

with the origins of the authors of literary texts with great care, but the problem of origins also arises for non-literary texts. The difficulties involved can be illustrated through the Vindolanda tablets, which, he rightly reminds us, were found in Britain, but the majority of their authors were likely to have been Celtic- and Germanic-speaking Batavians and Tungrians from the Continent. The main treatment of these texts is placed in the chapter on Britain (ch. IX), but the tension between the origin of the texts versus the origins of the authors cannot be resolved in this way. Indeed, the well supported argument that regional diversity was not restricted to regional boundaries might be somewhat undermined by the organization of the book itself (32), though it is hard to imagine a feasible alternative. A related comment concerns the excellent exposition of the problematic nature of statistical analysis and the importance of considering explanations other than regional variation, e.g. archaism. The concept of horizontal (geographical) and vertical (social) variation might perhaps have been emphasized more strongly, and the explanation for the confused evidence from the Republic might have focused more on the multicultural nature of Rome (118, 160, 181, 274).

The standard of production continues that set by the 2003 volume. The one inconvenient feature of Adams 2003, the lack of an *index locorum*, is thankfully rectified, though the exclusion of indices of the numerous Romance cognates may be regretted. Furthermore, even though the material is neatly marshalled into aptly entitled chapters and sections, it takes time to learn to navigate. For cross-references, page numbers are sometimes given, but it would perhaps have been convenient to have them as standard, as the references to sections could be confused by the use of bare numbers for *CIL*, and might pose difficulties for those using the book for reference.

A. modestly tries to play down his effort, by referring to himself 'groping around trying to unearth mere snippets' (xvi), but no reader will be fooled. A. has produced a rare book of outstanding scope and insight, combining all the best aspects of modern criticism with unrivalled traditional scholarship.

*Jesus College, Cambridge*

ALEX MULLEN

R. HUNTER, *THE SHADOW OF CALLIMACHUS: STUDIES IN THE RECEPTION OF HELLENISTIC POETRY AT ROME*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Pp. xi +162. ISBN 978-0-521-69179-6. £15.99.

A demanding but very rewarding book, if you do your homework. Hunter announces four interrelated chapters on the Roman reception of Greek poetry, particularly Callimachus, and points to some received opinions (1–6): the Callimachean qualities claimed by Catullus, Horace, Virgil, Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid, or asserted for them by modern critics, are based on only a few declarations in the *maestro* against big books and turgidity (*Ep.* 28; *Ap.* 105–13; *Aet.* fr. 1 Pf.), and reductively misrepresent Callimachus' actual variety. Other notions are (as he says) just wrong, e.g., that Callimachus repeatedly preached against hexameter epic, and that there is a watershed between the socially engaged poetry of Classical times and a frivolous and pedantic Hellenistic poetry bred in Alexandria, marked by 'crossing of the genres' (as Kroll put it in his *Studien zur Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (1924)). Nor, says H., was the foundation of Alexandria such a big deal in the continuity of Greek poetry; Callimachus' only innovation was his promotion of cultural panhellenism.

Ch. 1, 'In the Grove'

1.1. 'The priest of the Muses' (7–15): H. starts with Propertius posing as a priest of Callimachus, entering his grove (*Prop.* 3.1.1–6). This is not just a metaphor, but alludes to then still observed cults of early poets (Homer, Hesiod, Archilochus, Mimnermus). The worshipper, if worthy, becomes at last the worshipped (Callimachus and Hesiod, Ennius and Homer). The acolyte becomes priest by practice, technique, and competition, and hopes in turn to be remembered by merit after his death as a worthy exponent of the craft he has practised.

1.2. '*De monte sororum*' (16–28): such cults were tied to places. H. conjectures that Philotas' *Demeter* had a description of a *locus amoenus* in Cos imitated by Callimachus, Theocritus, and Propertius; Propertius' allusion to the 'mountain of the sisters' (3.1.17) takes us back through Callimachus' encounter with the Muses on Helicon (*Aet.* 1–2) to Hesiod's vision (*Theogony* 1–25); the surviving cult of the Muses near Ascræ and Thespiæ is described by Pausanias 9.31. H. refers to Velleius Paterculus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus to illustrate Hesiod's reputation in

the Augustan age as *the* poet of peace and agriculture (as opposed to Homer), and it is that which is most germane to Callimachus and the Roman poets, who keep returning to Callimachus' Helicon (Virgil, *E.* 6.64–73, Prop. 2.13.1–8). There is a sanctified poetical succession from Linus and Orpheus through Hesiod, Callimachus, Euphoriion, to Gallus and Virgil, and with the idea of such a tradition, such continuity, and the success of only the worthy few, there goes the poetic competitiveness that is enacted in the *Eclogues*.

