

i.e. the *iuvenis* (E. 1.42), in whom we are to find a beneficent king like Ptolemy Philadelphus as praised in Theocritus 17. This is bold and original, but also far-fetched and fanciful, especially as H. privileges this bookish interpretation over the direct, namely that the grim upheavals of unresolved Italian civil war include Arcady; but he warned us at the start that he was approaching Roman poetry from a Greek perspective. If that is Meliboeus, then what or who is Tityrus? H. reviews the ways in which Virgil is ambiguously identified with Tityrus (E. 1 and 6; G. 4.563–6) and with Menalcas (E. 5.85–90), deriving this from Theocritus' identification with Simachidas in *Id.* 7; moreover (4.3. 'The song fades' (130–40)) 'every bucolic singer, every pastoral poet, is in various ways a Daphnis', whose death is both an end and for his successor a beginning: in pastoral poetry, the singer is central, not the song, which is unrecorded and evanescent; yet writing does already exist in Arcadia; H. ends strongly in discussing this paradox, which takes off from the encounter of Simachidas and Lycidas in Theocritus 7. At E. 5.10–15, the contrast of rustic improvisation and laboured craftsmanship is explicit.

'Afterword' (141–6): H. asks in retrospect, I think 'knowingly', whether it mattered to the Roman poets that Callimachus *et al.* came after the Archaic and Classical poets, and that in turn they had spawned their own schools of imitators, now forgotten because they stood in their masters' shade; he leaves it to us to respond with the 'no' that he is inviting. He wonders whether it would have been better to proceed genre by genre. Again, surely no; H.'s own 'Kreuzung der Gattungen' is an essential feature of his whole approach. It would, however, have been useful to flag at the sub-headings of each chapter which poems the reader should not merely vaguely recall but should read carefully afresh and entire before attending to what H. has to say; for H.'s own Callimachean style, his inventive juxtaposing, and the compression inevitable in a slim volume such as this, will bewilder the casual browser or the *profanum uulgus* seeking essay-fodder.

University of St Andrews

A. S. GRATWICK

A. S. HOLLIS, *FRAGMENTS OF ROMAN POETRY c. 60 BC–AD 20; EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION, TRANSLATION, AND COMMENTARY.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. xviii + 440. ISBN 978-0-19-814698-8. £80.00.

Adrian Hollis's *Fragments of Roman Poetry c. 60 BC–AD 20* offers the reader text, translation, and commentary for the remains of twenty-eight poets who wrote in what is generally regarded as the greatest period in the history of Latin poetry. This muster of more or less celebrated poets begins with Helvius Cinna, a fitting poet to lead off a collection of *disiecta membra*, and ends with Rabirius, whom Velleius Paterculus mentions in the same phrase as Vergil (11–388); in between the reader will find the parade of familiar names and fragments out of which the editor attempts 'some integration of the poetic scene in Rome during this period' (*Preface*, vi) — a purpose admirably accomplished in these pages. The fragments of Rabirius are followed by a selection of *adespota* (389–419) and a valuable appendix on 'Named Poets of Whom No Verbatim Quotations Survive' (420–30). The chief differences between H.'s edition and Courtney's *Fragmentary Latin Poets* (2003<sup>2</sup>, with addenda) are the chronological limits of the fragmentary corpus and the scale of the commentary; both books are roughly the same length, but Courtney's contains the fragments of about one hundred poets spread out over six centuries of Latin literary production, while H. deals with the much briefer but highly influential and richly productive period of the four decades between 60 B.C. and A.D. 20. The following comparison will give some indication of the difference in scale; in H.'s edition Cornelius Gallus occupies thirty-six pages, in Courtney's twelve pages. Where the two books overlap in their treatment of the poets active between 60 B.C. and A.D. 20, readers will now find themselves the fortunate beneficiaries of not one but two outstanding editions of these intriguing texts. After working one's way through the sparse remains of such works as Calvus' *Io*, Varro's *Argonautae*, or Varius' *de morte*, it is hard not to feel sharp pangs of regret for what has been lost to our understanding of Latin poetry and the Latin language in general. Yet, there is some solace to be found in this wealth of observation, interpretation, and reconstruction, which gives us a sense of the aesthetic values and artistic merits of poets who have suffered the extreme indignity of random erasure.

