This is a difficult book to review. On the one hand, the author’s erudition and range are immediately apparent – Hutchinson (hereafter H.) presents a considerable quantity of information in over 350 pages of densely packed prose, guiding the reader through the geographical and cultural contexts in which Greek culture was transmitted to Rome. This is certainly a wonderful resource for anyone interested in the transformative aspects of the interaction between the two languages and their literatures, particularly for the period between 100 BC and AD 200, and contains comprehensive indexes that will aid the swift retrieval of information on specific concepts and texts. On the other hand, issues of presentation conspire to make this a difficult read, and the sheer volume of the material is likely to reduce the number of readers who persevere to the book’s conclusion. The choice (prompted by a reader for OUP) not to translate the Latin puts it beyond the reach of most undergraduates, while the price puts it beyond that of most scholars.

After a brief introduction (see below), H. proceeds to his main investigation of the various contexts for the importation of Greek literature to Rome; this is divided into four parts. Part I, ‘Time’, considers the chronological structures that Romans employed when conceptualizing the relationship between themselves and their Greek predecessors, and surveys the metaphors of competition and warfare between the cultures that appear in classical Roman literary histories; Romans viewed Greek literature as different from their own – Greek and Latin libraries were kept separate, a physical phenomenon reflected in the segregation of authors according to language in Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 10. These broad lines could, however, be blurred, for example when poets such as Horace and Propertius attempted to set themselves into Greek literary history.

«The basic structure seems simple enough: two chronological sequences of authors, in many spheres commonly seen as without significant overlap. But the structure generates numerous intricacies and subtleties, and can be twisted in various ways» (17).

Moreover, Roman authors came up with novel ways of dealing with the oppressive presence of Greek culture – by consigning it to the past (Quintilian), for example, or anthologizing it (Cornelius Nepos and Vitruvius). In general, they perceived their own literature as still in flux – dynamism is apparent in the wrangling of Cicero, Seneca, and Quintilian on the issue of prose style, as it is in the supplanting of Ennius by Vergil as the premier Latin writer of epic – whereas Greek literature came to be treated as a museum. Greek literary history conveniently dried up precisely where Roman literary history began.

Part II, ‘Space’, describes the places in which Romans encountered Greek culture and literature – «literary experience», as H. terms it. The reader is taken on a tour of the literary microcosms and macrocosms of the Mediterranean – the villas and retreats of Italy itself, the great university cities of Athens and Alexandria (H. makes some interesting points especially about the latter), as well as the military outposts in the east visited by authors such as Cicero and Catullus. In Chapter 3, after noting that some Romans (Cato, for example) considered their own culture as an offshoot of Greek civilization from the beginning, H. lists the Ital-
ian locales where interaction occurred – theaters, public libraries, festivals (such as the Sebasta at Naples), and the senate itself (where Greek speeches were given). Greek influence was also present in education, the book-trade, and the gatherings of the wealthy in the city of Rome and its surroundings. Departing from Italy, H. takes us around the Mediterranean, covering contexts for literary interaction in the major centers, while also providing evidence for the phenomenon in less discussed venues for cultural exchange such as Sicily and Marseilles. I found this part of the book particularly interesting, and it will be useful for anyone looking for a synoptic view before investigating specific depictions of interaction between the cultures, such as can be found in the Athenian setting of Cicero, De Finibus 5.

