material that Roller covers will also be few. Indeed, not even Roller manages that: he thinks that the phrase 'character, emotion, and actions' (Str. 1.2.3) is 'a direct quotation from the opening of Aristotle's *Poetics*' (16). On the historical and topographical matters to which the book is primarily devoted, however, his relentlessly detailed commentary commands greater confidence. Katherine Clarke, reviewing Roller's English translation of the *Geography* (*CPh* 111 [2016], 185–90), observed that

the reader will have to work hard. The promised commentary is to be awaited with eager anticipation, given R.'s expertise. It is to be hoped that this will provide adequate support to the weary reader so that he or she can relax and enjoy being led on Strabo's fascinating, though challenging, tour of the whole world known to Rome in a work of exceptional historical, literary, and intellectual richness.

I have doubts about 'relax and enjoy': but the support provided by Roller's commentary will certainly make reading Strabo easier and more informative. There is also an accompanying online map, which is well worth a visit.[10]

MALCOLM HEATH
M.F.Heath@leeds.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0017383518000189

Latin Literature

'Statius' *Thebaid*', someone donnishly quipped, 'has no sufficient reason to exist.'[1] Kyle Gervais might beg to differ. Like the *Thebaid* itself, his commentary on Book 2 has grown over many years, and deserves to be taken very seriously.[2] The crisp introduction sets the tone and clearly signals priorities in its four sections, a rising tetracolon for author, problems of editing, intratexts, and intertexts; not a word on style and prosody, and reception is excluded on the ground that Statius' own *imitatio* is quite enough to be getting on with. The text is newly constituted, with ample apparatus and text-critical discussion: Gervais joins Barrie Hall's rebellion against the bifid stemma, but fairly questions his view that the *Thebaid* should be easy reading; he accordingly diverges from his edition nearly a hundred times, and offers a translation which, if less old-falutin' than Shack's Loeb, does an equally good job of disabusing anyone who thought it would be quicker to read Statius in English.[3] The notes are full and rich: words aren't wasted, but both philological graft and literary interpretation amply attest to fine scholarship, good sense, and long thought.

Like most of the Statian *nouvelle vague*, Gervais finds much of the wit and meaning in the imitation, and he abundantly shows why others should too. From the complex brew

[10] <http://awmc.unc.edu/awmc/applications/strabo/>, accessed 25 May 2018.

[1] R. Jenkyns, *Classical Literature* (London, 2015), 269.

[2] *Statius, Thebaid 2. Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. By Kyle Gervais. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017. Pp. liii + 374. Hardback £100, ISBN 978-0-19-874470-2.

[3] J. B. Hall, A. L. Ritchie, and M. J. Edwards, *P. Papinius Statius. Thebaid and Achilleid*, 3 vols. (Newcastle, 2007–8) (the editing is by Hall); D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Statius. Thebaid*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA, 2003).

bringing Laertes and his dripping eyes up from Hades, through the fine tracery of Harmonia's necklace, to tyrannical Eteocles as Dido writ new (love for Aeneas turned to lust for power) and the epic blow-up of Tydeus' monomachy, he patiently and interestingly teases apart Statius' dense weave. We could perhaps take a bit more *interpretatio Romana*: Gervais doesn't want to get bogged down in 'pro-' and 'anti-Domitian', reasonably enough, but it's hard not to hear imperial cant when Eteocles affirms that the *patres* would not permit his resignation, even if he wanted it (*Theb.* 2.450–1); hard too not to hear the note of cynicism equally familiar from Silius and Valerius Flaccus. But that is a quibble: this is an edition to endure and earn due honours.

