

isn't the result a bit too naïve to have been said in the senate? I think Muretus had good reasons for thinking that *s. c.* is a gloss); 4. 8 (now we have *multos una dolores*, etc.; but it is disturbing that the mss. have *multas uno dolore*); 4. 11 (*vituperatione prohibebo*; but the mss. point to some serious trouble); 4. 13 (*cum <iure> avum*; the addition seems indispensable); 4. 13 (<*minus*> dropped); 4. 20 (*esse iudico turpem*; Clark had dropped *esse*, apparently because it appears in different collocations in the mss.).

In addition to the text, there are also great number of *testimonia* both to the speeches and to individual passages; these will be of great service to scholars. Of course, here and there one could add a *testimonium* or two; for instance, a passage from 1. 25 is quoted by Boethius (*Comm. in Aristot. περὶ ἔρμ.*, ed. Meiser vol. ii p. 344), from 1. 27 by Augustine (H. Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics* [1967] I 45), from 2. 11 by one of the *Panegyrici* (A. Klotz, *RhM* 66 [1911] 545). – At the end, there is an "Appendix orthographica" and an index of names. – In the whole volume, I observed only one misprint, 'testimionium' on p. xxxii.

This edition, based on very solid scholarship and criticism, will from now on no doubt be regarded as the standard edition. The editor must be congratulated upon his achievement.

Olli Salomies

*The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. Edited by PHILIP HARDIE. Cambridge Companions to Literature. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002. ISBN 0-521-77281-8 (hb), 0-521-77528-0 (pb). 408 pp. GBP 47.50 (hb), 15.95 (pb).

Even those who do not specialize in Ovid or even in Roman poetry must have noticed that Ovid has been receiving a lot of scholarly attention in the last ten or fifteen years. This has clearly resulted in the upgrading of Ovid's status as a poet, previously thought of by many as an author mainly suited to being read in school as an introduction to 'serious' poetry and in need of being commented upon mainly on points of mythological prosopography. But in Ovidian scholarship, times have changed, and it is thus no wonder that one can now add this *Companion* to the monographs dedicated to Ovid in recent years. On the other hand, one may be a little surprised of the fact that the year 2002 produced not only one but two *Companions* to Ovid, for in addition to the Cambridge one there is now also *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, edited by B. W. Boyd and also published in 2002. (One is reminded of the fact that the Cambridge and Brill *Companions* to Virgil appeared almost simultaneously a few years ago.)

Now the term *companion*, used as here in reference to the study of an author, leads one to think of something to be placed on a somewhat higher level than what would be called an *introduction*. But in fact this volume has also been conceived as "an introduction to basic aspects of Ovid's works and their reception", as one reads in the *Preface*; on the first page of the volume, under the heading "*The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*", there is a somewhat modified version of this, for here one reads that this book is also designed as an "accessible handbook for the general reader who wishes to learn about Ovid". But in both places, higher aims are also announced.

To be candid, it is hard to see how this book could be used either as an introduction or as a handbook, for there is no *index locorum* at all and the contributions published here tend to be pretty heavy reading, at least for beginners; moreover, some subjects which one would expect to find in an introduction or a handbook are not treated at all (cf. below). Thus it seems that this volume would be more correctly characterized as a collection of essays on Ovid (this impression also emerges from the fact that some of the contributors have not been able to resist the urge to furnish their articles with fancy names of the type where a meaningless and a meaningful part are separated in the middle by a colon), although it must of course be admitted there there is a clear logic in the selection and the collocation of the contributions.