Part III, ‘Words’, first focuses on perceived differences of language – the lightness and speed of Greek in contrast with the weight and ponderousness of Latin, for example – and the way that such perceptions could be translated into moral language. As in Part II, H. demonstrates that some Roman authors (Varro, for example) thought aspects of the Latin language to be related to Greek, and comments on the debate about the relative sizes of the two vocabularies. In Chapters 7–10 of Part III, perhaps the heart of the book, H. explores the Roman use of Greek texts in a series of close readings. In Chapter 7, the relationship is considered via triads of intertextually interrelated authors, such as a single Greek historian pitted against two Roman writers. According to H., certain developments in terms of perception of space can be discerned in the treatment by Polybius, Livy, and Silius Italicus of Hannibal’s crossing of the Alps: Polybius conceives of a reader not necessarily located at Rome, whereas Roman authors speak of how Hannibal, as Coelius Antipater put it, in Italiam venit. Moreover, Livy and Silius, in spite of their generic differences, show affinity in their use of a communal language: the intertextual relationship is tighter between the Latin authors than it is with the Greek. This may strike the reader as unsurprising, but it is worthy of comment, and H.’s investigation reveals nuance; in a subsequent section (‘Placing Pastoral’) H. shows how Calpurnius Siculus employs Virgil’s Eclogues rather than Theocritus, yet, H. notes,

«The significance of Greek intertexts must be strongly hinted; Calpurnius’ closeness to Virgil is bound up with nationalistic statement, but does not present an exclusive position, still less an actual avoidance of Greek models» (180).

The relationship between Greek and Latin is a complicated one; later Roman authors appear to draw primarily on their earlier Latin models, but there is room for interaction with the Greek archetype. This particular section of the book is highly condensed; little introduction to the works in question is provided, and the reader is immersed into a complicated triadic situation without much in the way of preparation. H. could have turned Chapter 7 into a monograph in itself, and indeed, in order to support its conclusion, which contains such statements as the following,

«Two aspects particularly mark out adaptation across languages: the change in the spatial orientation of the reader, and the difference in the languages themselves» (181),

one would have liked to have seen H. provide more than three case studies (even though the conclusion itself seems fairly uncontroversial). Chapters 8–10
investigate further aspects of translation and transformation, and contain, for example, an interesting contribution to the debate concerning the relationship of different Latin versions of Euripides’ Medea (those of Ennius and Seneca) and how different stylistic registers, determined by the period of composition, affected the interaction with the Greek author (‘The Birth of Point’). By the end of Chapter 9 the reader has been exposed to a series of tight explorations of the relationships between a number of sometimes fairly obscure texts, although the overall conclusion is somewhat ambivalent. H. avoids committing himself to large claims: as he states at the end of Part III,

«the exploration of particular adaptations, with an interest in wider tendencies, seems at least as profitable as ambitious generalization» (219).

This is perfectly reasonable, although it is small reward for the reader who has read through all of H.’s examples in the hope of a major payoff at the end. As things stand, these pages will probably be used more by scholars interested in the specific texts in question than by those looking for an account of the broader interaction of the literatures. If H. intended his book to be read through sequentially, and it seems that he did, it would have been useful to give the reader more aid in these chapters.

Part IV, ‘Genre’, the longest of the book, introduces the way in which Greek literature was incorporated into Roman culture by way of genre, a theme to which H. has returned throughout his career. Here, H., expanding on earlier work, introduces his conception of «super-genres» – philosophy, history, and oratory in prose, for example, and hexameter in poetry. In an interesting move, H. begins his discussion by providing lists of the titles and number of surviving books from each of the three major prose super-genres (224–225). H. then considers the development of and interaction between the various super-genres, before entering into a debate concerning Roman prose rhythm, apparently imported to Rome at quite a late date (234), and its varying popularity among the super-genres of oratory, philosophy, and history. He argues that the process of adoption was not identical across the board:

«Already on this basic level the super-genres have a very different relation among themselves to Roman, Greek, and other non-Roman subject-matter» (247).

Next, H. turns to consider the «grounds» of the super-genres – that is to say, «the situation and setting: the speaker, the addressee, the time, place, and so forth» (249). H. notes differences among the various forms – few Roman prose treatises are addressed to Greeks, for example, although the reverse certainly obtains (Greek prose treatises addressed to Romans). In history there are clear differences in the self-presentation of the author - Roman authors did not attach themselves to their home city, as had Greek historians, but Rome nevertheless forms a «deictic center» in their works. In oratory, of course, the ground is generally Roman:

«Oratory has a longer Roman tradition by the time of Cicero, and Roman material is less liable than philosophical conceptions to invite thoughts of Greek» (271).