Two disembodied alabaster hands holding stylus and plectrum: an eerie cover for Stanley Lombardo's new translation of the *Odes* and *Carmen Saeculare*.[4] It turns out to be the 'Hands of Horace' by the sculptor Sarah Danays in 2017, a suitably modern image for a stylishly modern translation. Lombardo has already tested his mettle on Homer, Virgil, and more, and his Horace (this time with facing Latin) is equally readable; Anthony Corbeill adds a brief introduction and thirty pages of skeletal notes. The Translator's Preface regrets all those dully rhyming quatrains of iambic pentameters that used to be trotted out (xvi), and promises a better impression of Horace's varying rhythms and stanzas, which Lombardo certainly delivers. Odd, though, to find no mention of David West, who did something similar both in his three volumes of *Odes* (likewise text and translation, but with interpretative essays too) and in his English-only *Odes* and *Epodes*.[5] Odder still the absence of Guy Lee, whose much admired volume of twenty years ago is an exact competitor: *Odes* and *Carmen Saeculare* translated in varying metres, with facing Latin, brief introduction and skeletal notes.[6]

Lombardo goes for shorter lines and freer adaptation than West, and has the advantage of being both bilingual and cheap; I suppose the peculiar choice of Shorey and Laing for the text of the *Odes* (we're not told where the *Carmen Saeculare* comes from) won't bother too many of the 'students of classical civilization' targeted on the cover.[7] With Lee the comparison is closer. Take the first stanza of *Nunc est bibendum* (*Odes* 1.37):

It's time for drinking, time with unfettered feet
To beat the ground in dances, high time today
To furnish the Gods' cushioned couches
With Saliarian banquets, comrades.
(Lee)

Now for some drinking, now for the earth
to shake under our dancing, high time now
to deck the gods' couches
with priestly banquets, friends.
(Lombardo)

[4] *Horace. Odes & Carmen Saeculare*. Translated by Stanley Lombardo. Introduction and notes by Anthony Corbeill. Indianapolis, IN, Hackett, 2018. Pp. xviii + 246. Hardback $56, ISBN: 978-1-62466-689-6; paperback $18, ISBN: 978-1-62466-688-9.

[5] D. West, *Horace Odes I. Carpe Diem* (Oxford, 1995); D. West, *Horace Odes II. Vatis Amici* (Oxford, 1998); D. West, *Horace Odes III. Dulce Periculum* (Oxford, 2002). D. West, *Horace. The Complete Odes and Epodes. Translated with an Introduction and Notes*, Oxford World's Classics (Oxford, 2000).

[6] G. Lee, *Horace. Odes and Carmen Saeculare. With an English Version in the Original Metres, Introduction and Notes* (Leeds, 1998).

[7] P. Shorey and G. J. Laing, *Horace, Odes and Epodes* (Chicago, IL, 1919).

Or of *Parcius iunctas* (*Odes* 1.25):

Rarely now they come, the unruly young men,	*Less and less often are those raunchy boys*
Rattling your closed shutters with volleyed gravel	*throwing pebbles at your shuttered windows*
Robbing you of sleep, but the door and door way	*and robbing you of your sleep; and your door,*
Hug each other, . . .	*hugging the threshold, . . .*
(Lee)	(Lombardo)

It must be serendipity that produced so much similarity among difference, but the syncrisis also points up Lombardo's slimmer, updated style (and Lee didn't call Lydia's *moechi* 'fuckers'). He is up to the minute on Ligurinus' grooming too, following Richard Thomas in taking the *pluma* of *Odes* 4.10.2 as pubic hair (if a shade less delicate than Horace in spelling it out). Alas for the translation of *mox* as 'soon' (*Odes* 4.4.9), but that's a stubborn weed, so do spread the good news ('subsequently, thereafter', etc.).[8] Production is very good.

