the difficulty that Maecenas, *qua* Vergil's student, is experiencing in following his teacher's lessons, as N. argues on pp. 123–4), but they will definitely profit from N.'s thoughtful and thought-provoking approach to the text.

A final quibble. Endnotes rather than footnotes in a scholarly book are always a nuisance, but when the notes contain extended references to and engagement with secondary literature (as opposed to brief citations), they really belong at the bottom of the page. Otherwise, the reader's experience will be nothing but frustration.

Columbia University KATHARINA VOLK

D. ARMSTRONG, J. FISH, P. A. JOHNSTON and M. B. SKINNER (EDS), *VERGIL, PHILODEMUS, AND THE AUGUSTANS*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004. Pp. xiv + 361. ISBN 0-292-70181-0. US$55.00.

This volume, based on papers delivered at the First International Symposium on Philodemus, Vergil, and the Augustans, held at Cuma in 2000, is a laudable attempt to illuminate the central Augustan poetic texts from the fragmentary and largely technical works of Philodemus (together with his epigrams) — two, for modern scholarly endeavour, still all too often largely separate worlds that we know from the ancient evidence were intimately connected (with further recent proof in Philodemus' unquestionable address in *P. Herc. Paris.* 2 to Plotius Tucca, Varius Rufus, Vergil, and Quintilius Varus). An excellent Introduction by David Armstrong sketches a historical map of Philodeman studies, and reviews those works of Philodemus most germane for readers of Augustan literature. Half of the sixteen chapters that follow centre on the *Aeneid*, preceded by six chapters on Vergil's earlier works, including the *Appendix Vergiliana*, and followed by two on Horace and Propertius.

Diskin Clay and Francesca Longo Auricchio add further Epicurean intertexts to the reading of *Catalepton* 5. Régine Chambert believes that the *Culex* is Vergilian and compounds implausibility with far-fetched Epicurean readings of the poem. Marcello Gigante, the doyen of modern Philodeman studies who died in 2001, by contrast reiterates his belief that even the *Eclogues* have nothing Epicurean about them. Gregson Davis, with a more balanced view of the Epicureanism of the *Eclogues*, enriches the understanding of *Ecl.* 1 with reference to Philodemus' invitation epigram to Piso, a text that Armstrong also draws into his discussion of Hor., *Epistles* 1.5. W. R. Johnson muses on a Lucretian fable by Leopardi in order to reflect on the nature of the self-sufficiency achieved by the Corycian old man in *Georgics* 4.

The chapters on the *Aeneid* attempt to match Vergilian themes or passages with particular Philodeman works or doctrines. In some cases this operates at too high a level of generality, as with Giovanni Indelli on anger, Patricia Johnston on piety, Marilyn Skinner on the Vergilian theme of the 'failure of art', and Daniel Delattre on music. To show that a poet is not inconsistent with a philosopher hardly constitutes proof of influence. By contrast Jeffrey Fish makes a dazzling case for the authenticity of the Helen episode in *Aeneid* 2 by matching the contrast between Aeneas' anger management in this and in later episodes in the poem with Philodemus' reading of the development of the character of Odysseus in *On the Good King*. The other highlight of the volume is Armstrong's revelatory chapter on the Philodeman underpinning of Horace, *Epistles* 1 (building on Gigante), convincing in general outline and, as a demonstration of Horace's detailed and intensive engagement with philosophical texts, to be set beside John Mole's 'Poetry, philosophy, politics and play: *Epistles* 1', in T. Woodman and D. Feeney (eds), *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (2002). Armstrong's Philodeman findings should now be fed back into a reconsideration of the equally strong Lucretian presence in *Epistles* 1, on which see above all R. Ferri, *I dispiaceri di un Epicureo* (1993). How exactly should we characterize the interweaving of the Philodeman and the Lucretian in the book?

In other cases there is a suspicion that the temptation to a pan-Philodemism of which Armstrong warns may lead to an undervaluing of the more obvious Lucretian models for Vergil. Michael Wigodsky's technical reconstruction of the argument of *De dis* seems less relevant to the ensuing discussion of Vergilian religion than do the important Lucretian passages also cited. Frederic Schroeder suggestively develops Philip De Lacy's classic article on 'distant views' in Lucretius (*CJ* 60 (1964)) with regard to Vergil's thematization of the engaged and detached viewer; Philodemus' therapeutics of detachment are a fascinating further context, but Lucretian models are perhaps sufficient to explain the Vergilian phenomena. Sauron's idea, to which Schroeder refers, that the belvedere of the Villa dei Papiri may have been inspired by the proem