But of course it is true that the volume is not meant to be seen only as an introduction to Ovid, but also as "a sample of the range of approaches that have emerged ... in recent years" (thus the *Preface*), and seen from this angle, things change, as there can be no doubt that this is an extremely valuable collection of papers for the student of Ovid, especially for the student of Ovid who is already well acquainted with the man and his *oeuvre*. As mentioned above, the contributions tend to be scholarly rather than didactic, and normally they clearly presuppose that the reader is familiar with Ovid's writings; moreover, some of them have clearly been written in a state of great inspiration. The contributions are presented under three headings: 'Contexts and History', 'Themes and works', and 'Reception', the first two being of more immediate interest to the student of Ovid himself, the last to the student of Ovid's influence. In Part 1, I was impressed especially by R. Tarrant on 'Ovid and ancient literary history' and by T. Habinek on 'Ovid and Empire' (but the introduction of a quotation from J. Fabian, no doubt a deep thinker but apparently a person with difficulties in formulating his thoughts clearly, on p. 55 seems embarrassingly out of place), articles elegantly written and full of interesting points. Hardie (the editor) on 'Ovid and earlier imperial literature' and A. Schiesaro on 'Ovid and the professional discourses of scholarship, religion and rhetoric' are also interesting, but I thought both Hardie's and Schiesaro's manner of presentation a bit high-flown (a feature perhaps also characterizing Hardie's Introduction to the volume). Moreover, when reading the paper of Schiesaro, there were moments when I thought that it was perhaps not a very good idea to combine the subject 'Ovid's scholarship' (most interesting) with 'religion' and 'rhetoric'.

In part 2, we have altogether ten contributions, all of them dealing either with separate works (but none of them really conceived as introductions covering the main problems of the respective works) or with specific themes. Thus we have papers on 'Ovid and genre' (by S. Harrison), on 'Gender and sexuality' (by A. Sharrock), on myth (F. Graf) and on the 'aesthetics of place' in the *Metamorphoses* (S. Hinds); and, on the other hand, we have papers on all the works from the amatory ones to the exile poetry. I thought highly, for instance, of Harrison's 'Ovid and genre' (79ff.), especially of the parts dealing with the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses* (but some potential readers might be scared off by the introduction of the concept 'supergenre' in the fourth line of this contribution) and of Barchiesi on 'Narrative technique', full of interesting and well-made points (180ff.; on p. 189, note the passage "unfortunately [!] my mission is to focus on narrative technique (etc.)", a passage which seems to illustrate some of the problems of volumes such as this: established scholars in many cases prefer to spread their wings

instead of submitting to the discipline imposed by editors). Of course all of the papers are worth reading (although I thought Hinds on 'Aesthetics of place' was a bit on the lengthier side and that A. Feldherr on 'Metamorphosis' was kept on a level much too high for the inexperienced). Of the two articles by A. Sharrock, 'Gender and Sexuality' (p. 95ff.) and 'The amatory works' (p. 150ff.), I thought the latter, a delightful piece, was more successful (and I shall certainly keep in mind the definition of the *Remedia* as an "underrated, superbly sexy poem"; p. 160). As for the one on Gender, although it is clear that, from the point of view of the representativeness of this collection, this is a most useful and appropriate contribution, I cannot help thinking that approaching a corpus like that of Ovid from the isolated point of view of gender and sexuality may in some cases lead to conclusions which illustrate our thinking rather than that of Ovid (note what happens to the *Aeneid* when seen from this angle, p. 104, line 6ff.).

In this context, I cannot go into Part 3 on Ovid's 'Reception' (an expression which strikes me as somehow German) except by pointing out the interest of the contributions (among which there is also C. Allen on 'Ovid and art') and D.F. Kennedy's observation (p. 335) that there is need for a major work on Ovid's 'reception' in the 20th century. Instead, if I may be allowed, I would like to make some observations on the whole volume and on its conception, keeping in mind the fact that this volume is also designed as an introduction and a handbook (cf. above).

Now it is very clear from the first page onwards that the point of view is almost exclusively literary. Accordingly, there is nothing here on Ovid's background, his style, or the manuscripts of his works, although one would assume that even those whose interests are literary might wish to be informed on these matters. The fact that Ovid was from Sulmo in the country of the Paeligni is of some interest by itself, and there are many epigraphical sources which could be used to illustrate the standing of the Ovidius family there. And shouldn't there be a critical examination of the poet's life? Moreover (to touch upon a detail of minor importance), I would also like to see an introduction to Ovid with a note on the name of the city where he lived in exile; normally literary historians speak of it as *Tomis*, but *Tomī* is not unheard of (note here 35 n. 5). And if it is *Tomis*, is this a singular or a plural? (Inscriptions seem to show that the city could be called both Τόμοι and Τόμις which is a singular and declines like πόλις.) Also, the section on the exile of Ovid in an introduction to Ovid might gain from a few words on the area of Tomis, a region with not only barbarians but also with old Greek colonies, reachable within a few hours journey from Tomis.