H. then proceeds to the complicated super-genre of hexameter, under which he includes narrative epic, pastoral, didactic, and satire. While Quintilian appears
to separate the latter from the other genres of dactylic hexameter, H. points out that satire had complex links with mainstream epic (certainly a reasonable point). There follows a typology of the different hexameter genres and their varying relationships to their Greek forerunners, as well as a discussion of how the situation changed over the centuries. In the final part of the book, H. argues for further intertexts – for example, finding connections between Lucan and Homer in spite of the fact that the latter poem is generally seen as engaging primarily with Virgil. In doing so, he puts forward evidence from the necromancy of Pharsalia 6 (cf. Odyssey 11), Caesar’s speech in Pharsalia 5 (cf. Odyssey 5), as well as the analogy Pompey : Cornelia :: Hector : Andromache, although in the case of the latter he admits:

«But the material is so much transformed that detailed connection is hard to establish» (331).

One should at the very least keep Homer in mind when reading the Pharsalia, but the connection is weak and prone to static caused partly by the Greek poem’s being filtered through later poets (332–333).

There is much of value in the book. H. offers insights that rest on decades of research and experience, and signs of a true Kenner of Greek and Latin literature are apparent on every page. His previous works on Cicero and Hellenistic poetry already demonstrated his ability to move between fields, and one frankly stands in awe of H.’s range and of his accomplishment in drawing together so many disparate threads into an overarching whole. Moreover, H.’s assessment of the broader cultural backdrop for intertextuality clearly fills something of a gap in the existing scholarship. While the individual readings perhaps lack the crispness of earlier discussions of intertextuality such as those of Conte and Hinds, this is frequently ascribable to their sheer density. H. also deserves thanks for emphasizing the importance of studying Greek and Latin intertextuality as a cross-linguistic phenomenon; despite the fact that this is not exactly a new breakthrough – see, for example, the essays in Richard Thomas’ ‘Reading Virgil and His Texts’ (1999) – nobody, to my knowledge, has attempted anything on this kind of scale before. The book demonstrates that the study of Latin intertextuality has matured in the wake of the classic essays of the final decades of the twentieth century.

Still, a few words must be said on what I feel to be the book’s shortcomings. The first is the absence of methodological consideration: the term «intertextuality» occurs in the title, but is defined neither in the introduction (which is two pages long; there is no separate conclusion) nor in the body of the book. Foundational theoretical texts on intertextuality, such as Genette’s Palimpsestes, are not mentioned, which is a shame, since Genette both discussed the issue of intertextuality between languages as well as the role of genre, introducing terms such as «hypotext» and «hypertext» that might have been useful for H.’s project. As things stand, H. seems to feel that the polysemous term «intertextuality» is entirely transparent and without need of definition. H. certainly gives practical demonstrations of his conception of intertextuality throughout his book, but some theoretical reflections at the outset would have been extremely valuable. Other important words for H.’s investigation, such as «ground» (a term that has been adopted from cognitive science) and «super-genre» are also defined only en
passant. The use of theoretical terminology would seem to require deeper discussion of the theories behind it than what we find here. In addition, H. generally focuses on the formal characteristics of the texts he considers; while H. excels at this, it would have been useful to see more sustained consideration of the place of psychological considerations in the transformation of «Greek into Latin». How does the figure of the author precisely function in H.’s analyses? How do Roman experiences in the multicultural settings that H. documents actually contribute to literary production? In particular, can one nowadays speak about authorial intention in literary criticism? Bloom’s «anxiety of influence» has long been put to productive use by Latinists (Philip Hardie, for example), and even if H. were against such an approach (and it does not seem that he is), this book presented an opportunity to return to some of the fundamental questions concerning allusion and intertext posed so remarkably by Stephen Hinds some sixteen years ago.