to *De rerum natura* 2 is probably a fond fancy, but Statius did apply the Lucretian vision to a bricks-and-mortar villa in *Silvae* 2.2 (see R. Nisbet, *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (1995) 27–46), and much later Frederick Hervey, Bishop of Derry, was to build Mussenden Temple, a library perched on the wild cliffs of the Antrim coast, with Dryden's translation of the opening lines of *De rerum natura* 2 inscribed round its dome. The two remaining chapters both get stuck into the detail of Philodeman texts: Francis Cairns gives a display of sometimes hair-raising ingenuity in his excavation of a continuous Epicurean and Philodeman subtext in Propertius' address to Lynceus (identified with Varius Rufus) in 2.34. Dirk Obbink gives an object lesson in the Delattre-Obbink method of reconstructing Herculaneum rolls, which is then put to sterling use in the restoration of some of the connections in Greco-Roman mythography.

Such imbalances as the volume shows should be taken as a sign that these are still pioneering times. Even those chapters that fall short in the attempt to show direct use of Philodemus in the Augustan poets serve a useful function in raising our consciousness of a crucial part of the intellectual environment of the Roman poets.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford PHILIP HARDIE

S. J. GREEN, *OVID,* FASTI I*: A COMMENTARY* (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum). Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2004. Pp. xii + 365, 1 table. ISBN 90-04-13985-0. €90.00/US$119.00.

Green's substantial commentary fills a conspicuous void in Ovidian studies: following Fantham's 1998 Cambridge Latin Classic on *Fasti* 4, it is the second English language commentary on this scale to deal with a single book of Ovid's *Fasti*, and the first specifically on Book 1, since Frazer's anthropologically oriented edition of all six books in 1929. This hefty and handsome Brill hardback consists of a bipartite introduction (25 pages), line-by-line commentary (302 pages), bibliography (*c.* 330 items), and indices (25 pages). The text used is the 1988 Teubner by Alton, Wormell, and Courtney, to which G. proposes twelve variants (listed on p. xii): these are plausibly advocated (mostly according to contextual logic, with stylistic coherence adduced in nn. 474 and 705), but are difficult to assess in the absence of a text, *apparatus criticus* (admittedly a bulky resource), and history of the text.

The first part of the introduction (1–14) highlights how the *Fasti* corresponds, and (deliberately) fails to correspond, to Ovid's ostensible programme (vv. 1–62): G. makes sensible use of recent scholarship on Roman religion, ascribing the flexibility with which Ovid handles his material to the absence of a rigid orthodoxy (7–9); at the same time, self-professedly disposed to the ambiguous/subversive reading of internal discrepancies (see p. 12, 21n.), G. ventures that the *Fasti* is 'essentially about Ovid, ingenious poet and savvy critic of Augustan discourse' (14). The commentary proper is similarly multilateral (cf. e.g. 65on.), and enables the reader to reach an independent position. In the second part of the introduction (15–25), G. demonstrates his mastery of the scholarship on the vexed issue of pre- and post-exilic strata in *Fasti* 1: a survey of the *status quaestionis* outlines the case for post-exilic revision (15–17), which G. accepts as valid, and resolves suspected revisions into three groups according to date and likelihood of revision (18–21). Taking issue with other scholars' indiscriminate use of the term 'revision' in relation to Ovid's post-exilic additions (e.g. p. 19, n. 17), G. defines a more serviceable heuristic terminology ('continue', 'update', and 'revise', p. 15 with n. 1). This lucid analysis of the problem ultimately exposes its insolubility, and paves the way for G.'s reader-centred approach: exilic in part, the text should be read as exilic *in toto*. Such a reading will ultimately subordinate the historicity of exilic strata to the autonomy of the text (e.g. 'whether or not the Evander episode was physically altered by the poet during exile … it admits of a strong exilic reading' (23)). If this proves too pragmatic a solution for some, there remains G.'s tentative reconciliation with the 'Ovidian intention': Ovid, once exiled, would himself have recognized the 'exilic potential' (23) of the entire work (22–3, 23n.).

Evidencing a certain Ovidian polymathy in its introduction, G.'s commentary perhaps reveals its origins as a doctoral thesis. As such, the introduction might prove more informed than informative for a reader new to the text: there are no immediately identifiable sections on, e.g., the status of the elegiac genre prior to the *Fasti*, Ovidian style, prosody etc., and entries on such important antecedents as Callimachus (1–2 (i) n. + 89–288 (iii) n. = 1.5 pages), Propertius (1–2 (v) n. = 1 page), and the didactic tradition (27–62 n. = 1 page) seem disproportionately concise, and are left until the commentary proper. The entry on Propertius, too, shows an uncharacteristic