Two slender tomes on Tacitus now, starting with Lee Fratantuono's commentary on *Annals* 16.[9] The idea of elucidating this corner of the Tacitean canon was a nice one, and we can thank Bloomsbury for bringing it to fruition. We might be more grateful if the book didn't tell students that Tacitus wrote the *Annals* before the *Histories* (7, 33), that the perfect of *abrumpere* is *abrumpsi* (155), or that suffect consuls in the Principate were created when an *ordinarius* 'for whatever reason had not finished his tenure' (97). Some help with Tacitus' tricky syntax would be nice (there are long notes on basic points), as would a halfway-accurate Latin text and – well, you get the idea. It would be trivial to point out that every lone 'i' has been auto-capitalized ('locus, -I, m.' etc.), if it didn't show such breath-taking disregard for copy-editing. I'm sorry to fulminate, because Fratantuono conveys great enthusiasm for his text, and – as you might expect, given all his work on epic poetry – catches some nice Virgilian notes. But it's hard not to be frustrated when an imprint calls itself 'Academic' and hawks wares like this to unsuspecting buyers: dear Bloomsbury, please take some responsibility for what you print and how you print it.

Victoria Emma Pagán meanwhile offers a new beginner's guide to Tacitus.[10] The structure is part thematic, part by work, and skirts scrupulously clear of predictability: a first chapter is themed around imperial prosopography; the second deals with speeches and deeds (with a tour of favourite anecdotes); then come a chapter each on *Germania*, *Dialogus*, and afterlife. Pagán works hard to keep the style fresh (even the *Teletubbies* pop up, surely a first in Tacitean scholarship), and makes the *Germania* her unorthodox key ('arguably the most important work for understanding Tacitus', 78). Of course the 'Introductions to Tacitus' shelf is a well-stocked one, and this volume finds a close

[8] H. J. Rose, '*Mox*', *CQ* 21 (1927), 57–66.

[9] *Tacitus Annals XVI*. By Lee Fratantuono. London, Bloomsbury Academic, 2018. Pp. xii + 184. Paperback £13.49, ISBN: 978-1-3500-2351-2.

[10] *Tacitus. Understanding Classics*. By Victoria Emma Pagán. London and New York, I. B. Tauris, 2017. Pp. xiv + 192. Hardback £39.50, ISBN: 978-1-78076-317-0; paperback £12.99, ISBN: 978-1-78076-318-7.

comparandum in Rhiannon Ash's student guide:[11] they share laconic title, length (but Pagán has endnotes), lively manner, a substantial reception chapter, and the climactic claim on the back cover that 'the wit and wisdom of Tacitus remain all too relevant to our contemporary world' (Ash)/'the work of Tacitus remains eternal' (Pagán). But these are two quite different books: where Ash introduces the five works in their traditional order, Pagán gives the deck her unusual shuffle, and the points of emphasis are various and varied. The work of enthusing new readers continues apace.

Ovid's Homer: now there's a title to catch the eye.[12] The fertile terrain of Virgil's Homer has been ploughed for many a year, Ovid's Virgil too. Now Barbara Weiden Boyd cuts out the middle man to ask how Ovid reads the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* themselves. The question has been asked before, of course, but she offers this as a first dedicated monograph, and one which dwells at least as much in the elegiac corpus as in the *Metamorphoses*. The introduction sets out a Bloomian stall, and paternity looms large throughout: how does Ovid treat his poetic 'father'? Rather fondly, it emerges: there is more filial piety (and genial winking) than parricide between these covers. Boyd shows similar benevolence herself, writing with clear affection for both her authors, and abundant positive critical energy.

