

élite usage; the native word was *olor*, and its occurrence in Lucilius is not a sign of possible colloquial colour: that is what most Romans normally called the bird. I fail to see how L. knows that Virgil was reluctant to use it (see, additionally, pp. 150–2, where L. asserts that Lucilius, Catullus, and Caesar ‘avoided’ *armentum*: how can he know this)? On p. 71 and in n. 196 L. feels that ‘it is worth pointing out that *curvus* is not a common (though a natural) epithet of *aratrum*’. Clearly, L. didn’t follow *TLL*’s advice at iii.1550.58–9 and check its article on *curvus*, ii.399.50–5. He would otherwise have learned that Clausen was right in his commentary to call it a standing epithet of the plough. Again, on p. 162 his comment on the use of *dicere* with *carmen* is wrong—what of Hor. *C.* 1.32.3–4 or *CS* 8? He would not have made it if he had followed the advice of the *Thesaurus* and gone to the cross-reference in the article on *carmen* in iii.469.58–64. So far, I have concentrated on details, but this is a detailed book, and, I repeat, L. maintains that he is providing scholars with *material*. But all the ‘material’ I have just drawn attention to is obviously flawed. I turn briefly to the quality of argument, which is hardly better.

Consider this as a method of argument: on pp. 91–2 L. notes that *Ecl.* 2.24 was recast by C. G. Heyne as a line of Greek verse. Though L. is aware that Virgil might simply have been pretending to quote a Greek poet, he nonetheless spends about a page in arguing that the model is not Parthenius, but Euphorion; then insensibly the existence of a Greek model subsequently becomes secure doctrine on pp. 96, 103, and 124. But there was not a shred of evidence that Virgil had a model in mind there at all. Then on p. 96 L. himself turns 6.29–30 into Greek, and again plumps for Euphorion as the source. Finally, on p. 101, 8.44, which Cartault put into Greek, is also ascribed to, yes, you guessed it, Euphorion. But there is no actual evidence for any of this tissue of Euphorionic speculation. As L. himself said at the outset, it may all be pretend on Virgil’s part.

I have said enough, perhaps too much, to indicate the quality of this research, which I can only hope was written up *after* the work had been approved for the D.Phil. degree at Oxford. It offers little to the scholar, who will have to check every last detail to ensure whether or not the author can be relied upon. In my view, that is not the sort of material we need.

*King’s College London*

ROLAND MAYER

A. LUISI: *Il perdono negato. Ovidio e la corrente filoantoniana.* (Quaderni di ‘Invigilata lucernis’ 13.) Pp. 178. Bari: Edipuglia, 2001. Paper, €15.90. ISBN: 88-7228-315-9.

In this study of Ovid’s *relegatio*, Aldo Luisi argues that Ovid belonged to a phil-Antonian group, led by Germanicus, aiming to destabilize Augustus and replace his secular model of emperor with an orientalised divine monarch. As cause for exile, ‘*carmen*’ is merely a red herring; the true cause is the mysterious ‘*crimen*’, probably knowledge of a plot against Augustus. In addition, Ovid sent coded messages to his friends and co-conspirators in Rome.

L. argues, from the exile poetry, that Ovid committed a real misdeed, which he presents as not *maleficium*, but a lesser fault, lacking criminal intent. Ovid diverts attention from that fault, which neither he nor Augustus wants publicized, by defending the irrelevant *Ars*. Augustus ‘intuited’ (p. 125) that Germanicus’ phil-Antonian group was plotting against him; hence the two Julias were exiled for political, not moral, reasons. The last chapter is a grab-bag of leftovers: Ovid’s rededication of the *Fasti* to Germanicus ensured his continued relegation by angering Tiberius; Ovid sent coded messages to his co-conspirators; in the *Fasti*, he had intended a national epic devoted to the *domus Fabia* (p. 146), which must have angered both Augustus and Livia. In the *Fasti*, Ovid treats Livia with irony by invoking her scandalous elopement with Augustus and inappropriately, given their ages, describing the two as bedmates (pp. 153–4).

