



Review of Fragments of Roman Poetry c. 60 B.C. – A.D. 20.

Citation

Thomas, Richard F. 2010. Review of Fragments of Roman poetry c. 60 B.C.–A.D. 20, by A.S. Hollis. *The Classical Review* NS 60(1): 128-130.

Published Version

doi:10.1017/S0009840X09990709

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:4031543>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

FRP

HOLLIS (A.S.) (ed., trans.) *Fragments of Roman Poetry c. 60 B.C. – A.D. 20*. Pp. xviii + 440. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Cased, £80. ISBN: 978-0-19-814698-8.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X09990709

Editions of fragments have traditionally been more abundant in Greek than in Latin, obviously in part because there is a disproportionate amount that is fragmentary in the former, particularly preserved on papyri. Things have changed, however, for those interested in the fragments of Roman poetry. In the early 1990s it was rumoured that two notable philologists, E. Courtney (hereafter C.) and A.S. Hollis (H.) were each at work producing an edition and commentary of the fragments of Roman poetry, dealing, one assumed, with the materials in E. Baehrens' *Fragmenta Poetarum Romanorum* (1886) and W. Morel's *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (1927, with revisions by Büchner in 1982). C. published *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* in 1993. This was followed by Blänsdorf's revision of Morel–Büchner in 1995. Twelve years later came H.'s *Fragments of Roman Poetry*. H. suggests his be called *FRP*, the others, *FPR*, *FPL* and *FLP* respectively. Where C. was inclusive, admitting later material excluded by Morel and Büchner, who were following Baehrens in this (but Baehrens included those works elsewhere, in his *Poetae Latini Minores*, *PLM*), H. decided to circumscribe his fragments to the period indicated in the title. The disadvantage of this goes without saying: we miss out on fragments outside the narrowed chronological scope. Some may object to H.'s rationale, as he opts for 'approximately the same dates which Velleius Paterculus allowed for the great age of Latin poetry' (p. v). After all things did keep on going after Velleius, and it is regrettable that his tastes should lead to the omission of earlier poets such as Hostius, Accius and Laevius, *inter alios*, who are surely formative for what followed. The chief advantage however is that H. has much more room to shape his volume into a fuller commentary than C.'s. Only 155 (pp. 147–8, 189–341) of C.'s 485 pages of text and commentary are devoted to the authors for whom H. can through his restriction provide 409 pages – named poets and *Adespota Selecta*. H. omits the *Carmen de bello Actiaco* (*P. Herc.* 817), found at C. pp. 334–40 and suspected by H. of being not by Rabirius as some think but 'from somewhat later in the first century' (p. 385).

H. in no way replaces C., then, and C. is superior in being more comprehensive, but the student of fragmentary Latin poetry is now well served by – or will need to buy – both. H.'s format is slightly preferable and his commentary, the major contribution of his edition, is fuller – though C.'s abbreviated style allowed him to pack a lot in. For each poet C. had introductory remarks in which unitemised testimonia are embedded, followed by numbered fragments (starting anew for each poet) and apparatus, with commentary following each numbered fragment (according to Blänsdorf's numeration except where he disagreed with positioning). H.'s numbering is continuous throughout the volume (1–262), with Latin and English translations of testimonia and text, followed by commentary grouped together following an introductory essay that comes immediately after each poet's testimonia and fragments. The allocation of numbers to testimonia and text alike ('items') follows the model of *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Authorial inclusion in the body of the book is based on having at least one word of poetry surviving (so Hortensius is in, based on 99 'cervix'). A useful appendix gathers the rest (pp. 420–30). The appeal of H.'s edition is precisely its presentation of individual poets; each is now presented with his

own testimonia, text, apparatus, translation (very useful as part of the explication), general introduction and commentary. H. also aims to give contexts for the fragments, and to relate them to more extensively surviving poets.

To take one example, the 34 pages on Cornelius Gallus provide a full and detailed commentary on the poet, with the testimonia gathered into numbered items (138–43), each of which is the basis for coherent thematic discussion in the commentary: 138, eight separate testimonia (passages from Prop., Ov., Suet., etc.), following a pattern throughout, on the life of the poet (pp. 225–30); 139, two (Serv., Prob.) on Gallus and Euphorion (pp. 230–4); 140, six (Ov.) recovering Gallan motifs (p. 234); 141, three (Virg., *Ecl.* 10.42–61, Serv. ad loc. [*bis*]) on Gallus and that poem (pp. 235–7); 142, two (*Ecl.* 6.64–73; Serv. ad loc.) on Gallus and the Permessus (pp. 237–8); 143, one (Parthenius, *Erotica Pathemata*) on the opening of that work and its address to Gallus (pp. 238–40). Then come the actual fragments old (144) and new (145). Taken together these pages represent a fairly complete study of the poet, and the ordering allows discrete commentary on each of the items. C. on the other hand treated the various testimonia in his introduction, though he did an actual commentary on *Ecl.* 10.44–63, lines Servius called *translati* from Gallus himself, as well as on the new Gallus.