The preliminaries over, we start with a potted history of Latin Homer from Livius Andronicus to Propertius. Boyd's plan of 'dispelling the large Virgilian shadow' over Ovid (4) is reflected straight away in Virgil's remarkable omission from this account (no Horace either); so is the temptation of teleology, as we whisk through Homer's Roman reception to its 'mature manifestation in Ovid' (23). Three short Ovidian readings then whet our appetite, as do interesting remarks on his use of the commentary tradition, before Chapter 2 launches the first major enquiry, 'Ovid's Diomedes'. It is a nice choice to open with: a 'secondary' hero for the 'secondary' Ovid (41), but a primary hero too, given his star role in the early fighting of the *Iliad*. Not all may agree that he is notable as 'an exemplar of rhetorical excellence in the *Iliad*' (66) or be described as 'much like the Ovidian narrator' in his αἰδώς (shame and/or respect) towards Agamemnon (52), but the connections drawn are intriguing. Four chapters then explore the paternity theme with the help of such father-figures as Nestor, Daedalus, and (a stretch, this) Agamemnon *qua* 'prospective father-in-law to Achilles' (107). Direct syncrisis is scarce here; the idea is rather that, if we think of Ovid as Homer's poetic son, all fathers and children can be read as metatextual comment on that relationship. Then comes a chapter on repeating yourself (aptly recycled from a conference volume[13]), with Ares and Aphrodite as its theme: when Ovid retells Demodocus' lay in *Ars am.* 2 and again in *Met.* 4, Boyd argues, he performs an act of Homeric repetition. I wasn't sure exactly how the studious variation in *Met.* 4 relates to formulaic orality, or what makes this example stand out among so many Ovidian self-imitations, but the readings are sensitive as ever, and 'repeatedly, incessantly and repetitiously' (219) is

[11] R. Ash, *Tacitus. Ancients in Action* (London, 2006).

[12] *Ovid's Homer. Authority, Repetition, and Reception*. By Barbara Weiden Boyd. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017. Pp. xvii + 301. Hardback £55, ISBN: 978-0-19-068004-6.

[13] Laurel Fulkerson and Tim Stover (eds.), *Repeat Performances. Ovidian Repetition and the Metamorphoses* (Madison, WI, 2006).

one of many nice touches of wit. Two further chapters on heroines and 'Homer's Gods in Rome' bring the total to a Pierian nine.

One striking thing about this study is the rarity of close intertextual work. To be sure, Homer gets his due and more, with long plot summaries-*cum*-analysis (a full eighteen pages on *Iliad* 4–5) offered throughout. Specific intertexts are proposed from time to time, some of them worked hard, and several scenes and episodes are read together in broad terms; but this is certainly not – to take three very various paragons – an Ovidian Knauer, Nelis, or Barchiesi.[14] A deliberate choice, no doubt, and reflected in the wide berth given to the 'Little *Iliad*' of *Metamorphoses* 12–13, mentioned briefly once, and Papaïoannou's big book about it, not mentioned at all.[15] Likewise presumably the exclusion of the Homeric hymns (think only of Pentheus in *Met.* 3). Still, Boyd's manifesto for thinking more about Homer when reading Ovid comes across most effectively in the closer comparisons – and would only gain from adding Virgil (we glimpse just one 'window reference', 70–1). Some more *Aeneid* might also help with suggestions about paternity, given how powerfully the dynamics of epic succession are inscribed by Virgil and described by Philip Hardie.[16] But Boyd has made her choices, and followed them through with style: *her* Ovid's Homer, after all, is above all an elegiac one – and the oblique gaze fits.

Bartolo Natoli, meanwhile, has been studying 'the poetics of speech in Ovid'.[17] Having considered some voices silenced in the *Metamorphoses*, he settles on the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, where he finds Ovid artfully and artificially fashioning his own 'silencing'. There is plenty of familiar material here, and the Latin texts and translations needed another check, but Natoli works hard to fashion a clear argument, and to ground it theoretically: he invokes 'schemata' and 'cultural memory', and criticizes psychologizing readings of the exile poetry, which he prefers to read through the lens of *persona*-theory.