Among the many attractive features of this book I will single out the following: the system of consecutive enumeration for all items, fragments and *testimonia*, which facilitates cross-referencing and contributes to the compactness of the discussions of authors and their works; translations not only of the fragments but also of the *testimonia*, an aid to readers who might

otherwise skip these deliberately fragmented pieces of literary and grammatical shop-talk; and finally, the always informative and often illuminating introductions to individual works (I note in particular the introductions to Cinna's *Smyrna*, Calvus' *Io*, Varro's *Chorographia*, and the pages on Furius Bibaculus and his *Annales Belli Gallici*). The commentary, which embodies the erudition of a scholar *utriusque linguae peritissimus*, will be for a very long time to come the seedbed that sustains the growth of our understanding of these fragments. In what follows I record some observations and differences of opinion.

p. 88 *noctivagis* (fr. 43A): H. points out that Egnatius' *noctivagis* has no exact Greek counterpart for the idea expressed in *noctivagis astris*. Since the Strasbourg papyrus has revealed that Lucretius found the model for the expressions *montiuagum genus ferarum* (2.597, 1081) and *montiuaga fera* (1.404) in Empedocles' poem (ὀρίπλαγκτος, a(ii) 26 Martin and Primavesi (1999)), it is worth considering the possibility that Empedocles was the source for Egnatius and Lucretius, his Latin epigones in the genre of poems *de rerum natura*, of the errant compound epithet νυκτίπλαγκτος applied to celestial phenomena (cf. Garvie on Aesch., *Cho.* 523–5). It should be noted that the combination of two epithets with one noun (*noctiuagis astris labentibus*) is a stylistic feature that Egnatius shares with Lucretius. *Altis* in the second line of this fragment is rightly obelized. The simplest solution, which appears not to have been considered, is to read *atum* ('lofty position'), *altis* being due to the common error of assimilation to the case of the previous word. Translate 'yielding its lofty position to daylight'. p. 167 (fr. 111.4): H.'s emendation *Phoebo* for the transmitted *Phoebi* is a definite improvement; (fr. 112.1) his conjecture *ut* for *at* is not supported by Ovid, *Met.* 1.45–7, where the phrase *eodem numero* makes clear the correlation between the *ut*-clause and the *sic*-clause. A parallel for *aetherius orbis* meaning 'the heavenly sphere' rather than 'celestial body' would be helpful. p. 168 *sidera septem* (fr. 113.1) is mistakenly translated 'the Pole Star', but in the commentary (p. 188) is correctly identified as 'the Great Bear'. p. 196 *mirabile uisu*: once again (cf. Courtney, 245) Varro is criticized for the weakness of this phrase. As I observed in my review of Courtney (*BMCR* 95.10.06), since humans have an upright posture and animals are prone, it is indeed cause for wonder when the ox is seen *suspiciens caelum*, an uncharacteristic activity (cf. the description of another bovine sky-watcher in Ovid, *Met.* 1.729–33). In the translation of this fragment (p. 171), H. inadvertently substituted Vergil's 'heifer' (*bucula*, *G.* 1.375–6) for Varro's 'ox' (*bos*). p. 208 *urbesque silebant*: the soundness of the plural *urbes* is needlessly questioned. Apollonius' description of night's onset is not specific to any location or person until he mentions Medea (3.751). There is then no reason to assume that at 3.749 Apollonius is referring to Colchis or that Varro had to interpret the Greek in that way. p. 221 *test.* 140(e): Ovid's phrase *lasciua carmina* is oddly translated 'ornamental poetry' rather than 'playful/risque poetry'; similarly at *test.* 160(d) (p. 283) Pliny the Younger's *uersiculos seuerum paruum* is paraphrased as 'risky verses' (a slip for 'risqué?'), while at *test.* 19(j) (p. 50) the same phrase is translated 'little poems that are far from austere'; the sense might be better rendered 'far from serious' or 'light-hearted'. p. 283, fr. 161 (Octavian's Fulvia epigram): the insult to Fulvia in Octavian's expression of concern for his invaluable *membrum virile* (6–7), which proved so effective when aimed at the Republican constitution, has not been fully appreciated. H. takes it to mean that Octavian 'would be exposing himself to some unpleasant disease' (p. 286), while Courtney sees it as an expression of his utter disdain for the repulsive Fulvia (p. 283). Both interpretations fail to take into account the chief danger, according to the male imagination at any rate, of attempting to satisfy a woman who is vilified as having a voracious sexual appetite, i.e. *rupta ilia*, as Catullus was well aware (11.20; cf. 80.7–8). Better to cross swords on the battlefield than to break one's sword in bed. After identifying *mentula* as the 'archetypal obscenity', Hollis translates 'penis', a rather flaccid companion for the English obscenity that salts the translation. The punctuation of line 4 with question marks after *pedicem* and *faciam* is an improvement. Is it possible that Fulvia's name is intended to carry an echo of *uulua*? This epigram seems out of place among the elegant flora of this largely Callimachean grove. Though its author is known, it would be more at home in the ribald company of *uersus populares*, a category excluded from this collection, or under the heading 'Ditties by Dictators'. p. 335 (fr. 200): the translation should reflect the fact that *humum* (neuter) is the subject of *mersit*. p. 373 (fr. 228, Albinovanus Pedo): the treatment of the infinitives in lines 7, 8, and 9 'as parts of accusative + infinitive without main verb' (commentary, pp. 375–6, 377) cannot be defended with a reference to *Aen.* 7.255–6, where it is clear that the infinitives are introduced by the notion of thinking in line 254, *uoluit sub pectore sortem*. In 3 *ire* is explained as an infinitive dependent on