While it will strike some as uncouth, I feel that it is important to note certain issues of structure and layout, since these have an impact on the accessibility of the information. H. may himself be the auctor of a new prose genre; he says as much on the first page:

«The style of presentation lies somewhere between that of a more normal critical book and that of a commentary» (1).

Indeed, it would have been useful for H. to have described in his introduction how he envisions his book being used – a monograph is generally read cover to cover, while a commentary is consulted ad locum. H.’s book is in fact more difficult to read than a simple commentary, in that it does not resemble a commentary of a single classical work as much as it does an anthology of commentaries on a range of different authors: one might call it a super-commentary.

One thing that should be remarked on is H.’s use of the footnote. As a rule, he only employs these at the end of each paragraph; this is perhaps a sensible strategy, in that it reduces the amount of ocular movement up and down the page, but this small mercy is offset by the fact that material that should be in the footnotes appears to have forced itself into the main body of the text. The conventions of the commentary are immediately apparent in H.’s prose – abbreviations, parentheses within parentheses, sentences ending within parentheses, and listings of comparanda abound. The information is all there, but its absorption is made difficult by the large clumps of matter that weigh down H.’s prose; one can observe the disruptive effect of this in the following:

«It is characteristic of Livy in naming writers to lay prime emphasis on those in the Roman tradition, but to distance himself from them, credulous or incredible as they are (so too Licinius Macer at 7.8.3–5, 10.9.10–12 (with Tubero), Claudius Quadrigarius at 9.5.1–5, Antipater at 29.25.2–4 (cf. 21.46.10), and Cincius at 21.38.1–9 (a Roman writing in Greek, Dion. Hal. Ant. 1.6.2, FGriHist 810 T 7)). This role is particularly played by Valerius Antias, from some point in the first century» (23).

Parentheses appear to have usurped the role of footnotes, the result being that reading H. can involve an exhausting hunt for the close of the brackets – a practice made difficult by the fact that there are so many of them. To give another example:
Pollio restored the official building the Atrium Libertatis (Suet. Aug. 29.5), and there
gave Rome its first public Greek and Latin collections (Ov. Trist. 3.1.71–2; Plin. Nat. 7.115
(read in urbe [so Sabellus]... [Romae] est?); 35.110, Isid. Etym. 6.5.1). Busts of authors
added atmosphere and pomp (50).

Yet while the presence of parentheses is at times problematic, at other points
one wishes that they had been used more liberally; take the following sentence
(which opens a paragraph on the role of Sicily as a context for cultural interaction):

Lucilius Marx = XXVI 16 Charpin suggests that Sicilians were like Tarentines and
Consentines in being Greek but able to understand Latin up to a point (77).

Here a certain awkwardness could have been avoided by placing the editor’s
name within brackets (or perhaps by simply dispensing with the identification of
the two editions); as the sentence stands, it is on first glance difficult to determine
whether the subject is «Lucilius» or «Charpin»; while the sentence resolves itself
after quick consideration, cognitive energy is nevertheless unnecessarily expend-
ed. There is no reason why one should labor so: the study of literary history can
be a riveting experience, as Norden’s ‘Die antike Kunstprosa’ demonstrated more
than a century ago. One is certainly impressed by the density of the comparanda
that H. provides, and his references will undoubtedly be useful for those consult-
ing the book for specific passages, but one wonders whether they needed to be
presented in the way they have been.

In fact, there is something rushed about the style of the book in general; the
language is at times unusual, to the extent that it is sometimes unclear whether
one is dealing with H.’s own idiolect or with a solecism. For example, the follow-
ing passage clearly involves the simple omission of the word ‘poet’ in the first
subordinate clause:

We see a lucid example of change between Virgil, who presents himself as the first Lat-
in pastoral and has Theocritus’ poetry as his prime point of reference, and Calpurnius,
who makes Virgil what Theocritus had been for Theocritus’ successors and for Virgil (P.
Vindob. Rainer 29801 illustrates a poem not even thought to be by Theocritus but using
his language.) (326).