As for discussion of the nine lines of the papyrus, H. has eleven pages (pp. 241–52), roughly twice the length of C.'s treatment (pp. 263–8). To compare: C. p. 260–2 treats the name Lycoris, and assembles much of the evidence that also ends up in H. pp. 242–3; similarly on the identity of Gallus' *Caesar*, both incline to Julius, H. (pp. 243–4) less insistently, and also citing articles by Hutchinson and West arguing for Octavian; C. (p. 265) took unelided *tum erunt* as 'prosodic hiatus', citing Cat. 97.1 *di ament*, while H. (p. 245) adduces other, more relevant examples of final *-m* functioning as a consonant before a following open vowel (he also mentions, and places in his apparatus, Lyne's suggestion *tum, Caesar, erunt*); C. (p. 266) is more troubled by *fecerunt carmina Musae* than is H., who adds (p. 246–7) passages from Greek epigram with the Muses as co-authors; for *domina dicere digna mea* H. (p. 247) accepts C.'s (p. 267) 'that I could call worthy of my mistress' over Nisbet's original 'utter as worthy of my mistress'. At times there seems to be almost a dialogue: where C. (p. 267) said of the many instances of *dicere digna* collected by Hinds 'I do not think that any significance should be attached to recurrences of the banal phrase *dicere digna* in other passages of Augustan poetry', H. (p. 247) seems to find a middle position 'one or two of which may be deliberate echoes of Gallus'.

Of course Gallus is exceptional, as is clear from a glance at Blänsdorf's bibliography or at *APh* for the decade or two following publication of P Quasr Ibrīm inv. 78–3–11 (L1/2), col. i in 1979. Taking a less well worn instance, Horace's friend (*Odes* 2.9) and ideal reader (*Sat.* 1.10.82) Valgius Rufus, one finds four pages in C. (pp. 287–90), in H. more than 12 (pp. 287–99). H. (p. 290–1) is more detailed on dates and on the social status of Valgius, and adds to C.'s (and others') observation (p. 287) that three of the six pentameters end in quadrisyllabic words the fact that this situates the poems in the thirties or early 20's – implied by C. but worth spelling out. Otherwise H. in part lingers somewhat more on certain questions, for instance the possible genres in which Valgius was involved, or his influence (minimal) on subsequent Latin poetry. H. enters into scholarly debate with C. and others: p. 292 cautionary response to C. and to Nisbet–Hubbard about whether *Odes* 2.9.9–10 requires that Valgius wrote extensively about the death of Mystes his *puer delicatus* (*Odes* 1.33 might equally lead to the conclusion that Tibullus wrote of the loss of Glycera to a younger rival); in fr. 165 (= Valgius fr. 1 C. *situ rugosa rutunda margarita*)

H. opts in his translation and his note for C.'s suggestion (i) that *rugosa* is predicative, obelises *situ* (which makes scansion difficult unless the line ends with *rutunda*), noting 'one might reduce *situ* to a monosyllable' – as C. had done (*si[tu]*, giving a hendecasyllable), and suggests, as Morel and C. had done, a possible connection to Hor. *Epod.* 8.3–4, 13–14; in the interesting fr. 166 (= Valgius fr. 2 C.), H. has a much fuller discussion of the possibility, rejected outright by C., that the name 'Codrus', both in the *Eclogues* and in Valgius with reference to the *Eclogues*, might be a cover-name for a real poet (most likely Virgil himself), and in general gives the eight lines the commentary they deserve, including argument for what must be a correct conjecture (anticipated by Markland) in the last line, *Crisaeo* for *Crisaeae*; on the other hand on the couplet at fr. 169 (= Valgius fr. 5 C.) H. has discussion of a number of intertexts and references gathered together by C. (they are not found in Blänsdorf), discussion that in a sense elaborates what had already been discovered by C.

This review, for the tardiness of which I apologise, has focussed as much on C. as on H., but that is a result of the close relationship between the two, fully acknowledged by H. All commentaries are in part accretive, collaborating with what went before. That is why Gomme and Sandbach's Menander commentary is in many ways unsatisfactory; so much of it was constructed *ab ouo*. C. in his preface had remarked 'I have examined nearly all, I think, that has been written specifically about these fragments'. H. in his translations, and particularly in his commentary, adds significantly to the achievement of C., but he also demonstrates throughout just how much C. changed and improved the landscape for those interested in the fragmentary remains of Latin poetry.

Harvard University

RICHARD F. THOMAS
rthomas@fas.harvard.edu

MANILIUS

VOLK (K.) *Manilius and his Intellectual Background*. Pp. xiv + 314, ills. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. Cased, £65. ISBN: 978-0-19-926522-0.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X09990710

Seven years after her admirable general study of Latin didactic poetry, *The Poetics of Latin Didactic* (Oxford, 2002), V. has turned her attention to a single poet and a single work: the *Astronomica* of Marcus Manilius. Her new study is a masterpiece, a landmark in the interpretation of Latin literature. Its success is due in part to the clarity and simplicity of V.'s exposition and to her style, which is both elegant and witty; in part also to her unlaboured mastery of notoriously difficult subject matter. For this reviewer, however, the architecture of the book is the principal key to her triumph.

V. offers a succession of what one might call 'takes on' or 'passes along' the *Astronomica* from different perspectives and at progressively deeper levels in the poem. These act rather like irradiations: they serve to light up different strands within the poem and so enhance our reading of it.

Chapter 2 is the cosmological take, the pass around the physical universe, specifically the 'two-sphere' universe, classical antiquity's default model in which the sphere of the fixed stars rotates around a fixed central Earth while in the opposite direction turn the spheres of the seven planets. This astronomer's universe is the