

detail in this book. These additions sometimes make it difficult to follow the thrust of her overall argument.

But these minor caveats are only concerned with organization. Yarrow's important contribution is to create from disparate and fragmentary sources a reasonably coherent view of what the provincial intellectuals thought about Roman rule during the first century BCE. In recent years scholars have demonstrated the double identity of many intellectuals of the Second Sophistic, and Yarrow brings together an earlier group of six provincial intellectuals who had two or perhaps even three (Nicolaus) vantage points: Roman, Hellenic, and non-Greek Semitic outsider. Just as Posidonius saw the horrors of the anti-Roman Athenian tyrant Athenion, all of these men accepted Roman *imperium* as the least bad option. In the history of empires, that is a considerable vote of confidence.

Ronald Mellor

University of California, Los Angeles

Sander M. Goldberg, *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. xii + 248 pages. ISBN-13 978-0-5218-5461-0.

The whole great panorama of the history of Latin literature, *ingentia bella* and all, has become strangely popular as a topic, perhaps in the wake of G.B. Conte's manual (1987; Eng. tr. 1994); thereafter we might note variously, and with varying degrees of unease, Fantham (1999), Dupont (1994; Eng. tr. 1999), and Habinek (1998 and 2005). Not to mention a *summa summarum* composed under the baton of S.J. Harrison (2005). Let us be clear that G(olberg) stands at the saner, more sober, scholarly end of the spectrum: much though I find to reprove in 'Constructing literature', it is lucid and agreeable to read and clearly would be stimulating to discuss with abler graduate students.

G. has a large appetite for modern critical theory, alongside, fortunately, much skill in digesting and regurgitating Fish, Bourdieu and Jauss. I do not complain of theory's presence, as G. so loudly does of its absence (*JRS* 94 [2004], 202f., at my own expense): we must for now agree to differ. G.'s principal line of argument is that it is the *readers* of Latin literature (actually, we would do better to say 'audience', for G. does consistently and misleadingly undervalue the various types of *hearer* outside the theatre proper) who created the history of Latin literature, as much as the writers, at the expense (oddly enough) of the audience inside the theatre. Fairly happy nuptials of theoreticians and scholars; *ulularunt vertice nympheae*. I share much of their pleasure. G.'s account of early work on Ennius and Naevius (24-6), of the transformation of a maelstrom of acting copies into our pre-Varronian corpus of Plautus and of the surprisingly comparable history of the transmission of Terence (52-86) is on first (and non-specialist) reading helpful and persuasive. We would agree entirely (*Culture of the Roman plebs*; G., 128) that comic audiences revel in tragic references. Ennius and Naevius survive through the work of their learned readers and editors to be re-born from the pens of Lucretius and Virgil. Cato, or rather, Cato's own image of Cato, is projected (just as intended, we might easily enough contend) to function as a principal element in Rome's own conception of *Romanitas* (20-51). Compare the *palliata* as an active element in the language of Catullus and in the arguments of Cicero (87-114; reading consistently and perplexingly, yet again, preferred to performance), or the living presence of Roman tragedy in the *Aeneid* (115-43, where the preference attributed to Virgil for reading over performance is, this time, demonstrably wrong, *infra*). Those sections of G. less close to my own (archaising) tastes I do not venture to (mis-)represent here, and D.C. Feeney's illuminating review of Goldberg in *BMCR* 2006 unfolds a whole range of intentions and strategies, unseen by me, in the text reviewed.

One of the joys of writing large commentaries on the *Aeneid* is, precisely, that you get to measure quite precisely what Virgil has been reading, and how thoughtfully. You even discover