But what is one to make of the heading in Chapter 3: ‘Rome: Initiatives of
Greek and Others’ (52)? Has an ‘s’ been inadvertently left out (H.’s headings can
be somewhat opaque)? At other times, one is simply dealing with unconvention-
al syntax that could have been ironed-out in the editing stage:

Poets who write hexameter satire do not write other types of hexameter poetry (if we
view Horace’s Epistles as an extension of satire; if not, he is an exception who does not in
hexameter aspire high generically) (325).

It may be just me, but I had to read the last clause a few times before I under-
stood how to construe it. At any rate, such difficulties reduce the pleasure that
one gets from reading, which is a pity given the ease with which they might have
been avoided.

In sum, there is much to recommend this book; H.’s achievement is monu-
mental and is probably unique in the field. Nevertheless, it is at the very least a
difficult read, and its insights might have been bolstered by more expansive fram-
ing material, as well as a full introduction/conclusion to elaborate on H.’s meth-
odology and distil his findings. One should doubtless consult its indexes as soon as possible in order to determine whether H. comments on passages on which one is working, but one can only hope that H.’s numerous substantive insights will be collected at some point in the future in a less monolithic companion edition. We have much to learn from this authority, and his findings ought to be showcased in a more accessible form.

Heidelberg

Andreas T. Zanker


In der Einleitung erfolgt ein Überblick über die «Forschung zur Horaz-Rezeption von Properz zu Lukan» (13 ff), wobei zu Recht beklagt wird, daß literarische Rezeption vielfach nur im Kontext derselben Gattung für möglich gehalten wird (22 f) – welches Prinzip bei strenger Durchführung dazu führen müßte, daß man wirkliche Horaz-Rezeption erst bei Prudenz oder zuvor allenfalls in den Chorliedern der Senecatragödien untersuchen könnte. Groß nimmt dagegen eine vielfältige und differenzierte Auseinandersetzung mit Horaz bereits seit der augusteischen Zeit an, wobei er das Pendel vielleicht etwas zu sehr nach der anderen Seite hin ausschlagen läßt: Etwa das, was über das Verhältnis Properzens zu Horaz gesagt wird (14–16), scheint doch ein wenig über das verfügbare Stellenmaterial hinauszugehen. Das herangezogene intertextuelle Begriffsinstrumentarium (35 ff, vgl. 274 f) wird, wie Groß selbst zugibt (38), etwas breiter entwickelt, als es für die Durchführung der Arbeit erforderlich ist.

Groß gibt sich nicht mit dem punktuellen Nachweis einzelner Berührungen zwischen Lucan und Horaz zufrieden, sondern will den horazischen Einfluß auch an der Erzählweise Lucans festmachen. So verfolgt er die zunehmende Subjektivierung der Erzählinstanz im Gang der epischen Gattung (41 ff) und sieht in Lucan den Höhepunkt dieser Entwicklung (43), was man beispielsweise an seinem intensiven Gebrauch der Apostrophe erkenne, die man keineswegs als bloßes Stilmittel in Übersetzungen nivellieren dürfe (44). Als spezifisch horazischer Einfluß auf die Haltung des lucanischen Erzählers wird die «mahrende Rede an ein Kollektiv» ausgemacht (46 f), die sich besonders in den mit dem Bürgerkrieg befaßten Epoden 7 und 16 nachweisen lasse.

Doch auch über den horazischen Einfluß hinaus wagt sich Groß an umstrittene Probleme der lucanischen Erzählhaltung heran, besonders in dem Kapitel ‘Lucan – Dichter des geistigen Widerstands?’ (48 ff).

Das hierbei erzielte Ergebnis scheint mir indes das bei weitem problematischste des ganzen Buches. Groß geht aus von dem Problem des Widerspruchs zwischen dem Nerolob im Prooemium (1 33 ff) und der vielfach beobachteten prinzipatsfeindlichen Haltung des lucanischen Erzählers (50 ff). Eine Lösung dieses Problems findet er darin, daß der Erzähler im Prooemium weitaus weniger emotional spreche als in der weiteren Erzählung,