*audaces* (so also Courtney). But, as I observed in my review of Courtney, this type of adjective-infinite combination usually has an epithetic quality expressing disposition, capacity, skill, fitness or the like; here we have a particular occasion which does not allow for a general statement of the men's behaviour as *audax*. The *apparatus* (p. 374) does not record that *pectore* is the transmitted reading in line 15; H.'s adoption of Bursian's conjecture, *obstructa in ... pectora*, results in an unparalleled expression for introducing direct speech. In line 19 I would suggest *terris* for the corrupt *+liberis/libris+*; the sense will be 'another world untouched by the human world (*terris*)'. Meyer's conjecture *bellis*, printed by H., seems too restricted a feature to differentiate adequately this *alium orbem*, which in 22–3 is described as *dium quietas sedes*. The punctuation of lines 20–21 (*di ... oculos*) as a question continuing the question introduced by *anne* in line 18 seems inconsistent with the context. The question introduced by *anne* in 18 (*alio ... orbem*) is a suggested answer to *quo ferimur?* (16); *di ... oculos* introduces a new thought that does not form part of the preceding question but instead introduces the idea of provoking the anger of the gods by transgressing mortal limits. This statement, essentially an injunction to turn back, sets up the following question (*quid ... sedes* 21–23), which expresses the fear that Germanicus' fleet is violating the sacred abode of the gods. p. 403 commentary on fr. 238.1: the phrase *semine nymphae* is described as 'a disturbing collocation'. The Greek parallels cited do nothing to alleviate the difficulty because they illustrate the use of *semen/semina* to mean 'offspring/seed of', not origin 'from the seed of', the mother; the reference to Lucretius 4.1211 (*materno semine*) reveals more about Epicurus' understanding of female physiology than it does about standard epic phraseology for identifying lineage. It may be possible that *mutatae nymphae* is an adnominal rather than a possessive genitive, explaining the identity of *Lycaonio semine*: 'you [Arcas], born of Lycaon's seed, the transformed nymph', meaning that his mother Callisto is to be identified as the seed of Lycaon, and not that Callisto herself is the source of the seed. Another possibility is to read *mutata nympha* (ablative) in apposition to *semine*, which would yield the same sense as above. In the translation of this fragment *raptam* is rendered 'after her abduction' (p. 238), which is inappropriate to the context; in the commentary (p. 403) the word is correctly translated 'carried off'. It should be noted that *rapere* is the *uox propria* for various forms of apotheosis (Ovid, *Met.* 2.506, Callisto and Arcas; 9.271, Hercules; 15.840, 845, Caesar the Dictator; Livy 1.16.2, Romulus). p. 391 (fr. 239): *sine fluctibus* is translated 'without help of the waves'; clearly the meaning is 'without coming into contact with the waves'.

At the risk of seeming ungrateful for the bounty produced from these gathered crumbs, I think that Cicero's 'flauti ab Epiro lenissimus Onchesmites' deserves a place in this volume as a poem-fragment rather than as a mere *testimonium* (1), and not only because it comes within its chronological limits (see Lyne, *CQ* 28 (1978), 167 = *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry* (2007), 60). The fact that a Roman consular, in a moment of epistolary relaxation, tossed off a line, which, if it had come from the hand of Cornelius Gallus, would be a showpiece of the *doctus poeta*'s anomalous knowledge and spondaic swagger, leaves one with a renewed appreciation for the mansion of the Muses; it has many rooms, not all of them illuminated by Aratean lamps.

The text is remarkably free of misprints. I noted only two worth mentioning: p. 304 (fr. 180.1), *Tibullo* for *Tibulle* and (fr. 181.2), *hominum* for *hominem*. To borrow the words of the poet Ticide (fr. 103), this book will be *doctorum maxima cura*.

University of Pittsburgh

D. MARK POSSANZA

N. M. HORSFALL, *VIRGIL, AENEID 7. A COMMENTARY* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 198). Leiden: Brill, 2000. Pp. xlv + 566. ISBN 9-00410-842-4. €207.00.

N. M. HORSFALL, *VIRGIL, AENEID 11. A COMMENTARY* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 244). Leiden: Brill, 2003. Pp. xxvii + 505. ISBN 9-00412-934-0. €130.00.

N. M. HORSFALL, *VIRGIL, AENEID 3. A COMMENTARY* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 273). Leiden: Brill, 2006. Pp. liv + 513. ISBN 9-00414-828-0. €165.00.

By this late date Horsfall 7 has been scrutinized and scrupled, its praises sung, its faults faulted. The 'unorthodox dodges' that distinguish H.'s editions are not always helpful. Good, though, is his use of O, P and T in the margins of the Latin to indicate notes on orthography, punctuation, and text. The reader is immediately (vv. 4–8) faced with the sequence TOTTO and suspects a cryptogram to H.'s beloved Skutsch.