This book offers repetitive, poorly evidenced arguments based on unsound philology and extremely selective readings in Ovid, along with instances of carelessness (to cite only one: including Martial and Juvenal [p. 98] in Ovid’s list, *Tr.* 2.361–470, of past authors not criticized for writing about love and sex). For instance: L. relies rather anachronistically on Ambrose and Augustine in discussing the meaning of *poena* in Ovid’s exilic poetry (pp. 103–4). Asserting that *precor* is reserved for addressing gods (p. 76)—a distinction that will surprise readers of Tibullus, who uses it in sexual entreaty (see 1.3.83, 1.8.51, 2.6.29)—L. deduces a divinizing treatment of Augustus in Ovid’s use of *precor* (*Tr.* 2.179). But its elegiac dimensions cannot easily be disentangled from its religious use, particularly as Ovid continues employing the elegiac meter in

his exilic pleading. Such anachronistic, uncontextualized philology inspires little confidence in L.'s interpretations of Ovid's poetry, particularly as he mostly overlooks the pre-exilic works. Thus, in arguing that Ovid wanted a divinized monarch, L. shows no consciousness of Ovid's habitual irreligious, irreverent treatment of the gods. (Here I speak less of *Ars* 1.637, 'expedit esse deos et, ut expedit, esse putemus', than of the unruly divinities of the *Metamorphoses*.) It would be interesting to know why a poet who consistently presents gods as petty, impulsive, violent, and vindictive (not to mention uncontrollably lustful) would want a divine ruler in Rome. I leave it to historians to determine the plausibility of L.'s 'corrente filoantoniana', though I note that he offers no explanation for Ovid's participation. One can imagine the motives of Germanicus and the Julias, but anyone who has read widely in Ovid will be hard put to imagine him conspiring to install a living god as emperor. (See also J. A. Richmond's review of L.'s co-edited text of selections from Ovid's exile poetry, at *BMCR* 2003.01.12.)

The book has neither an index of topics nor an *index locorum*. Its poorly related chapters, three of them virtually unrevised articles, regularly betray their published past: many footnotes refer not to other chapters, but to their original incarnations; there is much repetition between chapters. The first, on Ovid's removal from Rome and life at Tomis, is thematically irrelevant and treats its subject credulously: virtually all its evidence comes from Ovid, and, except where L. is guided by the scepticism or literary expertise of other scholars, he takes Ovid literally. Thus, he disputes some of Ovid's description of Tomis ('Ovid lies shamelessly' in order to invoke pity, p. 48) but, despite acknowledging an exile-genre devoted to that very purpose, fails to see it in Ovid's account of the journey there. The structure seems intended to maintain suspense in readers waiting to learn the secret of the coded messages. Such readers will be disappointed: imagining some interesting puzzle (Vergilian-style acrostics, perhaps?), one comes finally to this: 'I can name names' (pp. 134–5). One may then be tempted to say *parturient montes* . . . Whether or not Ovid knew of a plot against Augustus, he became *persona non grata*. What power does the scandalous exile retain but that of endangering former associates? Ovid's ability to get others into trouble, far from being an undiscovered secret, is implicit in the mere fact of exile poetry.

Careful reading in the work of Alessandro Barchiesi (*The Poet and the Prince* [Berkeley, 1997], here cited only twice in footnotes), not to mention broader reading in Ovid himself, could have prevented the problems of logic, philology, literary genre and context, and plausibility that plague this book.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

SHARON L. JAMES

A. GAOS SCHMIDT (ed.): *Aulo Gelio: Noches áticas. Tomo I. Libros I–IV. Introducción, traducción, notas e índice onomástico* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Mexicana). Pp. cclxxvi + 214 (double). Cased. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2000. ISBN: 968-36-8139-5 (968-36-8138-7 pbk).

A. GAOS SCHMIDT (ed.): *Aulo Gelio: Noches áticas. Tomo II. Libros V–X. Traducción, notas e índice onomástico* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Mexicana). Pp. clxxxix + 180 (double). Cased. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2002. ISBN: 968-36-9622-8 (968-36-9120-X pbk).

Until 2000, the only Spanish translation of Gellius was that by F. Navarro y Calvo (Madrid, 1893 and reprints), mendaciously described as 'traducción directa del latín' but in fact following the Nisard French version far more faithfully than that had followed Gellius. All the warmer a welcome is due to G.S.'s new translation, now at the half-way point, based on the Latin text of G. Bernardi Perini's UTET edition (see *CR* 48 [1998], 57–9); its use is defended by the difficulties of consulting manuscripts (or microfilms?) in Mexico (Volume I, p. xcix).

In a long introduction, G.S. classifies Gellius' chapters by content in accordance with the *artes liberales* and claims (in virtually the same words as at *Nova Tellus*, 17 [1999], 109–24) that their

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved