Finally, in 12.3 O. attempts to relate the various aspects of his discussion to the concept of ‘grounding’, the distinction an author makes between the foreground, or the main line of events (which are sequential) and the background, or events that are usually concurrent with the foreground. According to Hopper, ‘grounding’ is a ‘cluster concept’ because it uses the resources of reference, mood, voice, word order and so on. O.’s discussion not only confirms this view, but seems to be uncomfortable with «a fuzziness at the very core of the concept of grounding.» (475). While he recognizes that information type can be usefully plotted along the foreground-background continuum, and that the phasal character of a situation may affect its grounding, in the end it seems that O.’s topic and the opportunities created by the idea of grounding exhaust him. «In my view, this means that if we want to apply the concept of grounding we have to use it as a comprehensive term dependent on all these factors (and still others)». The last word in the body of his text is «etc.».

‘Part 5: Summary and conclusions’ is too brief to be useful, and that is in large part because the book attempts to cover every detail and to write for every audience. Most readers will not be interested in every chapter or part, and many will be frustrated by the assumptions and the dogged method of argument. An enormous amount of work that has gone into this book but the main value of the work is in its summary of data and its exhaustive bibliography.
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Any Latin poet who was born in 43 B.C. would inevitably grow up under the influence of the immortal genius Vergil, as well as of the generation of elegiac poets such as Gallus, Tibullus, and Propertius. Ovid came to Rome from Sulmo early in the 20’s to continue and finish his studies, and he was no doubt excited by the various products of that artistic political and educational center. Horace had just completed his two books of Satires; Vergil had just published his Geor- gica; Tibullus and Ovid were about to have their first collections of elegies given to the public. And Ovid found himself and felt himself in the center of a mass of poetry that provoked admiration and emulation. He tells us in Tr. 4.10 that he associated at different levels with all these poets, except that somehow the fates cheated him of the chance to become a friend of Tibullus (though he was around for about a decade with him), and that he only knew Vergil by sight: Vergilium vidi tantum (51). I find it a bit odd that friendship with Tibullus did not develop over those years, when Ovid was starting to compose elegies himself, but it is not

so strange that he and Vergil were distanced. Vergil was considerably older than Ovid and did not share the interests of the younger generation of elegiac poets, only of the Epicurean satirist and lyricist Horace, his near-contemporary. During the decade when Ovid and Vergil overlapped, it is not clear that Vergil spent even as much time in Rome as the reluctant Horace did; and he was firmly focused on the composition of his epic, far from the interests of Ovid. But when Vergil died in Sept., 19 B.C., he left that epic as a provocative work first for editors, then for critics and politicians and historians and above all for other poets, to make of what they could.

It was a little more than twenty years after Vergil’s death that Ovid set out to compose contemporaneously the elegiac-didactic *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*, a work in hexameters (his only such poem) and therefore viewable as a kind of epic. In the *Metamorphoses*, as most readers recognize, Ovid repeatedly confronts the text and themes of the *Aeneis*. The question which has been often asked and variously answered is: What does Ovid mean by constantly reminding us of his great predecessor?; or, What does he really think of Vergil’s epic achievement? It is, then, the problematic relationship of Vergil and Ovid in their two great works, the *Aeneis* and the *Metamorphoses*, that Andrae intends to explore with the thoroughness that the two poets and their poems deserve. The title she chooses indicates the direction of her thesis: Vergil’s poem exalted the Augustan Kosmos, as almost twenty years ago Hardie forcefully argued; and from that ideal order Ovid plunged in his poem to the opposite extreme, Chaos, in open defiance of Vergil. I shall be arguing that Andrae has not fully solved the problem with that extreme thesis.

In her Introduction, A. rightly notes the need to go beyond mere verbal and situational imitations or allusions by Ovid to deal with a very complicated comparison. She reviews the scholarship on Ovid and Vergil minutely, to demonstrate the problem of disagreement and the potential value of her exhaustive examination. But she provokes my caution when she examines the few passages where Ovid explicitly cites Vergil or his poetry and concludes that he expresses an ambiguous admiration for the poet of the *Aeneis*, unlike Silius Italicus, for instance – who would want Silius’ admiration more than Ovid’s quizzical smile? And she claims that Ovid frankly puts himself on the same level as Vergil in several passages, inviting us to compare the two. I do not think that the passages cited will bear the weight of her claims.

In her first main Chapter, which she entitles ‘Poetological Positioning’, A. takes Book I of the *Metamorphoses*, especially the opening presentation of Jupiter and the council of the gods and then the treatment of Apollo in 438ff, to present Ovid’s rivalry with Vergil. She notes that Ovid uses Vergil’s words, *conciliumque vocat*, also at the line-beginning, and she goes on to read Ovid’s Council as an explicit and obvious poetic defiance of his predecessor. Although it is possible to point out a series of contrasts between the two Councils and their outcomes in their respective poems, it is a bit presumptuous to infer that Ovid plotted his Council in explicit emulation of the *Aeneis*.

For example, Ovid’s angry Jupiter decided to drown mankind and did so by means of a storm in which he was ably assisted by his brother Neptune. Jupiter in *Aen.* 10 made an orderly decision calmly and surely; the storm which A. evokes as comparison occurs in...
Aeneis 1, not 10; it is not the result of a Council, nor activated by Jupiter but by an angry Juno. It would be easy to claim that Ovid alludes more specifically to Homer’s Councils (which were in the traditional initial book, unlike Vergil’s) than to Vergil’s, apart from this two-word verbal tag.

We might here ask what is it in the Aeneis that provokes Ovid’s poetological opposition. What is wrong with Vergil’s Council that stirs Ovid’s passion to defy him? Nothing, I think. Jupiter asserts himself impersonally and dispassionately, in accordance with Vergil’s view of him. Ovid does not question that construction, but he does have a different interpretation of Jupiter and a different theme to develop. The greatness of Vergil’s earlier narrative wins Ovid’s acceptance and admiration, but establishes a useful mark for his innovative poetry to exploit as it carves out its own brilliant path. To A., this seems like descending from Cosmic order into Chaos. But Ovid writes about chaos, not in a definitively chaotic manner; and Vergil more than once, and especially at the end of his epic, leaves us on what many feel to be the brink of chaos. For Vergil did not simply produce a conventional epic. There is no prior epic that resembles the Aeneis so closely that we are led to expect the powerful complexity of Vergil’s poem. And that means, I think, that it is dangerous to treat that poem as the paradigm of Latin epic, by which Ovid should be measured, by which we can judge the differences in Ovid’s manner as leading his audience to chaos.

After the Flood has subsided and new creatures replace the drowned ones, some of them new monsters, Ovid carefully selects out from that latter group the gigantic Python (1. 438), whom he apostrophizes familiarly for three lines, before changing his tone into something more objective and introducing Apollo as Python’s killer. A. reads Ovid’s narrative of ten lines as the victory of Good over Evil and therefore fully attuned to Vergilian epic (41). She cites with obvious approval the words of Nicoll, who declared it «a specimen of serious allegorizing epic. Virgil himself might have written it.» (42). On the contrary, Vergil would have died before composing something like this, which is neither serious nor allegorizing. The casual apostrophe to Python is a clear sign that Ovid is doing something special. He gives Apollo an epic compound, but ignores his heroic feelings and words, and his description of the god’s usual easy animal targets could well imply that the god blundered into this situation. As for the actual battle, Python does nothing to defend himself or to threaten the god, and the god emerges as a most incompetent archer, weighed down with a quiver containing a thousand arrows, almost all of which the great archer expends on the beast, turning it into a pin cushion before he finally produces mortal wounds. A. errs when she takes this mocking Ovidian narrative and likens it to Hercules and Cacus in Aen. 8. I do not think that Ovid is attempting to be like Vergil or unlike Vergil in this encounter with Python: he is setting Apollo up for his defeat by Love and his elegiacally styled pursuit of Daphne. None of that resembles chaos: it is an Ovidian tour de force which evokes the admiration of most readers and not a few great artists (like Bernini).

The next chapter (51ff) takes up what A. considers the basic disagreement of Vergil and Ovid at the level of conception. Her first sub-section uses her own title: ‘Vom Kosmos zum Chaos’ to fix the poets’ disagreement sharply. As if Ovid did write (or should have) in simple imitation of Vergil’s Augustan themes and structural principles, she castigates him for failing in this supposed goal and producing instead a general impression of disorder or chaos. The efforts of Brooks Otis to argue that Ovid in fact did organize his poem symmetrically have long since been rejected. But A. misses the attractions and successes of Ovid’s gliding transitions, his repetitions of motifs, and his penchant for surprises in what he
omits as well as in what he admits. He may turn some situations favored by Augustan propaganda from order into confusion, but chaos is not Ovid’s last word, not his final goal.

A. continues with a glance at narratology, contrasting the dominant, trusty narrator of the *Aeneis* with Ovid’s various and unreliable narrators. Similarly, Vergil has a consistent time-scheme, whereas Ovid does not; Vergil concentrates on a well-unified theme, but Ovid does not even have a metamorphosis in every story. In short, Ovid rejects and violates the principles of epic unity proclaimed by Aristotle and Horace and respected by Vergil. As a result, Ovid’s themes and structure are Chaos in performance. How little understanding this reveals of Ovid’s poetic achievement, simply because it differs from Vergil’s; and how little awareness that Vergil himself reveals serious doubts about the Augustan Cosmos, which we could imagine as anticipating Ovid.

A substantial chapter on Thematics focuses on the differing ways the two poets handle the same material. The bias is clear from the start: Vergil was always right, so it follows that Ovid’s differences were always defective.

A. starts with Daedalus in the ecphrasis of *Aen. 6* and in the several stories of *Met. 8*. The two poets achieve quite different thematic results, admittedly, but Ovid was more interested in his special themes than with any contrast with that short passage in Vergil. He produces a memorable and favorite account of the ingenious father Daedalus who could neither control his arts nor save his disobedient son Icarus from destruction. Then, just when we think we have reached a satisfactory sentimental closure, with Daedalus’ lament over his son’s corpse, Ovid sabotages himself and us with the correcting details about Perdix, the nephew whom jealous Daedalus attempted to murder. In presenting Daedalus as a pathetic father and also a murderous uncle, a masterful inventor of human flight and a vindictive avenger of his own artistic inferiority, Ovid abandons pathos for realism, not chaos.

A. also treats the role of Hercules in the two poets, the use of Fama in *Aen. 4* and *Met. 11* as an introductory device, the gross difference between Vergil’s two lines on Caeneus and Ovid’s four hundred – contrasts which seem forced to me –, before coming to the Aeneas of the two poets. Ovid’s so-called ‘Little Aeneis’ evidently plays with Vergil’s poem and assumes that his audience recognizes this fact. Ovid’s Aeneas is a very minor character, voiceless in a poem where many characters speak emphatically. If we are always expecting that this Aeneas should imitate Vergil’s hero in every detail, then, like A., we must register our critical disappointment. But those are the wrong expectations to impose on Ovid, as he makes clear. His poem is not the *Aeneis*; it is a poem of changed forms and of the theme of change.

The final chapter reviews implicit forms of Ovid’s opposition to Vergil and his epic, using four passages from the *Met.*: namely, the representation of Thebes under the authority of Pentheus, the battle of Perseus at his wedding, the contest between Arachne and Minerva, and finally the Calydonian Hunt. A. defers to Hardie, who is also her authority for Vergilian Cosmos, in his interpretation of Pentheus in *Met. 3* as an ‘anti-Aeneis’. There is a problem of definition in the word ‘anti’: it could refer to a substitute-*Aeneis* or to an attack on Vergil’s poem. A. seems to prefer the second interpretation, for she sub-titles her discussion to put Ovid’s stress on the ‘meaninglessness of history.’ That contrast with Vergil’s construction of Roman history as a supposed Cosmos then makes Ovid anti-Vergilian, opposed to Vergil, here.
The adaptation of Vergilian characters for the story of Perseus and his marriage to Andromeda, primarily at the start of *Met.* 5, leads A. in the same direction. She stops short of Galinsky’s and Boemer’s suggestion that Ovid produced an epic parody, but limits herself to calling it ‘only grotesque’ with Otis. What especially determines her conclusion is her conviction beyond doubt that ‘Perseus is in the right and Phineus in the wrong.’ (p. 216). However, it remains doubtful that Ovid puts Perseus in the right. Therefore, if Perseus plays the role of Aeneas in Vergil’s epic, he emerges as a worse Aeneas. Ovid, it seems to me, has clarified the ambiguities of Vergil, especially in *Aen.* 12, and represented Perseus as a sadistic bully.

The next example of opposition to Vergil A. finds in the often-discussed contest between Minerva and Arachne in *Met.* 6. 53ff. She makes some interesting readings of the passage, e.g., of the anaphora at 61 and 68 and of the significance of the double spondee at 69. However, she tends to simplify the interpretation of the whole passage and allegorize Arachne as Ovid, Minerva as Vergil. I doubt that Ovid’s meaning should be so drastically reduced, for he tends to make Arachne a spoiled brat even though a talented artist. And his list of her repetitive subjects strikes me as less interesting than the structured composition of Minerva. There are similar kinds of over-interpretation in the last two passages of Ovidian opposition to Vergilian epic: the Calydonian hunt, with its parodic version of *maius opus*, and the contest between Ulysses and Ajax (where again we are invited unwisely to read the characters as Ovid and Vergil).

A. has written a book that is both challenging and tendentious. She will find many readers, no doubt, who will readily accept her arguments that Ovid was in opposition to Vergil and that, in contrast to the earlier poet’s stress of Cosmos, Ovid constantly chose to emphasize the Chaos which he saw in the Augustan principate and in the human world in general. The problem I see in this simple opposition and in most of the interpretations which A. puts on contests and contrasts in the *Metamorphoses* is that it identifies Ovid too closely with his art and fails to see that he represents a world of myth with which he only partly agrees (just as, it seems clear, Vergil himself did not believe in the rigid Cosmos that is read into the *Aeneis*). Although Ovid conducts an almost constant dialogue with Vergil’s poem, it is too much to affirm that he wrote in answer to and in opposition to Vergil if we are not told why he objected to the *Aeneis*. It is too much to epitomize the theme of Ovid’s poem as mere chaos.
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