that Cicero's *carmina* are studied, pondered, absorbed and used. This is more exciting, more interesting, more fun even than the close pages of Teuffel-Schwabe-Kroll or Schanz-Hosius. The results are not that far, in profile, from what G. is here trying to do. Is it *right*, though? Or is some of it right? Does that actually matter? Actually, there is a bizarre analogy between one of my difficulties with G.'s approach and the structure of G.'s own argument, if you start to think of the history of classical scholarship in terms of the impact of the great scholars over the centuries. G. is commendably interested in some of the best German scholarship of the years 1840-70 (Weise, Ladewig, Ritschl). So it is slightly shocking not to find at 110, n. 50 that all modern discussion of *flagitatio* derives from Usener, via Fraenkel, *Kl. Beitr.* 1.122f. Or take allusions to Saturnian rhythm in later metres, in the wider context of cross-metrical allusion (23): see Handley, *Vir bonus...Studies...Skutsch*, 166ff., from Fraenkel, *Horace*, 439, in turn, after Heinze. On a lesser scale, discussion (cf. G., 134) of theatrical allusions in Lucretius begins seriously with David West, *Imagery and poetry of Lucretius*, 35-48; five years later, Wiseman (whom G. cites, alone) only polishes up a few details. And it is bizarre to explore the influence of comic language on Catullus (100-2) with not a word of the splendid exposition in Kroll's commentary.

I hardly doubt that G. would agree with me that it is good for students (and older readers) to be sent to the best, most authoritative discussions wherever possible. At 52f., there is a display of expertise in Roman topography, but when we reach 198, G. only cites, for Aeneas' tour of the site of Rome, Gransden's slight and tired commentary, which, after M. Steinby's *Lexicon*, the *Encyclopedia virgiliana*, Castagnoli's summary at *Enc. Virg.* 4, 546-8 (and his collected essays), along with C. Edwards' *Writing Rome* will hardly do. Lucretius' Iphianassa in Virgil (133-4) without P.R. Hardie, *CQ* 34 (1984), 406-12 does not add up. G. addresses the presence of the elegists in *CLE*: we have a good dissertation on the topic, E. Lissberger, Tübingen 1934, not to mention my remarks, *ZPE* 66 (1985), 251-73, *passim*. G. seems not to know A.M. Morelli's ample and careful *L'epigramma latino prima di Catullo* (Cassino 2000), or, for the decline of the Saturnian, Matteo Massaro's excellent discussion in *Epigrafia metrica latina...* (Bari 1992), 35ff.. It is not clear why, at 30, he discusses the force of repetition without citing the admirable book by J. Wills, whom he uses elsewhere. And for the complex question of seating in the Roman theatre (59, etc.), it is not enough to cite Miss Taylor's famous paper of 1937; with R.T. Scott, she returned to the topic, yet more fundamentally, in *TAPA* 100 (1969), 529-82. G. is hardly a scholar to suspect of haste; his editor and press may have a share in the blame, or indeed his friends and readers. These remarks derive only from a single reading, remote from the resources of a university library. And though G. is very close indeed at 128 to what I said in *Culture...*, 67, not there cited, that is, I take it, because we are both of us, *selbstverständlich*, right at least on that point, the unifying effect of the spectacle in the socially divided auditorium.

In reviewing T. Habinek, *World of Roman song, Hermathena* 181 (2006), 250-4 and *Myth, History and Culture* (the T.P. Wiseman *Festschrift*) at *SCI* 22 (2003), 320-3, I regretted that my (admittedly quite complex) argument (after Dahlmann), advanced in *Riv. Fil.* 122 (1994), 70-5, that the Roman tradition about the *carmina convivalia* went back not to some ancient reality, but to the early Greek world described in Dicaearchus, and had been calqued by the Romans in the absence of any clear information about their own pre-literary origins, had simply been ignored, *passim*. Not, though, by D.C. Feeney, *JRS* 95 (2005), 234; the case that what we are told about the *carm. conv.* may simply be a learned construct, of demonstrably Hellenistic origins, is, I am delighted to see, still alive and well. Unanswered too, as yet. But not a word in G.'s introduction, pages in which he also accepts a 'significant level of literacy' (5) in ch. 6 — Rome. There are indeed more written texts of that date than there used to be, but ample, optimistic generalisations are not yet permissible (cf. *Riv. Fil.*, *loc. cit.*, 55ff., and *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* 2 [Roma 1993], 792f.).