Miryana Dimitrova's book *Julius Caesar's Self-Created Image and Its Dramatic Afterlife*[18] does just what it says on the tin, dividing its attention between Caesar's commentaries (with some Lucan) and Caesar on the English stage; Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, Handel's *Giulio Cesare in Egitto*, and Bernard Shaw's *Caesar and Cleopatra* are the protagonists. Originating in a dissertation written at King's College London, it is a careful, clear discussion with light scholarly apparatus, arranged around three themes: Caesarian *celeritas*, his 'illeism' (all those third-person verbs), and, most interestingly,

[14] G. N. Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer. Studien zur poetischen Technik Virgils mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis* (Göttingen, 1964); D. Nelis, *Vergil's Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (Leeds, 2001); A. Barchiesi, *Homeric Effects in Vergil's Narrative* (Princeton, NJ, 2015).

[15] S. Papaïoannou, *Redesigning Achilles. 'Recycling' the Epic Cycle in the 'Little Iliad' (Ovid, Metamorphoses 12.1–13.622)* (Berlin, 2007).

[16] P. Hardie, *The Epic Successors of Virgil. A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* (Cambridge 1993), ch. 4.

[17] *Silenced Voices. The Poetics of Speech in Ovid.* By Bartolo A. Natoli. Wisconsin Studies in Classics. Madison, WI, University of Wisconsin Press, 2017. Pp. x + 227. 2 b/w illustrations, 2 tables. Hardback $69.95, ISBN: 987-0-299-31210-7.

[18] *Julius Caesar's Self-Created Image and its Dramatic Afterlife.* By Miryana Dimitrova. Bloomsbury Studies in Classical Reception. London, Bloomsbury Academic, 2018. Pp. ix + 236. Hardback £85, ISBN: 978-1-4742-4575-3.

his 'relationship with temporality', described as 'quasi-divinity' (22). The plays in question show scant sign of direct influence from the *commentarii* and only some of Lucan, but Dimitrova gives carefully considered reasons for reading them together, and shuttles gamely between her ancient and modern texts. I won't pursue my Bloomsbury-bashing except to suggest that they employ a copy-editor to iron out such wrinkles as 'Sallustus' and 'Assinius Pollio', and to ask whether it's good taste to feature dust-jacket puff ('A pioneering study…') from the author's own doctoral supervisor.

Plant of a Strange Vine by Robert John Sklenář is an entertainingly idiosyncratic reading of Seneca's *Oedipus*.[19] The idiosyncrasies start with the quotation in the title (Jeremiah, on the sins of Israel) and the prefatory request that we read Sklenář's earlier book on Lucan first: I didn't get round to that, I'm afraid, but would have gladly read a page or two summarizing it. They continue with a brief reading of *Epistulae morales* 114, whose attack on corrupt style Sklenář makes his interpretative key for Seneca's own tragedies; the bulk of the short book is a read-through of the *Oedipus* itself, oscillating between very close comment on language and very large claims about philosophy and cosmology. Given the premise that 'Seneca is a decadent poet' (5) and a tendency to take hyperbole literally (words such as 'false' and 'distorted' abound), it's perhaps not surprising that Sklenář finds the *Oedipus* – which stands in his view for all the tragedies – scarred by precisely the *oratio corrupta* excoriated in the letter-treatise. Not to mention differences between poetry and prose, doubts might fairly be raised about syllogisms along the lines of '*Ep.* 114 censures undue abruptness; I find this passage of *Oedipus* unduly abrupt; *ergo* Seneca is hoist by his own petard'. Sklenář also finds the letter itself flawed by a 'fatal contradiction' – a little unfairly, given that he mistranslates the sentence in question (12). Karlheinz Töchterle can rejoice to find his commentary cited in perhaps 80 per cent of the footnotes; why Tony Boyle's isn't cited at all we are left to guess.[20] For all that, the prose is gutsy and Sklenář knows his mind: a pleasingly knotty vine under which to pass an hour or two.

