Paulus, a poet who imitated Horace's lyric, surely significant for the poet's *fortuna* in the early second century A.D.

In §15 no word on Rudyard Kipling, so no reference to his short story 'Regulus', or that charming work, *Q. Horati Flacci Carminum Liber Quintus* (Oxford, 1920). For the uninitiated, the English poems are by Kipling and Charles Graves, turned into Latin chiefly by A. D. Godley, with help from the likes of Monsignor R. A. Knox: a gem of old-fashioned 'scholarship', and the warmest of tributes to Horace's hold on the English imagination. The short essay on C. M. Wieland does not mention in its

bibliography the edition of his translation of the *Epistulae*—published in 1782, not 1872—and *Sermones* by M. Fuhrmann (Frankfurt, 1986), vol. IX, which has a helpful account of the translator's aims and method, pp. 1061–95. There seems to be nothing on Philip Francis, whose English version of the *Odes* was so popular, and often reprinted, in the eighteenth century. (But there is an article on Dryden.)

Let me not end on a note of cavil. There is far more in these volumes that is worthwhile and illuminating than there is that deserves criticism. But their scale and expense will probably deter even libraries, so that what deserves attention is likely to be missed, not least because the editing has been so light.

King's College London

ROLAND MAYER

### METAMORPHOSES XIII

NEIL HOPKINSON (ed.): *Ovid, Metamorphoses XIII* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics). Pp. vii +252, map. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Cased, £40 (Paper, £14.95). ISBN: 0-521-55421-7 (0-521-55620-1 pbk).

It is a pleasure for me to see the Cambridge Classics offering some of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, having welcomed their work in the *Heroides* and *Fasti*. Wisely, too, considering the number of commentaries on the earlier books of the epic, Hopkinson decided to take on Book 13, the longest single book of the poem and one of the most versatile. It starts with the famous debate between Ajax and Ulysses, makes a quick transition to the tragic experiences of Hecuba over the deaths of her children Polyxena and Polydorus, starts on the so-called 'Little Aeneid', and ends with the amatory woes of Polyphemus, Acis, Galatea, and Glaucus. That allows Ovid to flaunt his various registers, and it tests the mettle of any commentator. Hopkinson does superbly.

The first ten pages are not a formal introduction: they contain only a table of contents, a brief preface, and a map of two pages. The true Introduction is a substantial block of forty-four pages, in which H. discusses the theme of metamorphosis in Ovid and earlier literature, briefly deals with structure and themes in the poem and especially Book XIII, then spends almost 40 pages examining five major divisions of the book. His purpose is to trace as many of the sources that Ovid drew upon as possible and to suggest the ways in which the poet exerted his originality. This strikes me as a little too much, and I daresay that many students, if not teachers, will prefer the Latin text and commentary to this Introduction, particularly since H. goes over much of this same material in his individual notes. But no one can say that it is not thorough.

The final page (p. 44) of the Introduction deals with the interesting text and apparatus criticus used. H. benefited from the advice of several Ovidian experts, notably E. J. Kenney and Richard Tarrant, who is soon to publish his long-awaited OCT of the *Metamorphoses*. Citing Tarrant's judgement, that 'enlightened eclecticism based on sense and usage' is the only prudent course for editors, he creates an interesting and somewhat controversial apparatus, a model of simplicity to encourage the application of 'enlightened eclecticism'. None of the manuscripts are identified; none are allowed to have the weight of numbers, age, or earlier authority. Instead, H. introduces the sigla M for the unanimity of the MS tradition and *m* for part of the