Over the years, I have also been grumbling — perhaps most in my reviews of *Strukturen der Mündlichkeit* ed. G. Vogt-Spira, *Riv. Fil.* 121 (1993), 81-5 and of J.P. Small, *Wax tablets of the*

*mind*, *JRA* 11 (1998), 565-71 — about the current unsatisfactory level of discussion of issues of ancient *Buchwesen*. In particular, G. is much concerned with the growth of literary canons in antiquity: he seems not to realise that there is much serious, recent discussion of the topic (76, n. 65): some of the contributors to M. Finkelberg, G. Stroumsa (ed.), *Homer, the Bible, and beyond. Literary and religious canons in the ancient world* (Leiden 2003) are a little extravagant, but Amiel Vardi's essay (*Homer...*, 131-52) clearly deserves citation, as does M. Scotti, *Esperienze letterarie* 7 (1982), 74ff. (known to Vardi). Perhaps even my own remarks, *SCI* 11 (1991/2), 127ff. It would be unacceptably tedious for the readers of *SCI* if I continued, in detail, down the melancholy list, but it is disconcerting to see in a serious book discussion (66) of ancient *Echtheitskritik* without mention of W. Speyer's *Die literarische Fälschung...*, discussion of ancient libraries (*passim*) without H. Blanck's excellent summary, *Das Buch in der Antike* (München 1992), 132-222, without G. Cavallo's invaluable collection in *Libri, editori e pubblico nel mondo antico* (Roma 1977) or ch. 2 of my *Virgilio; l'epopea in alambicco* (1991), and without either of R. Blum's ample discussions of Alexandrian book-usage, and lastly, repeated reference to professional readers and to public performances of epic (44-9) without note of a recent discussion of the Roman professional reader (*lector*) and his work, *GR* 42 (1995), 49ff.

Now I do not care a scrap whether I am myself cited or not, and I am indeed not engaged in accumulating some personal citation index, but when it begins to emerge that G. has not read particularly wisely or well on such central topics, it is clearly quicker to cite those discussions of the evidence and considered accumulations of the relevant bibliography that come ready to hand. If G. should protest that he had to be selective and had to cite what his readers could handle, then his readers should try to learn more languages and he should try harder to encourage them to explore the furthest anfractuositities of their library stacks.

And then there is Virgil (115-43): it is very odd that G. concentrates on the Furies of bk. 4 when there is also a first-class Fury in bk. 7, one quite fully commented, too. When G. writes (116) of 4.466 as V.'s 'one explicit reference to the theater', that is a bad slip: cf. *Alambicco*, 105f., A.J.E. Bell, *TAPA* 129 (1999), 269 for the evidence (notably, 1.429, 5.289). It is, I fear, easier to create the impression that there has been insufficient work on the *Aen.* and tragedy, than to dig out such excellent discussions as A. König's (1970) Berlin dissertation and M. Fernandelli *Quad. Dip. Fil...* *Torino* NS 1 (2002), 141-211. Not to mention articles on the tragedians, Greek and Roman, in the *Encic. Virgiliana*. More attention to V.'s tremendous sense of the theatrical spectacle and coup is called for; note Bell, *cit.* (273ff.) on the 'gladiatorial' character of Turnus' last fight. G. seems to think (120f.) that the ancient critics tended to underestimate the contribution of Roman tragedy to the *Aeneid*: the figures, nearly enough, are (in Serv.) Aesch. 3, Soph. 1, Eur. 2, Enn. *trag.* 12, Pacuv. 17, Acc. 11 and in Macr., Aesch. 5, Soph. 2, Eur. 12, Enn. 6, Pacuv. 3, Acc. 7, and that might prove helpful. Virgil's engagement with tragedy is at very least as theatrical as it is literary, *pace* G.; for the arguments, cf. Horsfall in this volume, 67-73.

It is (sort of) amusing to discover that CUP are as prone to mishap as lesser publishers, for 'Ptolomaic' rubs shoulders with 'Omeric', 'a plowmen' and '*homines nobilis*' (apparently in nom.; *bis*). 202, n. 66, for llx, read lx. While *Her.* is difficult CUP minimalism for *Rhet. Her.*, Syrian (91f., n. 10) is trickier, for Syrian. (the commentary on Hermogenes, a work of course generally familiar). Alas, much of the Italian, names and titles, is simply, grotesquely, wrong. Still, this is in parts a helpful, intelligent book, though I do wish it had not been so widely and variously vexatious. These defects clearly establish the reviewer's insatiable pedantry, but also reduce G.'s credibility and utility.