A scenic book to finish, *Prudentius and the Landscapes of Late Antiquity*.[21] Cillian O'Hogan has revised his Toronto dissertation into a picaresque tour of Prudentius, in particular the *Cathemerinon* and *Peristephanon*. Keeping his eyes peeled for allusions to classical poetry, he offers a string of sensitive small-scale readings marked by careful attention to the model texts. Thematic unity comes from 'landscape', liberally interpreted (journeys, urban space, pastoral, architecture), unity of argument from the opening claim that 'Prudentius' poetry consistently…retreats into descriptions of the world that owe more to biblical and classical precedents than they do to lived experience' (2; how many ancient poets would have agreed that life and literary imitation are so separable?). To pick out one of many interesting details, I confess to leaving Chapter 5 unconvinced that Prudentius subtly expresses reservations about the marvels

[19] *Plant of a Strange Vine. 'Oratio Corrupta' and the Poetics of Senecan Tragedy*. By Robert John Sklenář. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 363. Berlin, De Gruyter, 2017. Pp. iii + 99. Hardback £63.50, ISBN: 978-3-11-051772-9.

[20] K. Töchterle, *Lucius Annaeus Seneca. Oedipus* (Heidelberg, 1994); A. J. Boyle, *Seneca. Oedipus* (Oxford, 2011).

[21] *Prudentius and the Landscapes of Late Antiquity*. By Cillian O'Hogan. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. viii + 197. Hardback £60, ISBN: 978-0-19-874922-6.

of modern buildings, but the argument raises a question about intertextual methodology. Prudentius enthuses over a basilica in Emerita with its *laquearibus aureolis* (*Peristephanon* 2.197), echoing Virgil's *laquearibus aureis* (*Aen.* 1.726). O'Hogan is curiously reluctant to accept this 'putative imitation' (in fact one of the clearest liaisons he considers), then suggests that it expresses 'ambivalence' and 'uneasiness' about Carthaginian luxury in church (156). But that depends on agreeing, first, that Prudentius also found Dido's palace problematic and, second, that we can stabilize exactly which connotations are imported when a given phrase is imitated. (What *does* Sklenář mean with his title?) In any case, as Statius' *Siluae* show, Horatian moralizing discourse isn't the only way to turn rich architecture into verse. Still, food for thought, and – like all O'Hogan's arguments – served with care and ingenuity. Many other nice morsels are offered along the way, and images too, as of poor St Cassian, 'martyred by being stabbed to death by his stylus-wielding pupils' (52): a lesson to remember.

CHRISTOPHER WHITTON
clw36@cam.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0017383518000177

Greek History

This is a particularly rich crop of books on Greek history. I commence with two important volumes on citizenship in archaic and classical Greece. Traditional narratives of Greek citizenship are based on three assumptions: that citizenship is a legal status primarily linked to political rights; that there was a trajectory from the primitive forms of archaic citizenship to the developed and institutionalized classical citizenship; and that the history of citizenship is closely linked to a wider Whig narrative of movement from the aristocratic politics of archaic Greece to classical Athenian democracy.

The first volume, on archaic citizenship, edited by Alain Duplouy and Roger Brock, includes ten chapters alongside an introduction and conclusion by the editors.[1] It provides a devastating critique of the assumptions above; but what should replace them? Some chapters in this volume focus on citizenship as performance, arguing that membership in the citizen community was based on the successful performance of activities such as commensality, cult, hunting, and athletics, rather than being a clearly defined legal status. There is no doubt that there is great value in this approach, not only with regard to the archaic period but also for the classical, and Cartledge's presentation of Spartan citizenship as successive stages of successful performances is illuminating. On the other hand, there is clear evidence that archaic communities attempted to institutionalize and formalize citizenship. The Solonian census shows that archaic citizenship could be linked to clearly defined statuses; but, as van Wees shows in an important contribution on warfare, archaic citizenship could be a conglomerate of a clearly defined status for the elites that had military and economic obligations and a much looser status for the majority of the population, who had few obligations but

[1] *Defining Citizenship in Archaic Greece*. Edited by Alain Duplouy and Roger Brock. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2018. Pp. xiv + 370. 5 figures, 4 tables. Hardback £80, ISBN: 978-0-19-881719-2.