1.3. 'Hard choices' (28–41): Ovid in *Amores* 3.1 meets the ladies Elegy and Tragedy in a *locus amoenus*, and has to decide; H. compares Longus 1.4.1–3 and Propertius 3.3 for the setting, and for the allegorical ladies, Prodicus' account of the young Heracles' encounter with Virtue and Vice as told by Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.1.22, to which H. wants to relate 'the tall lady' in Callimachus, *Aet.* 1.9–12; he further shows how Ovid in *Am.* 3.1 has with some typical inversions also exploited Callimachus' reply to the Telchines.

## Ch. 2, 'In the Grip of the God'

2.1. 'Dionysiac uncertainties' (43–5): 'Augustan poets turned Bacchus into a principal source of poetic inspiration...'; by contrast, Bacchus had only a small role in Alexandrian literature, because, says H., he was too popular, undisciplined, and noisy (cf. Catullus 64.251–64) for Alexandrian water-drinkers. (The Bacchus myth is alluded to, but only marginally, at Apollonius, *Arg.* 2.904–10 and 4.424–34, Call., *Ath.* 125–6, and strangest of all, Theocritus 26, a brief and clinical description of Pentheus' horrible death with the narrator's enigmatic verdict.) There is an interesting discussion of the ambiguity of Horace's ode on the deaths of Antony and Cleopatra (*Carm.* 1.37).

2.2. 'The boundaries of power' (50–67): Tibullus 1.7 honours Messalla: 'before his birth, the Fates prophesied the birth of one who would conquer Aquitania', cf. Catullus 64.321–2, 382–3 and Virgil, *Aen.* 1.286–90. H. derives both of these long-distance prophecies (about Achilles and Julius Caesar respectively) from the prophecy made by Apollo in Call., *Del.* about Ptolemy Philadelphus as future conqueror of the Gauls. H. notes how Tibullus and Horace take it on themselves to comment that they are personally contributing to the public honour of their patrons, following old Alcaeus, Theognis, and Archilochus; the hymnic form too has a public and a private aspect. Tibullus draws parallels between Osiris' *gesta* and blessings on mankind and the status and achievements of Messalla. This reflects the syncretic religious and political ideas of Tibullus' time. There is little in Alexandrian poetry about Osiris, but Tibullus 1.7 is replete with Isiac references, to illustrate which H. devotes an over-long section (55–67). He gets bogged down here. The main texts are Prop. 3.15–20, Ovid, *Tr.* 5.3, Tib. 1.3.35–46, 2.1.37–56, 1.3.23–32, and the fragmentary hexameter hymn to Isis from Andros (W. Peek, *Der Isishymnus von Andros* (1930)), in that order. H. claims that the Romans, in coming to world dominion, looked back romantically to the *early* Ptolemies as worthy precursors. Debatable.

2.3. 'The power of the name' (67–80): 'Bacchus' = wine and 'Ceres' = bread are common in Latin poetry: the main texts are Tib. 1.7.35–42, Prop. 3.17, Tib. 1.2.1–4, Pl., *Cur.* 96–120, and Hor., *Carm.* 3.21. Metonymy was a feature of high style in older Greek poetry, but in Hellenistic verse, only Ares as 'war' is common; other cases (Tethys, Amphitrite, Nereus for 'sea') are sporadic. Starting from here, H. somehow arrives, through another over-compressed discussion — the main texts are Theocritus 11 *init.*, [Homer] *b. Ven.* 56–7, Call., *Dem. passim*, Prodicus fr 5 D.-K., Eur., *Ba.* 272–85, *Cyc.* 117–26, 521–6, and Cat. 64.1–11 — at this opaque conclusion: 'Dionysus, then, was for Roman poets not just a source of inspiration, but a multifaceted idea with which to explore both their own similarity to and difference from the Greek poets whom they professed to follow, and also the uneasy relationship of imitation and superiority that Roman power and the Roman elite constructed with the Greek world which preceded them and was never far away'. Though H. is generally clear and as precise as speculative ideas will allow, he sometimes lapses into preciosity and abstraction.

## Ch. 3. 'Nothing Like This Before'

3.1. 'The art of the simile' (81–7): H. plays in his own 'knowingly' Callimachean way with unexpected and stimulating juxtapositions, and begins his discussion of similes with Pl., *Ps.* 397–405 (the poet seeking what is not, yet 'finding' it) beside Call., *Jov.* 60–5 (poets of old were not always truthful); thence to Homer, *Il.* 2.455–83 (the string of similes introducing the Catalogue of Ships), Virgil, *Aen.* 1.148–54 (the politician of authority calming a mob), *E.* 5.45–9

(Mopsus' singing soothes like a siesta and cool water), *ibid.*, 81–4 (Menalcas' singing pleases more than the whistling of the south wind rising, or the sounds of waves on the shore or splashing rivers), which leads through Theocritus 1.7–8 to the simile at Catullus 68.57–66, where relief is brought to the thirsty traveller by the Alpine stream and to storm-tossed mariners by the gentle wind for which they have prayed. 'Virgil [in *E.* 5] enacts similarity and difference not merely by reworking Theocritus' own analogies [about the death of Daphnis in Theocritus 1], but by recalling the most extended previous meditation in Latin poetry on "likeness" [Catullus 68.57–66], one very probably itself indebted to Theocritus and ... concerned with its relation to Greek poetry'.

