En ce moment plusieurs travaux se concentrent sur le rôle des animaux dans la littérature ancienne, un domaine tout à fait négligé auparavant. L’ouvrage de Jones, dans lequel la faune, les animaux domestiqués, ainsi que la flore et la nature en général sont étudiés, s’inscrit partiellement dans cette mouvance.

Bien que la poésie de Virgile ne soit pas un terrain tout à fait inexploré, l’ouvrage de Jones réussit à approfondir les connaissances sur l’œuvre bucolique du poète. Les éléments caractéristiques de l’espace bucolique des Élogues sont étudiés en grand détail. Ceux dont le domaine d’intérêt est la poésie bucolique (ou pastorale), non seulement celle de Virgile mais en général, trouveront dans l’ouvrage de Jones plusieurs nouveaux points de vue, et possiblement des nouveaux points de départ pour leurs recherches.

*Jari Nummi*


The study of panegyrics has undergone a renaissance in recent years, a good example of which is this collected volume from a few years back. While panegyrical literature had for long been considered an almost repulsive genre, new studies have discovered surprising new sides to it. Praise to the ruler, as typically presented in Roman literature, had important Greek and Roman predecessors, such as funeral orations or laudationes. The imperial panegyric, of which Pliny's Panegyricus from AD 100 is the first notable example, emerges as a typical representation of the position of the emperor during Late Antiquity. What this volume seeks to do is to present this remarkable speech in its contemporary context, not as a predecessor to a later tradition. Chapters in this volume continue a growing trend, present for example in studies on Seneca, which seeks to reread early panegyric texts or texts involving seemingly indiscriminate praise to seek out double meanings and irony. The result of these efforts has been the reevaluation of these texts, not as pure praise but as guidance and warnings, where the speakers seek to establish control over the emperor through the positive and negative examples they present.

In this short volume, the stage is set by an introductory chapter by Roche, who set the Panegyricus in its context within not only senatorial imperial oratory, but also the Greek and Hellenistic tradition. He maintains that the speech forms a bond between Domitian and Trajan as the negative and positive examples, and forms a praise of both Trajan's Rome and also Pliny himself. Carlos Noreña explores the role of the author and his prominent part in the presentation of prestige. The speech, given as it was on the occasion of Pliny's consulship, is as much an enterprise of self-definition and self-praise of Pliny's own role in imperial politics as it is of Trajan. Roche returns to describe the act of acquisition by Nerva and Trajan of Domitian's vast building projects, as well as the praise of Trajan's other acts of public munificentia, such as the alimenta and congiarium.

Doreen Innes explores the Panegyricus in the context of rhetorical theory and the presentation of the virtues of the emperor. Gesine Manuwald raises Cicero as an important precursor to Pliny, and compares the praise in Cicero to praise in Pliny, while noting the vastly different political landscapes in which they operated. Bruce Gibson then compares Pliny's epideictic to its contemporaries,
especially that of Tacitus, Statius, and Pliny's own letters. Gregory Hutchinson studies the aesthetic ideals in the Panegyricus, its presentation of beauty and magnificence, especially where Trajan's rise to prominence is shown equally as a sublime experience. John Henderson discusses the theme of historical exempla, how the superiority of Trajan is constructed with the creative and liberal use of historical examples. In this unfair comparison, Trajan emerges time and again as optimus. In the final chapter, Roger Rees aptly describes the way that the Panegyricus was received by later authors and how it influenced the language of the panegyric as a genre.

The volume is a welcome one, and offers a new and interesting interpretation(s), fresh use of the language of propaganda (Henderson's chapter is an especially good example of this), and a reevaluation of a long tradition. The individual chapters and the book itself are well produced and generally of high quality. It is essential reading for all scholars of Pliny, illustrating important new ways of approaching this often maligned text.

Kaius Tuori


The Oxford Lexicon proceeds with commendable speed. The first fascicle dedicated to Asia Minor was published in 2010, and now we have the second one, which covers the southern coastal regions of Asia Minor, from Caria through Lycia and Pamphylia to Cilicia. It is a huge volume, with 443 pages of name lists and a reverse index of some 27 pages. The name lists are preceded by introductory remarks of exceptional length; in fact, they are much more extensive than in any other volume of this series, no doubt due to the complexity of the material. One greets with pleasure, e.g., the detailed analysis of the naming practices in the regions dealt with in this volume. But was it necessary to give an overview of the Pamphylian dialect as we now have the excellent description of that dialect by Brixhe?

The central region covered by the present fascicle is Caria. The inclusion of Miletos to Caria instead of Ionia, a Herodotean decision so to speak, might seem surprising. Be that as it may (although surely Miletos was a Ionian city), the decision to include Miletos to Caria made by Peter Fraser in accordance with the opinion of some ancient historians (and not only Herodotus) as well as the basic principles of the organization of the Lexicon along geographical lines, has the virtue of convenience. It means that volume V.B, despite the rich onomastic material which Miletos offers, is at least slimmer than the huge volume V.A.

Due to its prosopographic character, the Lexicon, in each of its volumes, strives for material completeness. The authors of this particular volume have indeed succeeded in putting together practically all the persons known from the regions in question, and it would be pointless to complain about gaps. I have, in fact, found only two missing names in an inscription from Leros from the Imperial period, published by Th. Wiegand, AM 36 (1911) 294 no. 3: Θαρσαγόρα ἥρως χρηστέ, χαίρε. Τὸ ἡρῶον Φιλοπόνου τοῦ Θαρσαγόρου. Both names are known at Miletos from other sources. As to slaves, the majority of them seem to have been omitted, in accordance with the original decision not