

Seneca's tragedies, which he has edited (1966); and one each Virgil, Ovid, Varro, Seneca *N. Q.*, Apuleius, the *Historia Augusta*, and Porphyrio (oddly, this last consists of seven unconnected notes on pp. 368–73 of Holder's edition). He adds only a laboured expansion of his note on Catullus 55.9 and some remarks on Goold's Loeb of Propertius. The volume will not perform much of a service, therefore, except to readers who have no access to *Museum Criticum*. One cross-reference (p. 61 n. 5) works only in the original version, which is where Marzullo's dutifully reported brainwaves should have stayed.

G.'s conjectures seldom alter more than one word, and they are a mixed bag. Many are reasonable without being cogent; he rightly places sense and idiom above the shapes of letters, but a conjecture like *manavit* at Prop. 2.32.23 (for *me laedit*), which no reader would ever find fault with if it were transmitted (any more than with the fifteenth-century conjecture *pervenit*), runs the risk of looking more like an evasion than a solution. He can bring one up with a salutary jolt, as when he argues that *O funde* at Cat. 44.1 is a corrupt name (though one of his suggestions, Ofonius, would be unmetrical in the vocative), or that at Hor. *Ep.* 1.11.26 not *locus* but *Notus* was *effusi late maris arbiter*, or that at 118.5 Petronius credited Horace with *curiosa facilitas* and not, despite the better rhythm, *felicitas*. His objections to transmitted readings or previous conjectures, for instance Prop. 1.2.9 *non fossa*, are often just, but it is hard to see why his own *consternet* at Prop. 1.4.23 or *pulpa voretur* at 2.20.31 escapes.

Bibliographical annotation is light, and sometimes his argument cuts corners. At Cat. 3.17 his *vestra* for *tua* presupposes what many consider an unacceptable text in 16. In Cat. 44 he neglects to reinterpret ll. 2–4. At *Aen.* 9.172 his parallels for *quis* include one with the complement in the dative and none with it in the accusative. At Prop. 2.32.47 he needed parallels not for generalizing plurals but for a mixture of generalizing and ordinary plurals. At Prop. 2.5.28 *lingua levis* (H. Richards), not mentioned, surely has more in its favour than *verbilevis* (Scaliger, with *formipotens*). At Prop. 4.11.53 he should have explained the relevance, which eludes me, of Lucr. 1.656. Going back to *HSCP* 71 (1966), 76–7 would have saved him from wondering how Goold took *motis decor artubus* at Prop. 1.4.13.

At Catullus 97.3 his appeal to the authority of G rests on two false statements, one specific and the other general; and what makes a conjecture 'autorevole' (pp. 10, 66)? On his *soporem* at Hor. *Od.* 3.1.19 see now F. Cairns, *Coll. Latomus* 266 (2002), 84–5. He quotes Ausonius *Mos.* 324–6 in a baffling form by omitting words and making two mistakes, one of them an unmetrical *mari* for *amni* (p. 27). Also unmetrical is his *arcus dant* at Petronius 119.11. Sen. *N. Q.* 6.1.13 *infamis ruinis* (Tyre *aliquando*) is surely protected against his *informis* by *Ep.* 14.8 *ab illa regione verticibus infami* (the Straits of Messina), 6.21.1 *vexerit* against his *evexerit* by rhythm.

G.'s editions of Seneca's tragedies (1966) and of Cicero's speeches *Pro Rabirio Postumo* (1967) and *Pro Balbo* (1971) were the best available at the time. Together with these notes, they have shown him to be a sober and thoughtful critic of both poetry and prose. So retrospective a volume is therefore a disappointment.

Pembroke College, Cambridge

MICHAEL D. REEVE

M. LIPKA: *Language in Vergil's Eclogues*. (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 60.) Pp. xii + 224. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 3-11-016936-3.

'The work is designed to provide scholars with *material*' (p. xi, author's emphasis). It is hard to believe, however, that any scholar will be content with the bare statement on p. 13 that *agellus* in *Ecl.* 9.3 means 'beloved homeland', rather than 'little farm' or 'smallholding'. Similarly, on p. 91 there is a faulty paraphrase of 2.12 *uestigia lustru* as 'follows in Alexis' footsteps'. The phrase really means 'go round in search of', or simply 'track'. Thus the scholar for whom the book is designed might well repudiate the proposed debt to Callimachus, canvassed at that point, as illusory. Or consider this: on p. 34 we are told that, in *Ecl.* 2.22 'lac mihi non aestate nouum, non frigore defit', *non aestate . . . non frigore* is 'a simple hendiadys . . . (= *nunquam*)'. Has L. never encountered the term 'polar expression' or, as E. L. Bundy used to call it, 'universalizing doublet'? L. has another heterodox 'take' on hendiadys on p. 153, where he regards the double *atque* in 5.23 as an example; again, no explanation supports the claim. I doubt the notion on p. 41, that in 3.58 'incipit, Damoeta; tu deinde sequere, Menalca', *sequere* is an imperative, will count as 'material' in a scholar's armoury. Surprising too is the claim on p. 158 that *cycnus* is the common word for 'swan' in classical Latin. 'Common' to whom? As a loanword, it was part of

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

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