the lemmata (3. 1. 42 *Sidone*, 3 26. 6 *lurida*) with 'some thirty others' suggested in the notes. R generally parts company from N, up-front, when Bentley (emulated or abetted by Housman) sets N off questing for a *tibicen* to save the text from illogic, implausibility, infelicity. (A reminder that all language contains those seeds. You only need to read hard enough.) He has *always*, since before *In Pisonem*, used proving of the paradosis as a reading-strategy that cuts straight to the bone ('I have considered … But …'). And if N has now taken the method way past where H would've vetoed, but where now R may demur, it should (I insist) no way be misunderstood as footling whimsy, but rather construed as focussed hermeneutic scrutiny. If you don't try to read as closely as N does, (1) that won't be a bit surprising, (2) you'll be copping out of really being a Latinist, (3) your own style of scrutiny will be no less esoteric, and most likely more self-deceived.

There's not a page in NRIII that I couldn't disagree with, thank goodness; and if there was a note that I didn't learn from, about Horace, Latin, Classics, poetry, language, culture, humanity, then it was because I lost it – and suspect NR would still rather read *Odes* II, or I, as well.

King's College, Cambridge JOHN HENDERSON
jgh1000@cam.ac.uk

OVID'S *FASTI*

MURGATROYD (P.) *Mythical and Legendary Narrative in Ovid's* Fasti. (*Mnemosyne* Supplementum 263.) Pp. xiv + 299. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005. Cased, €99, US$139. ISBN: 90-04-14320-3.
doi:10.1017/S0009840X05000570

The past twenty years or so have witnessed extensive scholarship uncovering the literary, socio-political, historical, religious and astronomical dimensions to Ovid's *Fasti*. It is the case, however, that no work has thus far devoted itself exclusively to a study of the poem's narrative, and Paul Murgatroyd aims to fill this gap by conducting a specific analysis of the poem's mythical and legendary narrative, using the latest tools of the literary critic. M. states in his preface (p. xi) that he has little room in an already lengthy book to consider the other, non-literary contexts for the poem; that he has room only to list the major influences on his work, rather than to argue his critical position; that his analyses and observations are densely packed, and intended for both student and teacher. Self-consciously apologetic as this opening may be, it does set the reader up for a vast series of observations on *Fasti*'s narrative, neatly arranged into chapters and subheadings, with good cross-referencing throughout: this book covers fairly well-worn topics such as the poem's internal narrators and rape narratives, offers summary overviews of Ovid's literary debts to Virgil, Livy and, indeed, himself, and enters some new territory by analysing narrative aperture and closure in the poem.

Like the subject-matter itself, my feelings towards this book are mixed. The most useful and detailed chapter, I feel, is 'Ovid and Vergil' (pp. 97–140), which provides a very good overview of Ovid's debt to Virgil, from the borrowing of single words and phrases to more extended instances of intertextuality and 'interfigurality' (pp. 119–26). In many other chapters, however, there are pros and cons. A closer look at two of these chapters – 'Other Voices' (pp. 27–62) and 'Ovid and Ovid' (pp. 235–67) – might reveal some of this book's strengths and weaknesses. In Chapter

2, 'Other Voices', M. analyses the various internal narrators who provide information in the poem. Building on the scholarship of others, M. summarises old and offers new observations on the individuality and subjectivity of the narrators, and moves the discussion on by giving closer attention to the personalities of those who inspire information: on this latter front, some interesting new points are made about the rambling, boastful tendencies of the inspirer Carmentis, who sets herself up in a contest of authority with Virgil's Evander (pp. 34–7), and about Egeria's noticeable concentration on her dead husband Numa (pp. 39–41). But elsewhere, the amount of material that M. tries to pack in makes for only general and incomplete analysis. For example, M. is right to suggest that Janus frustrates our expectation of a fight in the story in which he rescues Rome from the Sabine attack (p. 34), but he does not offer views as to *why* Janus does this – is the refusal to take up arms a generic point, or is this a further indication of the god's naturally peaceful ways? Furthermore – and this is a feature of most chapters – there are no concluding remarks to tie the observations together: for example, there are hints throughout this chapter that the authority of the voices deteriorates as we progress through the poem (e.g. p. 34), but any supporting evidence is not brought together at the end. Generally speaking, then, the analysis in this chapter is good at a summary level, as a first point of reference; indeed, the sense that this chapter is designed as introductory reading is increased by the regular use of colloquialisms (e.g. 'going a bit over the top' [p. 45], 'plonk' [p. 47]). But the student, and definitely the teacher, will need to flesh this chapter out for themselves by consulting more detailed secondary bibliography.