But what about the other *Companion* to Ovid published in 2002? There are things in this volume which make one think. There is a biography (by P. White), a superb chapter (by E.J. Kenney) on language and style (p. 27–89; in part, a modification of an earlier exposition), a useful paper (by M. Dewar) on the fate of Ovid in Antiquity (up to the 5th century), and a very thorough and informative contribution on the manuscript tradition (by J. Richmond). Moreover, there is an *index locorum*. Add to this the fact that in the Brill volume, too, there are contributions on the individual works, on narrative technique, and on Ovid's afterlife (but only on that in the Middle Ages), and the result would seem to be that many might be inclined to think that, if one had to choose between the two, the Brill volume would be more desirable. (I would say that this was the case with the two *Companions* to Virgil.) However, there is one notoriously bad thing about

books published by Brill, and the Cambridge volume covers some ground which is neglected in its Brill counterpart. And, to say the truth, after having read the book reviewed here, it is now clear to me that there is room for even more introductions to Ovid, a previously neglected poet now almost in the centre of critical attention and no doubt offering much material for further scholarship. And, of course, I thought this was a great book, and I enjoyed every minute I was reading it.

*Olli Salomies*

MARIA PLAZA: *Laughter and Derision in Petronius' Satyrice. A Literary Study*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis: Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 46. Almquist & Wiksell International, Stockholm 2000. ISBN 91-22-01891-3. xii, 227 pp. SEK 244.

Maria Plaza's study of Petronius' *Satyrice* (a revised version of her doctoral dissertation) consists of the following main parts: Chapter 2 bears the title "A critical survey of previous research on laughter and related topics", concentrating on the narrating-"I" and experiencing-"I" (2.1) and the interpretations of the function of laughter (2.2); Chapter 3 focusses on the "Analysis of the motif of laughter and derision", with subchapters on *Sat.* 1–26.6 (3.1), *Cena Trimalchionis* (3.2) and *Sat.* 79–141 (3.3.), all divided into further sub-sections. Plaza's grounds (p. 11) for giving a special introduction and summary in 3.2 on the *Cena*, the central and almost independent episode of the work, are acceptable.

Plaza analyzes the function of the explicit references to laughter and derision in the *Satyrice*. This is a well-grounded theme for study because, as far as I know, she is quite correct (p. 3) that explicit laughter and derision have been considered important in the *Satyrice*, but the study of them has been neglected. This book, with its systematic episode-by-episode analysis of the references and contexts of laughter, fills that gap in the scholarly research on Petronius.

Plaza explains her aims inspiringly (p. 2). In particular her designs for finding out the function of the references in colouring the "tone of narrative" and "connection with major aspects of the *Satyrice*, satyr-like behaviour, satire and humour" offer a good starting point for discussion. Her deliberately narrow delineation (stated on p. 3), instead of a more theoretical approach is, indeed, a wise method of study. Plaza mentions first (p. 3) that she is "not primarily concerned with laughter in general" – yet she suggests to us on the following page that "our interest in laughter must thus be a broad one". This verbal inconsistency does not, however, reflect her analysis. To read this book is rewarding.

Ch. 2, the survey of the previous study of laughter and related topics in the *Satyrice*, is a clear introduction for a general reader, too. Plaza discusses respectively the main functions of laughter and derision in the novel suggested by scholars: satire, entertainment, pessimism and despair, affirmation and relativisation. She herself develops the points of view of the relativizing function of this laughter, presented in 1974 by Louis Callebaut and particularly 1990 by Gerlinde Huber; for Huber's research applied successfully by Plaza, see pp. 183–185 on *Sat.* 111–112, Eumolpus' story of the Widow of Ephesus. According to Callebaut and Huber, the laughter of the *Satyrice* is ambivalent, that is challenging and affirmative (so Callebaut, see p. 52, but see Plaza's criticism of his