3.2. 'Callimachean and Catullan similes' (88–102): H. starts from the striking and possibly Callimachean simile at Catullus 65.15–24 (the embarrassment of the girl who lets slip in her mother's presence an apple given as a love-token; cf. Call., *Aet.* 3); he notes that full-blown similes are rare in Callimachus, but are ironically pointed when they come — the humble Molorchus hears his enemy the mice as a fawn hears a lioncub in the offing, Call. fr. 177.5–11 Pf. [SH 259.5–11]. (H. often refers to 'SH', even in the Index of passages discussed (158), without anywhere explaining that it is the *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, ed. H. Lloyd-Jones and P. J. Parsons (1983); it is also missing from the Bibliography.) Ancient criticism distinguished the 'vehicle' of a simile (the narrative which prompts the simile) and the 'tenor' (its subject matter); Callimachus likes to break such 'rules' in his similes (*Cer.* 50–3), and the Roman hexameter poets are still more intertextually allusive and inventive in the ways that they apply them. The main similes and passages discussed are Virgil, *Aen.* 4.143–50 (Aeneas joining Dido for the hunt is like Apollo on the move), Apollonius, *Arg.* 1.307–11 (Jason passing through the crowd is like Apollo on the move), *Aen.* 1.498–504 (Dido is compared to Diana), Homer, *Od.* 6.102–9 (Nausicaa with her maids is like Artemis with her nymphs), Apollonius, *Arg.* 3.876–86 (Medea processing in her chariot to meet Jason at the Temple is like Artemis fresh from bathing), *Arg.* 1.311–16 (Jason, compared to Apollo, is immediately met by Iphias, a senior priestess of Artemis), Call., *Del.* 141–7 (the clashing of Ares' shield), Virgil, *G.* 4.170–8 (the business of the bees is like that of the Cyclopes beneath Etna), Call., *Dian.* 46–61 (Artemis and her handmaidens visit the frightening workshops of the Cyclopes), Homer, *Od.* 9.391–4 (the Cyclops' eye being put out sizzles like red hot metal plunged in water), Virgil, *E.* 1.22–5 (comparison of small with large), Catullus 64.100–11 (the Minotaur collapses like a huge tree overturned in a gale), Theocritus 13.49–52 (Hylas falling into the pool is like a shooting-star plunging into the sea, taken as a weather-sign), Homer, *Il.* 4.75–84 (Athena's flight from Olympus to earth is like a shooting star, 'a marvel for sailors or an army'); in that order. H.'s juxtaposing of apt examples works particularly well here.

3.3. 'Catullus 68' (102–7): Catullus goes beyond Callimachus in his unorthodox handling of similes, e.g., in 68.51–66, starting as if the Alpine stream were to illustrate Catullus' tears, but turning out to refer to the relief that Allius has brought him. In the eclectic background there are Homer, *Il.* 9.14–15 (Agamemnon's tears flow like a dark stream down a steep rock), 16.3–4 (Patroclus' tears likewise), *Od.* 19.204–9 (Penelope's tears are like snow melting on a mountain top and filling the rivers below to flooding), *Od.* 23.231–40 (Penelope is as glad to see Odysseus at last as shipwrecked sailors are to see land); and 68.79–86 (Laodamia's situation implicitly like Penelope's).

3.4. 'Something like a simile' (108–14); H. juxtaposes a few paratactic comparisons that do not specifically involve an 'as' or a 'like': Theocritus 17.9–12 ('The woodman wonders where to start his work in the forest; where am I to start in praising the honours bestowed by heaven on the best of kings?'), 13.62–5, Call., *AP* 12.102, Hor., *Sat.* 1.2.101–10, Call., *AP* 12.43, Hor., *Sat.* 1.2.114–19, 1.2.120–7, Philodemus, *AP* 5.126. The coherence of the chapter as a whole would have been better served by the omission of this section, which has the air of an appendix; besides, the last three cases discussed leave a gratuitously nasty taste.

#### Ch. 4. 'The Shadows Lengthen'

This chapter is especially rich and stimulating, drawing together points and approaches made in each of the preceding chapters, but it is not uniformly persuasive.

4.1. 'Passing on the pipe' (115–24) and 4.2. 'The origins of pastoral' (124–30): H. finds in Meliboeus' exile in Virgil, *E.* 1 'the passage of pastoral verse-making from Greece to Rome (i.e. from Theocritus to Virgil) troped as dispossession' (120); 'Meliboeus sees Roman Pastoral as a takeover by the barbarians, whereas Tityrus sees it as a miracle worked by a benefactor' (124),

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