Similar criticism might be levelled at Chapter 8, 'Ovid and Ovid'. Whilst there are some interesting individual observations, about e.g. the sexual allusions in the Europa story (pp. 241–2) and Ariadne's memory (pp. 264–7), the lack of space means that M. does not engage properly with the major secondary scholarship which deals with comparison of Ovidian narrative in elegy and epic: though M. mentions Heinze and Hinds in a footnote (p. 235, n. 3), and wants to move the discussion beyond this scholarship, he doesn't actually answer them. The differences that M. detects between the narrative of Ovid's *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* are explained in terms of the poet's delight in telling the same story in different ways; but how does this fit in with or speak against the arguments put forward by Heinze and Hinds on the importance of *genre* in such differences?

Looking at the book as a whole, I am ultimately inclined to question the fruitfulness of focussing *exclusively* on literary aspects of *Fasti*'s narrative. The most productive readings of *Fasti* in the past decades have come from those studies which both use the tools of literary criticism (especially narratology and intertextuality) and seek to locate the poem in its religious, historical and socio-political contexts. M.'s choice to focus specifically on literary aspects, though valid and successful in places, loses out in other ways. In some places, I do not feel that the particular literary theory employed actually aids us a great deal. I personally cannot see the benefit in applying Propp's theory of 'functions' to Ovid's rape narratives (pp. 66–73) or Greimas' Actant Model theory to Ovidian characters (pp. 151–6). In both cases, it seems that the text exemplifies the theory, rather than the theory elucidating the text – what do we gain from such approaches other than a reassertion of something we already know, that Ovid is a master of *uariatio*? In other places, a less exclusively literary approach to *Fasti* is sorely missed. This is particularly the case with the poem's socio-political context. Because M. only mentions Augustus in passing, his use of terms such as 'irreverent' (e.g. pp. 2, 176) and 'subversive' (e.g. pp. 2, 209) remains nebulous. This weakness is especially felt when M. speaks of rape as subversion (pp. 91–4). For

example, M. makes a passing comment on the 'religious subversion' of having stories of rapist gods in a 'serious and erudite discussion of deities, cults and ritual practices' (p. 91). This is far too simplistic, given that the gods' sexual antics are at the heart of Roman religious mythology, with the worst offender of all, Priapus, worshipped at large at Rome and proudly advertised by some noble Roman families as their exalted ancestor.

In summary, M.'s book achieves what it sets out to do: to concentrate on the mythical and legendary narrative in *Fasti* and, building on earlier scholarship, to present new observations on its literary aspects to a mixed audience. And there are indeed many interesting observations scattered throughout this book beyond those I have highlighted above. But with too much material packed within its covers, little argumentation and no overarching message beyond the fact that Ovid enjoyed variety, this book is less useful than it might have been.

University of Leeds STEVEN J. GREEN
s.j.green@leeds.ac.uk

ARS AMATORIA I

DIMUNDO (R.) *Ovidio. Lezioni d'amore. Saggio di commento al I Libro dell'*Ars amatoria. (Scrinia 22.) Pp. 309. Bari: Edipuglia, 2003. Paper, €24. ISBN: 88-7228-380-9.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X05000582

Adrian Hollis' 1977 Oxford commentary on *Ars* 1 has long been a useful tool for scholars and students alike. At over twice its length, the expanded scope of Dimundo's commentary means that it will be welcomed by scholars. D.'s debt to Hollis is clear, however, from the frequency with which he is cited, and many will still find it valuable to consult him.

D.'s short introduction encompasses (i) Ovidian models, (ii) the poet's addressees and aims, (iii) the book's structure and techniques for capture, (iv) the authorial voice in the *Amores* and *Ars*, and (v) the relationship between the *Ars* and Latin love elegy; it does not consider the manuscript tradition, and discussion of the text is for the most part relegated to footnotes. The five sections of the introduction provide a concise overview of the ambit of D.'s commentary, although guidance on stylistic matters (in particular word order, sound and repetition) is also frequent. Such comments are, however, not always particularly useful; to take one example, her parallels for polyptoton of proper names at 27 ('Clio Cliusque sorores') are less specific and thus less illuminating than Wills 1996 on use of the device to illustrate close fraternal relationships.[1]

D. provides more guidance than Hollis on potential didactic models, with many additional allusions to Lucretius and the *Georgics* detected and discussed. Unlike Hollis, who is often content to let the parallels that he quotes speak for themselves, D. tends to provide analysis of passages where she detects intertextuality. This is particularly useful for students, but perhaps less so for the scholarly audience clearly envisaged for D.'s commentary. Nevertheless, it is good to see D. discuss in detail the use of Lucretius at 473ff., examples of time's effect dismissed by Hollis as 'trite enough to need no illustration'.

[1] J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1996), p. 259.